

Administrative Review Draft

Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study and Economic Impact Analysis



May 13, 2015



DAVID PAUL ROSEN & ASSOCIATES
DEVELOPMENT, FINANCE AND POLICY ADVISORS



SUBMITTED TO:

City of Seattle
Legislative Department
PO Box 34025
Seattle, WA 98124-4025

SUBMITTED BY:

David Paul Rosen & Associates

1330 Broadway, Suite 937
Oakland, CA 94612
510-451-2552
510-451-2554 Fax
david@draconsultants.com
www.draconsultants.com

3941 Hendrix Street
Irvine, CA 92614
949-559-5650
949-559-5706 Fax
nora@draconsultants.com
www.draconsultants.com



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Background and Introduction	1
Target Income Levels	2
Affordability Gap Analysis.....	3
Residential Nexus Analysis.....	4
Introduction	1
The Nexus Rationale.....	1
Affordability Gap Analysis.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Housing Development Costs	4
Calculation of Per Unit Subsidy Amounts.....	4
Residential Nexus Analysis	5
Impact Methodology and Use of the IMPLAN Model	5
The IMPLAN Model	6
Disposable Income of New Households.....	7
Projected Employment Generation	9
Projected Household Growth.....	9
Projected Very Low and Low Income Households	9
Total Affordability Gap for New Households.....	10
Non-Residential Nexus Analysis	11
Overview of Non-Residential Nexus Methodology.....	11
Non-Residential Nexus Methodology and Assumptions	12
Estimate Total New Employees in Prototype Buildings...	12
Estimate Employees Living in the City of Seattle	13
Adjust from Employees to Employee Households	13
Distribute Employee Households By Occupation	14
Estimate Wages by Occupation	14
Estimate Very Low and Low Income Households	14



List of Tables
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

Table Number	Table Title	Pages	Page Number
Table 1	Affordable Housing Income Limits by Household Size		5
Table 2	Per Unit Affordability Gaps	New Construction Multifamily Housing	6
Table 3	Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees, Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes	Current Minimum Wage	9
Table 4	Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees, Office and Hotel Prototypes	Current Minimum Wage	9
Table 5	Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees, Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes	2017 Minimum Wage	10
Table 6	Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees, Office and Hotel Prototypes	2017 Minimum Wage	10
Table 7	Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees, Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential Prototypes and Non-Residential Uses	Current Minimum Wage	11
Table 8	Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees, Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential Prototypes and Non-Residential Uses	2017 Minimum Wage	12
Table 9	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes	Current Minimum Wage	2 16
Table 10	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Office and Hotel Prototypes	2017 Minimum Wage	2 18
Table 11	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes	Current Minimum Wage	1 20
Table 12	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Office and Hotel Prototypes	2017 Minimum Wage	1 21
Table 13	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fee: Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential and Mixed-Use Prototypes	Current Minimum Wage	1 22
Table 14	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees: Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential and Mixed-Use Prototypes	2017 Minimum Wage	1 23
Table 15	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Non-Residential Nexus Fees: Additional Non-Residential Land Uses	Current Minimum Wage	1 24
Table 16	Calculation of Estimated Maximum Non-Residential Nexus Fees: Additional Non-Residential Land Uses	2017 Minimum Wage	1 25
Table 17	Rental Affordability Gap Calculations	Low and Mid-Rise Prototypes	1 26
Table 18	Development Prototypes		3 27
Table 19	Additional Development Prototypes		2 30
Table 20	Disposable Household Income of New Homebuyers	Owner Housing Prototypes	1 32
Table 21	Disposable Household Income of New Renter Households	Rental Housing Prototypes	1 33
Table 22	Disposable Household Income of New Homebuyers	Additional Owner Housing Prototypes	1 34
Table 23	Disposable Household Income of New Renter Households	Additional Rental Housing Prototypes	1 35
Table 24	Projected Employment Generation	Residential Prototypes	2 36
Table 25	Projected Employment Generation	Additional Residential Prototypes	1 38
Table 26	Wages by Occupational Grouping	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division	4 39
Table 27	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 1A	1 43
Table 28	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 2A	1 44
Table 29	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 4A	1 45
Table 30	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 4B	1 46
Table 31	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 5A	1 47
Table 32	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 5B	1 48
Table 33	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 7A	1 49
Table 34	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 7B	1 50
Table 35	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 9A	1 51
Table 36	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 9B	1 52
Table 37	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 10A	1 53
Table 38	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 10B	1 54
Table 39	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 11A	1 55
Table 40	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Prototype 12A	1 56
Table 41	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Single-Family Infill	1 57
Table 42	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Owner Townhomes	1 58
Table 43	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Owner Flats	1 59
Table 44	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Rental Flats	1 60
Table 45	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Mixed-Use Grocery Store	1 61
Table 46	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Mixed-Use Restaurant	1 62
Table 47	Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households	Mixed-Use Entertainment	1 63
Table 48	Estimated Distribution of Employees by Occupation	Office and Hotel Workers	1 64
Table 49	Estimated Distribution of Employees by Occupation	Additional Non-Residential Land Uses	1 65
Table 50	Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households	Office and Hotel Prototypes	1 66
Table 51	Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households	Non-Residential Uses in Mixed-Use Prototypes	1 67
Table 52	Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households	Additional Non-Residential Uses	1 68
Table 53	Estimated Households Earning Up to 30% AMI	Office and Hotel Prototypes	1 69
Table 54	Estimated Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI	Office and Hotel Prototypes	1 70
Table 55	Estimated Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI	Office and Hotel Prototypes	1 71
Table 56	Estimated Households Earning Up to 30% AMI	Additional Non-Residential Land Uses	1 72
Table 57	Estimated Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI	Additional Non-Residential Land Uses	1 73
Table 58	Estimated Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI	Additional Non-Residential Land Uses	1 74



Executive Summary

1. Background and Introduction

In May 2013, the Seattle City Council adopted Resolution 31444, which sets out a work program for reviewing and potentially revising the current affordable housing incentive program and reviewing best practices for affordable housing production and preservation. Review of national best practices was conducted by Otak and Peninger Consulting.

Pursuant to Resolution 31444, the City of Seattle retained DRA to conduct an economic analysis for the purpose of advising the City on revision and potential expansion of its affordable housing incentive programs for commercial and residential development, currently in place in the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers and other areas of the City that have been upzoned since 2006. The City's current programs provide developers with bonus floor area in exchange for the provision of housing for households with incomes up to 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) for rental housing and up to 100% of AMI for homeownership housing. The payment of a fee in lieu of providing units is allowed in some areas, including the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers. For commercial projects in the Downtown and South Lake Union areas and residential development in South Lake Union the program imposes other requirements, including the purchase of transfer of development rights (TDR) and, for commercial development only, payment of a childcare fee.

DRA worked closely with City staff to develop twelve residential and commercial office development prototypes that reflect current underlying zoning designations in the City. Each prototype is examined in a base case "no incentive" version that reflects the requirements of the underlying zoning, and a "with incentive" version that reflects the additional bonus floor area and other guidelines associated with the incentive program. The prototypes include mid- and high-rise residential and office prototypes appropriate to zoning designations in the Downtown and South Lake Union areas of the City. They also include low- and mid-rise prototypes



consistent with zoning designations found in areas surrounding the Downtown and in target Urban Centers and Villages. These 24 prototypes formed the basis of DRA's economic analysis of the current incentive program and alternative policies, and were examined under several economic scenarios. The findings of the analysis will assist the City in evaluating alternative policy options for the incentive programs that will generate affordable housing and/or in lieu fees while being sensitive to current and future real estate market conditions.

The City of Seattle (City) subsequently retained David Paul Rosen & Associates (DRA) to prepare a study establishing a rational nexus between market-rate residential and non-residential development and the need for affordable housing in the City. To the extent that new market-rate residential and non-residential development in the City increases demand for housing and exacerbates the City's shortage of affordable housing, the City has a strong public interest in, and a legal basis for, causing new affordable housing to be developed to meet this additional demand. The nexus study examined 14 of the original 24 prototypes examined in DRA's 2014 incentive zoning analysis, and added 10 additional low- and mid-rise residential, mixed-use, and non-residential prototypes.

In designing a fee on new residential and non-residential development to assist the provision of affordable housing, the basis for the fee is that such development has a deleterious impact by increasing employment, which also increases the demand for housing for the added employees, because market-rate housing development, with no public assistance, will not provide housing affordable for the additional lower-earning employees. The legal requirement is that a local government charging a fee make some affirmative showing that: (1) those who must pay the fee are contributing to the problem that the fee will address; and (2) the amount of the fee is reasonably justified by the magnitude of the fee-payer's contribution to the problem. This relationship has been well documented and nexus fees have been successfully upheld against legal challenge where the fees met standards set by case law.

Target Income Levels

The nexus analysis uses income limits commonly defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program. This study calculates an affordable housing nexus fee for the following income categories in King County in 2015:

- Households with incomes up to 30 percent of area median income (AMI), or approximately \$26,900 for a four-person household;



- Households with incomes between 31 percent and 60 percent of AMI, or between \$26,901 and \$53,760 for a four-person household; and
- Households with incomes between 61 percent and 80 percent of AMI, or between \$53,761 and \$65,800 for a four-person household.

All of these income limits are based on the 2015 median family income (MFI) of \$89,600 for the Seattle-Bellevue HUD Metro FMR Area (HMFA)¹, adjusted by household size, as provided by the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development.

Table 1 shows 2015 income limits for the City of Seattle for these income categories for household sizes of one to six persons.

Table 1 Affordable Housing Income Limits by Household Size City of Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study 2015			
Household Size	30% AMI	60% AMI	80% AMI
One Person	\$18,550	\$37,080	\$46,100
Two Persons	\$21,550	\$43,020	\$52,650
Three Persons	\$24,250	\$48,420	\$55,950
Four Persons	\$26,900	\$53,760	\$65,800
Five Persons	\$29,100	\$58,080	\$71,100
Six Persons	\$31,200	\$62,400	\$76,350

Source: 2015 median household income for the Seattle-Bellevue HMFA of \$89,600, adjusted by household size and income level; City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development; DRA.

Affordability Gap Analysis

The affordability gap analysis compares the cost of housing development in the City to the amount very low and low income households can afford to pay for housing. The affordability gap represents the capital subsidy required to develop housing affordable to families at these target income levels. For the purpose of the nexus analysis, the affordability gap is calculated assuming new construction of

¹FMR stands for Fair Market Rent. The Seattle-Bellevue HMFA is a HUD-defined metropolitan area comprised of King and Snohomish Counties.

low- or mid-rise multifamily units, based on assumptions developed by DRA for the “Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis”, 2014, updated to 2015.

The per unit subsidy required to make new housing affordable to households at the above income level was calculated by subtracting per unit development costs from the per unit mortgage supportable from affordable rents. No leverage (e.g. use of tax credits) is assumed. The resulting per unit subsidy requirement by unit bedroom count and income level is shown in **Table 2**.

The results of the gap analysis show significant affordability gaps at the above income levels analyzed in this report.

Table 2 Per Unit Affordability Gaps New Construction Multifamily Housing City of Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study 2015				
Unit Bedroom Count	Per Unit Development Cost ¹	Per Unit Affordability Gap by Percent of Area Median Income ²		
		30% AMI ³	60% AMI	80% AMI
Studio	\$239,200	\$239,200	\$200,600	\$168,300
One Bedroom	\$294,400	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000
Two Bedrooms	\$441,600	\$441,600	\$369,400	\$328,000

¹Assumes average development cost of \$368 per net square foot (NSF) and unit sizes of 650 NSF for a studio unit, 800 NSF for a one-bedroom unit and 1,200 for a two-bedroom unit based on DRA’s “Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis”, 2014, escalated 5% to 2015.

²Based on per unit supportable mortgage by income level less total development cost, assuming affordable rents at 30% of gross income, utility allowances of \$110 for studio/one-bedroom units and \$160 for a two-bedroom units, annual operating costs of \$6,760 per unit, and a 30-year fixed mortgage at an interest rate of 6.5%.

³At the 30% AMI level, affordable rents are insufficient to pay full operating costs and there is no cash flow available for debt service.

Source: DRA.

Residential Nexus Analysis

The methodology used for the residential nexus analysis begins with the estimated sales prices of a prototypical condominium development, or rents at an apartment



complex, and moves through a series of linkages to the incomes of the households that purchase or rent the units, the annual expenditures of those households on goods and services, the jobs associated with the delivery of these goods and services, the income of the workers performing those jobs, the household income of those worker households, and finally to the affordability level of the housing needed by those worker households. The steps of the analysis are as follows:

1. Define a prototypical market-rate residential development.
2. Estimate the household income distribution of the households purchasing or renting these homes.
3. Estimate the consumer expenditures of those households.
4. Estimate the number of new full-time employees required to provide the goods and services purchased by these households.
5. Estimate the number of new households associated with this employment growth.
6. Estimate the income distribution of these new employee households.
7. Estimate the number of new households requiring affordable housing.
8. Estimate the housing affordability gap for these affordable housing units.
9. Calculate the maximum supportable residential nexus fee.

For owner housing, DRA estimated the household income distribution of households purchasing the new homes based on the estimated minimum income necessary to afford the mortgage principal and interest, property taxes and property insurance required to purchase the home. For renters, tenant household income is calculated from typical income to rent standards used by apartment owners. This analysis uses the sales prices and rents estimated for these prototypes (under the “middle” cost scenario for the low- and mid-rise prototypes) in DRA’s “Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis”, 2014, escalated to estimated 2015 prices.

The consumer expenditures of these households and the jobs generated by these expenditures are estimated using the IMPLAN model, a model widely used for the past 25 years to quantify employment impacts from personal income. Based on



the employment generation by industry from the IMPLAN model, DRA used its nexus model to quantify the income of worker households by affordability level.

The 2013 wage data for the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division from the U.S. Department of Labor used in this analysis do not take into account Seattle's new minimum wage ordinance (Ordinance 124490) adopted by the City Council in June 2014. The \$15 per hour minimum wage for employees in 2017 means that a full-time minimum wage worker will earn an annual wage of approximately \$31,200, which is identical to the 30% of area median income limit in 2015 for a six-person household. This means that virtually all of the full-time 30% AMI employees will move up into the 30% to 50% AMI category, based on today's area median income. To account for this change, DRA calculated a second version of the maximum supportable residential and non-residential nexus with just two income levels (under 60% of AMI, and 60% to 80% of AMI), assuming the households earning less than 30% of AMI move into the 30% to 60% of AMI category. This reduces the nexus fees, since it is more costly to provide an affordable unit at 30% of AMI than at 60% of AMI.

Table 3 summarizes the estimated maximum supportable residential nexus fee per housing unit and per net square foot for the prototypes analyzed in DRA's incentive zoning analysis based on the 2013 wage data unadjusted for the future increase in the minimum wage. **Table 4** summarizes the estimated maximum supportable non-residential nexus fees per net square foot building area for the same prototypes. **Tables 5** and **6** summarize the estimated maximum supportable nexus fees for these residential and non-residential development, respectively, after adjusting for the estimated effects of the future increase in the minimum wage. As noted above, this analysis uses the "middle" sales price and rent scenario for the low- and mid-rise prototypes. DRA also calculated the maximum nexus fee for these prototypes

These fees are based on the costs to build new multifamily housing in Seattle, the most cost-effective means of housing these very low and low income employee households. Given the average household size of 2.06¹ persons in the City, the affordability gap for a one-bedroom unit is used to calculate the nexus fees. The results of the nexus analysis show significant supportable nexus fees for all prototypes and income levels.

¹Based on a household population of 583,735 divided by 283,510 households in the City of Seattle as of the 2010 census.

Table 3 Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes Current Minimum Wage Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study 2015					
Prototype ¹	Prototype Description	Maximum Nexus Fee per Net Square Foot			
		Under 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 1A	DT Rental, 40 Stories	\$12.39	\$27.83	\$9.56	\$49.79
Prototype 2A	DT Owner, 40 Stories	\$14.53	\$32.04	\$10.42	\$56.99
Prototype 4A	SLU Rental, 24 Stories	\$11.60	\$26.62	\$9.35	\$47.57
Prototype 4B	SLU Rental, 7 Stories	\$9.82	\$24.59	\$9.39	\$43.80
Prototype 5A	SLU Owner, 24 Stories	\$12.73	\$27.88	\$9.13	\$49.74
Prototype 5B	SLU Renter, 7 Stories	\$11.07	\$21.55	\$7.94	\$40.56
Prototype 7A	Rental, 7 Stories	\$12.76	\$26.61	\$9.14	\$48.51
Prototype 7B	Rental, 4 Stories	\$13.32	\$22.23	\$9.55	\$45.10
Prototype 9A	Rental, 6 Stories	\$12.82	\$24.95	\$9.19	\$46.96
Prototype 9B	Rental, 4 Stories	\$12.58	\$26.24	\$9.02	\$47.84
Prototype 10A	Owner, 6 Stories	\$8.55	\$21.39	\$6.13	\$36.07
Prototype 10B	Owner, 4 Stories	\$12.60	\$21.02	\$9.03	\$42.64
Prototype 11A	Rental, 7 Stories	\$10.06	\$25.19	\$7.21	\$42.47
Prototype 12A	Owner, 7 Stories	\$6.71	\$16.80	\$4.81	\$28.32

DT = Downtown, SLU = South Lake Union

¹Based on prototypes from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014, as described in Table 13.

Source: DRA

Table 4 Estimated Maximum Non-Residential Nexus Fees Office and Hotel Prototypes Current Minimum Wage Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study 2015					
Prototype ¹	Prototype Description	Maximum Nexus Fee per Net Square Foot			
		Under 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 3A	DT Office, 8 Stories	\$3.42	\$40.76	\$13.11	\$57.29
Prototype 6A	SLU Office, 8 Stories	\$3.33	\$40.90	\$12.83	\$57.07
Hotel Prototype	DT Hotel, 14 Stories	\$18.78	\$38.22	\$3.59	\$60.58

DT = Downtown, SLU = South Lake Union



¹Based on prototypes from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014, as described in Table 13.

Source: DRA

Table 5 Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes 2017 Minimum Wage Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study 2015				
Prototype ¹	Prototype Description	Maximum Nexus Fee per Net Square Foot		
		Under 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 1A	DT Rental, 40 Stories	\$38.17	\$9.56	\$47.73
Prototype 2A	DT Owner, 40 Stories	\$44.16	\$10.42	\$54.58
Prototype 4A	SLU Rental, 24 Stories	\$36.30	\$9.35	\$45.65
Prototype 4B	SLU Rental, 7 Stories	\$32.78	\$9.39	\$42.17
Prototype 5A	SLU Owner, 24 Stories	\$38.51	\$9.13	\$47.63
Prototype 5B	SLU Renter, 7 Stories	\$30.79	\$7.94	\$38.73
Prototype 7A	Rental, 7 Stories	\$37.25	\$9.14	\$46.40
Prototype 7B	Rental, 4 Stories	\$35.65	\$9.19	\$44.83
Prototype 9A	Rental, 6 Stories	\$36.74	\$9.02	\$45.75
Prototype 9B	Rental, 4 Stories	\$36.74	\$9.02	\$45.75
Prototype 10A	Owner, 6 Stories	\$28.52	\$6.13	\$34.65
Prototype 10B	Owner, 4 Stories	\$31.53	\$9.03	\$40.56
Prototype 11A	Rental, 7 Stories	\$33.59	\$7.21	\$40.80
Prototype 12A	Owner, 7 Stories	\$22.39	\$4.81	\$27.20

DT = Downtown, SLU = South Lake Union

¹Based on prototypes from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014, as described in Table 13.

Source: DRA

Table 6 Estimated Maximum Non-Residential Nexus Fee Office and Hotel Prototypes 2017 Minimum Wage Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study 2015				
Prototype ¹	Prototype Description	Maximum Nexus Fee per Net Square Foot		
		Under 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 3A	DT Office, 8 Stories	\$43.61	\$13.11	\$56.72
Prototype 6A	SLU Office, 8 Stories	\$43.68	\$12.83	\$56.51
Hotel Prototype	DT Hotel, 14 Stories	\$53.88	\$3.59	\$57.47

DT = Downtown, SLU = South Lake Union



¹Based on prototypes from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014, as described in Table 13.

Source: DRA

Table 7 summarizes the estimated maximum supportable nexus fee per net square foot for the additional low- and mid-rise residential, mixed-use and non-residential prototypes. **Table 8** summarizes the estimated maximum supportable nexus fees for these prototypes, after adjusting for the estimated effects of the future increase in the minimum wage. The nexus fees in Tables 7 and 8 for the mixed-use prototypes are for the commercial uses within the prototype.

Table 7 Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential Prototypes and Non-Residential Uses Current Minimum Wage Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study 2015					
Prototype/Use	Prototype/Use Description	Maximum Nexus Fee per Net Square Foot			
		Under 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
SF Infill House	Single-Family Home	\$5.94	\$13.16	\$4.46	\$23.56
Owner TH	6 Townhomes	\$7.81	\$17.47	\$5.83	\$31.11
Owner Flats	9 Condo Flats	\$7.95	\$17.86	\$5.96	\$31.78
Rental Flats	12 Apt. Flats	\$10.61	\$23.78	\$7.96	\$42.35
Grocery Store	50,000 GSF	\$17.43	\$19.13	\$4.58	\$41.14
Restaurant	3,000 GSF	\$15.70	\$18.83	\$4.22	\$38.75
Entertainment	15,000 GSF	\$12.07	\$13.26	\$3.59	\$28.92
Stand-Alone Retail	25,000 GSF	\$17.37	\$19.11	\$4.30	\$40.78
R&D Laboratory	100,000 GSF	\$17.15	\$62.20	\$38.06	\$117.41
Medical Office	87,000 GSF	\$5.16	\$18.65	\$11.44	\$35.24

Source: City of Seattle; DRA.



Table 8 Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential Prototypes and Non-Residential Uses 2017 Minimum Wage Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study 2015				
Prototype/Use	Prototype/Use Description	Maximum Nexus Fee per Net Square Foot		
		Under 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
SF Infill House	Single-Family Home	\$16.98	\$3.80	\$20.77
Owner TH	6 Townhomes	\$22.48	\$4.96	\$27.44
Owner Flats	9 Condo Flats	\$22.96	\$5.07	\$28.03
Rental Flats	12 Apt. Flats	\$30.59	\$6.76	\$37.35
Grocery Store	50,000 GSF	\$33.67	\$4.58	\$38.25
Restaurant	3,000 GSF	\$31.93	\$4.22	\$36.15
Entertainment	15,000 GSF	\$23.33	\$3.59	\$26.92
Stand-Alone Retail	25,000 GSF	\$33.60	\$4.30	\$37.90
R&D Laboratory	100,000 GSF	\$76.50	\$38.06	\$114.57
Medical Office	87,000 GSF	\$22.95	\$11.44	\$34.39

Source: DRA

Detailed calculation of the nexus fees by prototype are shown in **Tables 9** and **10** for the original residential and non-residential nexus fees, respectively, under the current minimum wage, and in **Tables 11** and **12** for these prototypes, respectively, under the 2017 minimum wage. These tables, along with the rest of the tables referenced in this analysis, are presented at the end of the text.

Detailed calculation of the nexus fees by prototype are shown in **Table 13** for the residential uses in the additional residential and mixed-use prototypes and in **Table 14** for the non-residential uses under the current minimum wage, and in **Tables 15** and **16** for these prototypes, respectively, under the 2017 minimum wage. These tables, along with the rest of the tables referenced in this analysis, are presented at the end of the text.

Development impact fee programs may include the cost of administering the program that funds affordable housing, including:

- The administrative costs of assessing, collecting, cost accounting, and public reporting of the fee;
- The cost of justification analyses, legal support, and other costs of annual and/or periodic updates to the fee; and
- Costs of capital planning and programming, including project management costs associated with the share of projects funded by the fee.

Administration charges typically range from 1.0 percent up to 5.0 percent and may be added to the maximum fee level.





Introduction

The City of Seattle (City) retained David Paul Rosen & Associates (DRA) to prepare a nexus study establishing a rational nexus between residential development and the need for affordable housing in the City.

This report describes the methodology, assumptions and findings of the nexus analysis. The nexus analysis estimates the number of very low and low income households associated with development of new residential and commercial (office and hotel) development in the City, and calculates the maximum nexus fee based on the cost to produce housing affordable to these households. The nexus analysis is based on the demographic and economic characteristics of employees expected to provide goods and services to new residential customers, and for those expected to work in the commercial buildings.

This report is presented in the following major sections:

- Nexus Rationale
- Affordability Gap Analysis
- Residential Nexus Analysis
- Non-Residential Nexus Analysis

The Nexus Rationale

Job growth does not occur in most industry sectors without buildings to house new workers. Therefore, new buildings are constructed to accommodate the workers associated with job growth.

Any new non-residential building in the City may be occupied partly or wholly by businesses relocating from elsewhere in the City. However, when a business relocates to a new building in the City, it vacates building space in the old location, which in turn is filled by new businesses and employees. Somewhere in



the chain there are jobs new to the City. The net effect is that new buildings accommodate new employees.

Just as new non-residential buildings make room for new firms and their employees relocating to the City, so new residential construction makes room for new population and households moving to the City. Even if the household moving into a new unit is relocating from another house in the City, the household vacates an existing unit that, in turn, is filled with another household. Again, somewhere in the chain new population and households are added to the City.

New market-rate housing development accommodates growth in population and households. The arrival of new population creates demand for additional jobs in retail outlets and services that serve that population. A portion of the income of the residents in new market-rate housing units will be spent to purchase a range of goods and services, such as purchases at local supermarkets and restaurants or services at local dry cleaners. These purchases in the local economy in turn generate employment in a range of different compensation levels.

New housing affordable to lower income households is not added to the supply in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of new lower income employee households. The cost to build new housing, or to acquire and rehabilitate existing housing, is more than the rents or home prices that lower income households can afford to pay.

The methodology for quantifying the nexus relationship for new market rate residential development can be demonstrated in relation to a new family moving into the City. A new residential unit is developed within the City and sold or rented to a family at the going market rate. The family's income can be estimated based on the amount needed to purchase or rent the home, by using current mortgage rates, lending standards, and income/rent ratios used by rental property managers. A portion of a household's income will be used to purchase goods and services, which will generate the need for additional employees at the businesses the household frequents. The additional employees will be paid at different salary levels, based on the industry and type of job. Some of the jobs that are produced will be low paying, especially service industry jobs, and will produce very low, low, and moderate income households, even when there are multiple earners in the households. These households are unable to purchase or rent housing units at market rates, and thus will seek out affordable units.

The nexus methodology used by DRA quantifies the estimated increase in lower income households associated with new non-residential and residential



development, and estimates the costs of providing housing affordable to these new households. These costs are then translated into the maximum nexus fee that may be levied on residential and non-residential development. This methodology is consistent with the standards of reasonable relationship established by Supreme Court case law.

DRA's nexus analyses are designed to demonstrate the economic relationship between residential and non-residential development and the need for affordable housing in the City. DRA employs consistently conservative assumptions, so that the resulting calculations of the maximum fees are likely to understate the maximum nexus calculation for each land use type.

Affordability Gap Analysis

The affordability gap analysis compares the cost of housing development in the City to the amount very low and low income households can afford to pay for housing. The affordability gap represents the capital subsidy required to develop housing affordable to families at target income levels. The methodology, key assumptions and findings of the affordability gap analysis are summarized below.

The resulting affordability gaps are used in later sections of this report to estimate the maximum residential nexus fees required to mitigate new demand generated by each building type for housing affordable to very low and low income households.

Methodology

The first step in the gap analysis establishes the amount a tenant or homebuyer can afford to contribute to the cost of renting or owning a dwelling unit. The second step estimates the costs of constructing or preserving affordable housing in the City. For the purposes of the nexus analysis, DRA calculated the affordability gap based on the costs to build new multifamily housing in Seattle, the most cost-effective means of housing these very low and low income employee households. Given the average household size of 2.06¹ persons in the City, the affordability gap for a one-bedroom unit is used to calculate the nexus fees.

The third step in the gap analysis establishes the housing expenses borne by the tenants and owners. These costs can be categorized into operating costs, and

¹Based on a household population of 583,735 divided by 283,510 households in the City of Seattle as of the 2010 census.

financing or mortgage obligations. Operating costs are the maintenance expenses of the unit, including utilities, property maintenance, property taxes, management fees, property insurance, replacement reserve, and insurance. For the rental prototype used in this analysis, DRA assumed that the landlord pays all but certain tenant-paid utilities as an annual operating cost of the unit paid from rental income.

Financing or mortgage obligations are the costs associated with the purchase or development of the housing unit itself. These costs occur when all or a portion of the development cost is financed. This cost is always an obligation of the landlord or owner. Supportable financing is deducted from the total development cost, to determine the capital subsidy required to develop the prototypical housing unit affordable to an eligible family at each income level.

For the rental housing prototype used in this analysis, the gap analysis calculates the difference between total development costs and the conventional mortgage supportable by net operating income from restricted rents.

The purpose of the gap analysis is to determine the fee amount that would be required to develop housing affordable to the very low and low income households who will need to find housing in the City in connection with new market-rate residential and commercial development in the City. Therefore, no other housing subsidies, or leverage, are assumed.

Housing Development Costs

DRA estimated the costs to build the new rental housing prototype used in the gap analysis based on interviews with developers active in the Seattle Area as part of DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis," 2014. Based on this analysis, we assume average development costs of \$350 per square foot for low or mid-rise multifamily construction and average unit sizes of 650 net square feet for a studio unit, 800 net square feet for a one-bedroom units, and 1,200 net square feet for a two-bedroom unit.

Calculation of Per Unit Subsidy Amounts

The per unit subsidy required to make new housing affordable to very low and low income residents was calculated by subtracting per unit development costs from



the per unit mortgage supportable from affordable rents. These calculations are shown in **Table 17**.

The results of the gap analysis show significant affordability gaps for very low and low income households.

Residential Nexus Analysis

Impact Methodology and Use of the IMPLAN Model

The methodology used for the residential nexus analysis begins with the estimated sales prices of a prototypical residential development and moves through a series of linkages to the incomes of the households that purchased the units, the annual expenditures of those households on goods and services, the jobs associated with the delivery of these goods and services, the income of the workers performing those jobs, the household income of those worker households, and finally to the affordability level of the housing needed by those worker households. The steps of the analysis are as follows:

1. Define a prototypical residential development.
2. Estimate the household income distribution of the households purchasing or renting these homes.
3. Estimate the consumer expenditures of those households.
4. Estimate the number of new full-time employees required to provide the goods and services purchased by these households.
5. Estimate the number of new households associated with this employment growth.
6. Estimate the income distribution of these new employee households.
7. Estimate the number of new households requiring affordable housing.
8. Estimate the housing affordability gap for these affordable housing units.
9. Calculate the maximum supportable residential nexus fee.

For owner housing, DRA estimated the household income distribution of households purchasing the new homes based on the estimated minimum income necessary to afford the mortgage principal and interest, property taxes and property insurance required to purchase the home. For renters, tenant household income is calculated from typical income to rent standards used by apartment owners. The consumer expenditures of these households and the jobs generated by these expenditures are estimated using the IMPLAN model, a model widely used for the past 25 years to quantify employment impacts from personal income. Based on the employment generation by industry from the IMPLAN model, DRA used its nexus model to quantify the income of worker households by affordability level.

THE IMPLAN MODEL

The IMPLAN model is an economic analysis software package now commercially available through the Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG). IMPLAN was originally developed by the U.S. Forest Service, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management. It has been in use since 1979 and refined over time. IMPLAN has become one of the industry standards widely used across the United States to predict economic impacts in a broad range of applications from major construction projects to natural resource programs. IMPLAN's clients include more than 20 federal government agencies, 60 state agencies across the country, and academic, local government, nonprofit and private sector clients numbering in the hundreds (follow these links to IMPLAN's [Client List](#) and [Consultants Listing](#)). IMPLAN is also the industry standard in California for use in local residential nexus impact fee analyses.

The IMPLAN model projects the number of employees needed to produce a given amount of goods and services, based on actual 2012 economic data for King County. More specifically, IMPLAN is based on an input-output accounting of commodity flows within an economy from producers to intermediate and final consumers. The model establishes a matrix of supply chain relationships between industries and also between households and the producers of household goods and services. The model tracks changes in purchases for final consumption through the supply chain. Industries that produce goods and services for final consumption must purchase inputs from other producers that, in turn, purchase goods and services. The model tracks these relationships through the economy to the point where leakages from the region stop the cycle.

IMPLAN's industry sectoring scheme is tied to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) Input-Output Study. The most recent 2007 BEA Benchmark study uses a 440-sector scheme. This scheme approximates 6-digit North American Industrial



Classification System (NAICS) for manufacturing, and is more highly aggregated for service sectors. IMPLAN data sets are available for each county and state, so the model can be tailored to the specific economic conditions of the region being analyzed. This analysis uses the most current 2012 data set for King County.

Economic impacts estimated using the IMPLAN model are divided into three categories:

Direct impacts result from the household spending included in the analysis. A relevant example is restaurant employment created when households in new residential buildings spend money dining out. Employment at the restaurant would be considered a direct impact.

Indirect impacts result from supplier purchases made by the business operations of the companies included in the analysis. With the restaurant example, indirect impacts would include employment at food wholesalers, kitchen suppliers, and producers of agricultural products.

Induced impacts result from increased demand for local-serving retail and services by the new employees. Again using the restaurant example, induced impacts would include employment generated when employees of the restaurant, food wholesaler and kitchen suppliers spend their earnings in the local economy.

The IMPLAN model projections include all three of the impacts listed above. The IMPLAN Pro Guide provides an introduction to input-output analysis and further documentation on the model's assumptions and mathematical equations. (Follow these links to the [Version 2 IMPLAN Pro guide](#) and the [Version 3.0 Reference Manual](#).)

Disposable Income of New Households

The analysis begins with fourteen of the prototypical housing prototypes and the two office prototypes analyzed by DRA in its 2014 "Affordable Housing Incentive Analysis Economic Analysis" prepared for the City of Seattle, as well as one additional hotel prototype provided by City staff. These prototypes are described in **Table 18**. The analysis also examines 10 additional low- and mid-rise residential, mixed-use and non-residential prototypes, described in **Table 19**.

The nexus analysis also uses the sales prices and rents estimated for these prototypes (under the "middle" cost scenario for the low- and mid-rise prototypes)



in the 2014 DRA study, escalated to estimated 2015 prices. The income of the new households moving into these units is estimated based on the estimated average sales price or rent for each prototype.

To estimate the income distribution for the buyers of new for-sale homes, this analysis assumes the average incomes are approximately equal to the minimum qualifying income criteria for a new-home loan. This calculation assumes that the new buyers pay a 10 percent down payment and secure a mortgage equal to 90 percent of the home's sale price. Monthly principal and interest payments on the mortgage are calculated assuming a 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 5.0 percent interest. Qualifying household income is estimated assuming households pay 35 percent of gross household income for principal, income, taxes and insurance (PITI), a typical standard used by mortgage lenders.

For renters, the income distribution of tenants in the new apartments is estimated assuming tenants on average spend 33 percent of their household income for rent.

The IMPLAN model uses disposable household income as the primary upfront input. To arrive at disposable income, gross income for residents of prototypical units must be adjusted downward to account for Federal and State income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and personal savings. Other taxes, including sales tax, gas tax and property tax, are handled internally within the model. Housing expenses are not deducted from disposable income as they are also handled internally with the IMPLAN model. Based on a review of data from the Tax Policy Center (a joint venture of the Brookings Institution and the Urban Institute), and the California Franchise Tax Board, disposable income for households in the income levels projected for the buyers and renters of the prototypical market-rate housing units is estimated at 65 percent of total household income.

Table 20 shows the estimated average household income, projected total household income, and projected total disposable household income of new homebuyers for each of the original owner prototypes. **Table 21** shows the disposable household income projections for tenants in the original rental prototype. **Tables 22** and **23** project household income of owners and renters in the additional low- and mid-rise owner and renter prototypes, respectively.

Projected Employment Generation

The IMPLAN model has been applied to link household consumption expenditures to job growth occurring in the City. The IMPLAN model distributes spending among various types of goods and services, and therefore industry sectors, based on data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey and the Bureau of Economic Analysis Benchmark Input-Output study to estimate direct, indirect, and induced employment generated. The IMPLAN model also projects total industry output and payroll associated with the direct, indirect and induced impacts.

The IMPLAN model input is the projected disposable income of the renters and homebuyers. The projected economic impacts from each residential development are summarized in **Table 24** for the original residential prototypes and in **Table 25** for the additional residential prototypes.

Projected Household Growth

The next step in this analysis is to translate the number of new employees into the number of employee households in the City. The 2012 Five-Year ACS indicates that the City of Seattle had an average of 1.59 workers per worker household.¹ Therefore, DRA divided the number of new employees by 1.59 to generate the number of new households.

Projected Very Low and Low Income Households

This step estimates the number of new employee households that will require affordable housing. The IMPLAN model provides information on payroll per employee. To estimate household incomes, DRA multiplied each payroll per employee figure by 1.59, the citywide average number of workers per worker household. This approach assumes that all workers in a household earn similar wages.

The average household size in the City of Seattle as of the 2010 census was 2.06 persons.² Therefore, this analysis uses the income limits for a household size of

¹ 356,914 employed residents divided by 224,155 households with an least one worker.

² Total household population of 583,735 divided by 283,510 households.

two and one-half persons¹ of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI, and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

The percentage of employee households in each industry category expected to fall into each of the three income categories (less than 30% AMI, 30% to 60% AMI, and 60% to 80% AMI) was estimated based on wage data by occupational grouping for the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics dated May 2013. **Table 32** summarizes this wage data by two-digit Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) code, including mean, 10th percentile, 25th percentile, median, 75th percentile and 90th percentile wages for each occupational category. The wage distribution for these occupational groupings are translated into wage distribution by income categories based on the distribution of occupations associated with each industry category from the May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.

The 2013 wage data in this analysis do not take into account Seattle's new minimum wage ordinance (Ordinance 124490) adopted by the City Council in June 2014. The \$15 per hour minimum wage for larger employees in 2017 means that a full-time minimum wage worker will earn an annual wage of approximately \$31,200, which substantially exceeds 30% of area median income limit for a 2.5 person household in 2015 of \$22,900. This means that most of the full-time 30% AMI employees will move up into the 30% to 50% AMI category.

Tables 27 through **47** detail the calculation of very low and low income households that would be expected to move to the City for the original and additional prototypes with residential uses.

Total Affordability Gap for New Households

Using the projected number of households that will require affordable housing, DRA estimated the costs of providing housing to these new households using the results of the affordability gap analysis.

The results of the nexus analysis show significant supportable nexus fees for all prototypes for very low and low income households.

¹ This is more conservative than using an average household size of two persons since it results in higher income limits.

Non-Residential Nexus Analysis

Overview of Non-Residential Nexus Methodology

The numerical nexus analysis in this report identifies the number of households at very low and low income levels associated with the employees that work in a building of a given size and land use type in the City, and calculates the development impact fee required to make housing affordable to those households.

DRA examined the development of two office prototypes and one hotel prototype.

The nexus analysis employs a tested nexus and gap methodology, described below, that has proven acceptable to the courts. The economic analysis uses a conservative approach to understate the maximum fee amount. Therefore, the housing impacts are likely even greater than indicated in the analysis.

The nexus economic analysis methodology employs the following steps:

1. Estimate total new employees;
2. Estimate new employees living in the City;
3. Adjust for potential future increase in labor force participation;
4. Estimate the number of new households represented by the number of new employees;
5. Distribute households by industry groupings for each land use; and
6. Estimate the number of employee households meeting very low and low income limits, adjusted for household size, based on estimated wages by occupation and industry.

The result of these steps is the estimated number of households by land use living in the City and qualifying as very low and low income based on development in the City. DRA used the results of the housing affordability gap analysis to calculate the development impact fee required to make housing affordable to the very low



and low income households who will need to find housing in the City in connection with new non-residential development in the City.

Non-Residential Nexus Methodology and Assumptions

The nexus analysis requires a number of assumptions. In all cases, we consistently employ conservative assumptions that serve to understate the nexus calculation. We expect that the cumulative effect of these assumptions understates the maximum nexus fee calculation for each building type. We do not believe, therefore, that changing individual assumptions would fundamentally alter the conclusions of the analysis.

The residential nexus fee calculation estimates affordable housing needs generated by employees meeting the goods and services needs generated by new market rate residential development in the City. This is particularly the case for commercial/retail space (which is not analyzed in the present study). To address the overlap between employees created by new residential development and those created by new non-residential development, DRA recommends that the City establish residential and non-residential nexus fees that are below the maximum level. However, not all of the non-residential employment impact is caused by local employment. For example, typical ratios for community shopping space from the 2008 Urban Land Institute “Retail Development Handbook” and “Dollars & Cents of Shopping Centers,” suggest that at least 30 percent of the demand for this space typically comes from sources other than local residents, including visitors, travelers, employees, and others.

Each of the steps in the nexus analysis is described below, along with corresponding assumptions.

ESTIMATE TOTAL NEW EMPLOYEES IN PROTOTYPE BUILDINGS

The first step estimates the total number of direct employees who will work at or in the building type being analyzed. This step implicitly assumes that all employees are new employees to the City. When firms and their employees relocate from other buildings in the City, they will have vacated spaces that will likely be filled by other firms and employees. A subsequent step in this analysis adjusts for existing unemployed City residents who may be hired in the building.

The estimate of the number of employees that will be working in each prototype building is based on an employment density factor for each land use (i.e. number



of net square feet per employee). The net square feet of building area is divided by the employment density factor to calculate employment.

The employment density factors used in this analysis are as follows, based on industry standards for typical activities:

Office: 250 net square feet per employee.

Medical Office: 350 net square feet per employee.

R&D Laboratory: 350 net square feet per employee.

Grocery Store: 500 net square feet per employee.

Restaurant: 500 net square feet per employee.

Entertainment: 750 net square feet per employee.

Stand-Alone Retail: 500 net square feet per employee.

Hotel: One employee per room and an average of 500 square feet per hotel room.

ESTIMATE EMPLOYEES LIVING IN THE CITY OF SEATTLE

This step estimates the number of new employees associated with new employment growth in the City that would live in the City.

The 2012 Five-Year ACS indicates that 73.8 percent of workers in the City aged 16 years and older worked in the City¹. For the purposes of this analysis, we have assumed that 73.8 percent of new City workers will reside in the City.

ADJUST FROM EMPLOYEES TO EMPLOYEE HOUSEHOLDS

The next step in the analysis converts the number of employees living in the City to the number of employee households that will work at or in the building type being analyzed. This step recognizes that there is, on average, more than one worker per household, and thus the number of housing units in demand for new workers must be reduced. The worker per worker household ratio also eliminates all non-working households, including retired persons, students, and those on public assistance.

¹ Based 350,673 workers in the City of Seattle and 258,706 workers in the City of Seattle that work in their place of residence.

Based on ACS Five-Year estimates for 2012, the City of Seattle had 356,914 employed residents and 224,155 households with one or more workers, for an average of 1.59 workers per worker households. The total number of employed residents includes part-time and full-time workers. This is a conservative assumption. If only full-time workers were included, the ratio of workers per household would be smaller, leading to a larger estimate of new households created. In addition, wages by occupation and industry assume full-time employment. Household incomes will be lower for households with part-time workers, generating a larger impact than projected in this study.

DISTRIBUTE EMPLOYEE HOUSEHOLDS BY OCCUPATION

This step distributes households by occupational groupings for each land use. This step is necessary to estimate new workers' incomes. DRA reviewed data from the May, 2013 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates to estimate the percentage distribution of employment by industry occupational category for the non-residential land uses. These distributions are shown in **Table 48** for the original office and hotel prototypes and in **Table 49** for the additional non-residential uses. The calculation of the number of new employee households by occupation and prototype are shown in **Tables 50** through **52**.

ESTIMATE WAGES BY OCCUPATION

In this step, occupation is translated to income based on May 2013 wage and salary information for the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data on mean, median, 10th percentile, 25th percentile, 75th percentile and 90th percentile hourly wages by occupation were used to estimate the percentage of employees earning salaries in the very low and low income categories based on the 2014 HUD income limits for the Seattle-Bellevue HMFA.

ESTIMATE VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

The estimated percentage and number of households earning salaries under 30 percent AMI, between 31 percent and 60 percent AMI, and between 61 percent and 80 percent AMI are shown in **Tables 53** through **58** for the residential and non-residential uses in the development prototypes. These estimates were derived using 2014 income limits for a family of 2.5 persons of \$22,500 for households earning less than 30 percent of AMI, \$44,950 for households at 60 percent of AMI, and

\$59,950 for households at 80 percent of AML. As noted above, these calculations do not factor in the increase in the City's minimum wage starting in 2017.

Individual employee income data was used to calculate the number of households that fall into these income categories by assuming that multiple earner households are, on average, formed of individuals with incomes within the same income category (very low income or low income).



Table 9
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes
Current Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

	Less than 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 1A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	13	35	14	62
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$3,827,200	\$8,596,000	\$2,954,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	426	426	426	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,984	\$20,178	\$6,934	\$36,097
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	725	725	725	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$12.39	\$27.83	\$9.56	\$49.79
Prototype 2A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	14	37	14	65
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$4,121,600	\$9,087,200	\$2,954,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	344	344	344	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$11,981	\$26,416	\$8,587	\$46,985
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	825	825	825	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$14.53	\$32.04	\$10.42	\$56.99
Prototype 4A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	8	22	9	39
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$2,355,200	\$5,403,200	\$1,899,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	280	280	280	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,411	\$19,297	\$6,782	\$34,491
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	725	725	725	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$11.60	\$26.62	\$9.35	\$47.57
Prototype 4B				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	3	9	4	16
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$883,200	\$2,210,400	\$844,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	124	124	124	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$7,123	\$17,826	\$6,806	\$31,755
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	725	725	725	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$9.82	\$24.59	\$9.39	\$43.80
Prototype 5A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	8	21	8	37
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$2,355,200	\$5,157,600	\$1,688,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	218	218	218	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$10,804	\$23,659	\$7,743	\$42,206
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	849	849	849	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$12.73	\$27.88	\$9.13	\$49.74
Prototype 5B				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	3	7	3	13
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$883,200	\$1,719,200	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	94	94	94	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$9,396	\$18,289	\$6,734	\$34,419
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	849	849	849	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$11.07	\$21.55	\$7.94	\$40.56
Prototype 7A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	5	2	9
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$1,228,000	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	71	71	71	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,293	\$17,296	\$5,944	\$31,532
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$12.76	\$26.61	\$9.14	\$48.51

Table 9
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes
Current Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

	Less than 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 7B				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	1	2	1	4
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$294,400	\$491,200	\$211,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	34	34	34	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,659	\$14,447	\$6,206	\$29,312
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$13.32	\$22.23	\$9.55	\$45.10
Prototype 9A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	3	7	3	13
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$883,200	\$1,719,200	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	106	106	106	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,332	\$16,219	\$5,972	\$30,523
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$12.82	\$24.95	\$9.19	\$46.96
Prototype 9B				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	5	2	9
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$1,228,000	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	72	72	72	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,178	\$17,056	\$5,861	\$31,094
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$12.58	\$26.24	\$9.02	\$47.84
Prototype 10A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	6	2	10
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$1,473,600	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	84	84	84	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$7,010	\$17,543	\$5,024	\$29,576
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	820	820	820	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$8.55	\$21.39	\$6.13	\$36.07
Prototype 10B				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	4	2	8
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$982,400	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	57	57	57	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$10,330	\$17,235	\$7,404	\$34,968
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	820	820	820	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$12.60	\$21.02	\$9.03	\$42.64
Prototype 11A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	3	9	3	15
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$883,200	\$2,210,400	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	135	135	135	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$6,542	\$16,373	\$4,689	\$27,604
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$10.06	\$25.19	\$7.21	\$42.47
Prototype 12A				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	6	2	10
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$1,473,600	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	107	107	107	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$5,503	\$13,772	\$3,944	\$23,219
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	820	820	820	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$6.71	\$16.80	\$4.81	\$28.32

- (1) Based on per unit affordability gap by income level for one-bedroom units.
(2) Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.
(3) Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Source: DRA

Table 10
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Office and Hotel Prototypes
2017 Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

	Less than 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 1A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	48	14	62
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$11,788,800	\$2,954,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	426	426	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$27,673	\$6,934	\$34,608
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	725	725	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$38.17	\$9.56	\$47.73
Prototype 2A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	51	14	65
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$12,525,600	\$2,954,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	344	344	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$36,412	\$8,587	\$44,999
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	825	825	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$44.16	\$10.42	\$54.58
Prototype 4A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	30	9	39
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$7,368,000	\$1,899,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	280	280	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$26,314	\$6,782	\$33,096
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	725	725	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$36.30	\$9.35	\$45.65
Prototype 4B			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	12	4	16
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$2,947,200	\$844,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	124	124	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$23,768	\$6,806	\$30,574
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	725	725	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$32.78	\$9.39	\$42.17
Prototype 5A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	29	8	37
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$7,122,400	\$1,688,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	218	218	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$32,672	\$7,743	\$40,415
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	849	849	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$38.51	\$9.13	\$47.63
Prototype 5B			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	10	3	13
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$2,456,000	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	94	94	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$26,128	\$6,734	\$32,862
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	849	849	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$30.79	\$7.94	\$38.73
Prototype 7A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	7	2	9
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$1,719,200	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	71	71	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$24,214	\$5,944	\$30,158
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$37.25	\$9.14	\$46.40

Table 10
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Office and Hotel Prototypes
2017 Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

	Less than 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Prototype 7B			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	3	1	4
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$736,800	\$211,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	34	34	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$21,671	\$6,206	\$27,876
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$33.34	\$9.55	\$42.89
Prototype 9A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	10	3	13
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$2,456,000	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	106	106	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$23,170	\$5,972	\$30,308
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$35.65	\$9.19	\$44.83
Prototype 9B			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	7	2	9
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$1,719,200	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	72	72	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$23,878	\$5,861	\$30,308
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$36.74	\$9.02	\$45.75
Prototype 10A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	8	2	10
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$1,964,800	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	84	84	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$23,390	\$5,024	\$30,308
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	820	820	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$28.52	\$6.13	\$34.65
Prototype 10B			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	6	2	8
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$1,473,600	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	57	57	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$25,853	\$7,404	\$30,308
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	820	820	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$31.53	\$9.03	\$40.56
Prototype 11A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	12	3	15
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$2,947,200	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	135	135	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$21,831	\$4,689	\$30,308
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$33.59	\$7.21	\$40.80
Prototype 12A			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	8	2	10
Gap Per Household (1)	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$1,964,800	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	107	107	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$18,363	\$3,944	\$30,308
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	820	820	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$22.39	\$4.81	\$27.20

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap by income level for one-bedroom units.

(2) Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.

(3) Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Source: DRA

Table 11
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Renter and Owner Housing Prototypes
Current Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2014

		Office Prototype 3A	Office Prototype 6A	Hotel Prototype
Net Square Feet by Prototype		249,480	238,400	117,600
Households Earning Up to 30% AMI				
1. Number of Employee Households		2.9	2.7	7.5
2. Estimated Housing Gap Cost at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$294,400	\$853,760	\$794,880	\$2,208,000
3. Cost of Housing Gap Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$3.42	\$3.33	\$18.78
Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI				
1. Number of Employee Households		41	40	18
2. Estimated Housing Gap Cost at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$245,600	\$10,167,840	\$9,750,320	\$4,494,480
3. Cost of Housing Gap Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$40.76	\$40.90	\$38.22
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI				
1. Number of Employee Households		16	15	2
2. Estimated Housing Gap Cost at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$211,000	\$3,270,500	\$3,059,500	\$422,000
3. Cost of Housing Gap Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$13.11	\$12.83	\$3.59
Total Fee Per Square Foot		\$57.29	\$57.07	\$60.58

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap for one-bedroom units.

Table 12
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Nexus Fees: Office and Hotel Prototypes
2017 Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2014

		Office Prototype 3A	Office Prototype 6A	Hotel Prototype
Net Square Feet by Prototype		249,480	238,400	117,600
Households Earning Up to 60% AMI				
1. Number of Employee Households		44	42	26
2. Estimated Housing Gap Cost at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$245,600	\$10,880,080	\$10,413,440	\$6,336,480
3. Cost of Housing Gap Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$43.61	\$43.68	\$53.88
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI				
1. Number of Employee Households		16	15	2
2. Estimated Housing Gap Cost at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$211,000	\$3,270,500	\$3,059,500	\$422,000
3. Cost of Housing Gap Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$13.11	\$12.83	\$3.59
Total Fee Per Square Foot		\$56.72	\$56.51	\$57.47

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap for one-bedroom units.

Table 13
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fee: Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential and Mixed-Use Prototypes
Current Minimum Wage
Low Cost Scenario
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Less than 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Single-Family Infill				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.044	0.118	0.047	0.209
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$13,072	\$28,947	\$9,820	
No. of Units in Prototype	1	1	1	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$13,072	\$28,947	\$9,820	\$51,839
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2,200	2,200	2,200	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$5.94	\$13.16	\$4.46	\$23.56
Owner Townhomes				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.223	0.598	0.232	1.053
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$65,583	\$146,788	\$48,968	
No. of Units in Prototype	6	6	6	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$10,930	\$24,465	\$8,161	\$43,557
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,400	1,400	1,400	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$7.81	\$17.47	\$5.83	\$31.11
Owner Flats				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.251	0.676	0.263	1.191
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$73,970	\$166,128	\$55,470	
No. of Units in Prototype	9	9	9	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,219	\$18,459	\$6,163	\$32,841
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,033	1,033	1,033	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$7.95	\$17.86	\$5.96	\$31.78
Rental Flats				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.342	0.920	0.358	1.620
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$100,800	\$225,921	\$75,575	
No. of Units in Prototype	12	12	12	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,400	\$18,827	\$6,298	\$33,525
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	792	792	792	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$10.61	\$23.78	\$7.96	\$42.35
Mixed-Use Grocery Store				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	5	13	5	23
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$1,472,000	\$3,192,800	\$1,055,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	173	173	173	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,509	\$18,455	\$6,098	\$33,062
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$13.09	\$28.39	\$9.38	\$50.87
Mixed-Use Restaurant				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	5	2	9
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$1,228,000	\$422,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	72	72	72	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,178	\$17,056	\$5,861	\$31,094
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$12.58	\$26.24	\$9.02	\$47.84
Mixed-Use Entertainment				
Est. No. of New Employee Households	2	6	3	11
Gap Per Household (1)	\$294,400	\$245,600	\$211,000	
Total Gap	\$588,800	\$1,473,600	\$633,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	88	88	88	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$6,691	\$16,745	\$7,193	\$30,630
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$10.29	\$25.76	\$11.07	\$47.12

- (1) Based on per unit affordability gap by income level for one-bedroom units.
(2) Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.
(3) Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Source: DRA

Table 14
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees: Additional Low- and Mid-Rise Residential and Mixed-Use Protot
2017 Minimum Wage
Low Cost Scenario
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Less than 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	Total
Single-Family Infill			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.162	0.047	0.209
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$37,353	\$8,349	
No. of Units in Prototype	1	1	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$37,353.21	\$8,349	\$45,703
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2,200	2,200	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$16.98	\$3.80	\$20.77
Owner Townhomes			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.820	0.232	1.053
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$188,865	\$41,634	
No. of Units in Prototype	6	6	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$31,478	\$6,939	\$38,417
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,400	1,400	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$22.48	\$4.96	\$27.44
Owner Flats			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.928	0.263	1.191
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$213,550	\$47,163	
No. of Units in Prototype	9	9	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$23,728	\$5,240	\$28,968
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,033	1,033	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$22.96	\$5.07	\$28.03
Rental Flats			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	1.262	0.358	1.620
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$290,573	\$64,257	
No. of Units in Prototype	12	12	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$24,214	\$5,355	\$29,569
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	792	792	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$30.59	\$6.76	\$37.35
Mixed-Use Grocery Store			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	18	5	23
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$4,143,600	\$897,000	
No. of Units in Prototype	173	173	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$23,951	\$5,185	\$29,136
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$36.85	\$7.98	\$44.83
Mixed-Use Restaurant			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	7	2	9
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$1,611,400	\$358,800	
No. of Units in Prototype	72	72	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$22,381	\$4,983	\$27,364
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$34.43	\$7.67	\$42.10
Mixed-Use Entertainment			
Est. No. of New Employee Households	8	3	11
Gap Per Household (1)	\$230,200	\$179,400	
Total Gap	\$1,841,600	\$538,200	
No. of Units in Prototype	88	88	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$20,927	\$6,116	\$27,043
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	650	650	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$32.20	\$9.41	\$41.60

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap by income level for one-bedroom units.

(2) Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.

(3) Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Source: DRA

Table 15
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Non- Residential Nexus Fees: Additional Non-Residential Land Uses
Current Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Grocery Store	Restaurant	Entertainment	Stand-Alone Retail	R&D Laboratory	Medical Office
Gross Square Feet of Land Use	50,000	3,000	15,000	25,000	100,000	87,000
TOTAL EMPLOYEES BY INCOME LEVEL						
Households Earning Up to 30% AMI	3.0	0.2	0.6	1.5	5.8	1.5
Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI	3.9	0.2	0.8	1.9	25.3	6.6
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	18.0	4.7
Total	7.9	0.5	1.7	3.9	49.2	12.8
FEES UNDER MIDDLE COST SCENARIO						
Households Earning Up to 30% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$294,400	\$871,424	\$47,104	\$181,056	\$434,240	\$1,714,880
Justifiable Fee Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$17.43	\$15.70	\$12.07	\$17.37	\$17.15
Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$245,600	\$956,612	\$56,488	\$198,936	\$477,692	\$6,219,820
Justifiable Fee Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$19.13	\$18.83	\$13.26	\$19.11	\$62.20
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$211,000	\$228,935	\$12,660	\$53,805	\$107,610	\$3,806,440
Justifiable Fee Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$4.58	\$4.22	\$3.59	\$4.30	\$38.06
Total Fee Per Square Foot--Low Cost Scenario		\$41.14	\$38.75	\$28.92	\$40.78	\$117.41
						\$35.24

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap for one-bedroom units under low-, medium- and high-cost scenarios.

Source: DRA

Table 16
Calculation of Estimated Maximum Non- Residential Nexus Fees: Additional Non-Residential Land Uses
2017 Minimum Wage
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Grocery Store	Restaurant	Entertainment	Stand-Alone Retail	R&D Laboratory	Medical Office	
Net Square Feet of Land Use	50,000	3,000	15,000	25,000	100,000	87,000	
TOTAL EMPLOYEES BY INCOME LEVEL							
Households Earning Up to 60% AMI	6.9	0.4	1.4	3.4	31.2	8.1	
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	18.0	4.7	
Total	7.9	0.5	1.7	3.9	49.2	12.8	
FEES UNDER MID COST SCENARIO							
Households Earning Up to 60% AMI							
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$245,600	\$1,683,588	\$95,784	\$349,980	\$839,952	\$7,650,440	\$1,996,728
Justifiable Fee Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$33.67	\$31.93	\$23.33	\$33.60	\$76.50	\$22.95
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI							
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1)	\$211,000	\$228,935	\$12,660	\$53,805	\$107,610	\$3,806,440	\$994,865
Justifiable Fee Per Square Foot Bldg. Area		\$4.58	\$4.22	\$3.59	\$4.30	\$38.06	\$11.44
Total Fee Per Square Foot--Low Cost Scenario		\$38.25	\$36.15	\$26.92	\$37.90	\$114.57	\$34.39

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap for one-bedroom units under low-, medium- and high-cost scenarios.

Source: DRA

Table 17
Rental Affordability Gap Calculations
Low and Mid-Rise Prototypes
Low Cost Scenario
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
Economic Analysis
2015

Assumptions

HUD Median Household Income, Seattle-Bellevue HMFA, 2015 \$89,600
 Affordable Housing Expense As a % of Income 30%

No. of Bedrooms	Studio	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Household Size	1.0 Persons	1.5 Persons	3.0 Persons	4.5 Persons	6.0 Persons
Household Size Income Adjust. Factor	70%	75%	90%	104%	116%
Renter Utility Allowance, City of Seattle (1)					
Tenant Pays All Utilities (2)	\$110	\$110	\$160	\$245	\$325
Tenant Pays Heat and Electricity	\$35	\$35	\$60	\$95	\$155
Tenant Pays Electricity Only	\$15	\$15	\$20	\$35	\$65
Assumed for these calculations:	\$110	\$110	\$160	\$245	\$325

Miscellaneous Income Per Unit Per Year \$100
 Vacancy Rate 3.00%
 Operating Cost Per Unit Per Year
 Low-Rise/Mid-Rise Prototypes, Citywide \$6,760
 Mortgage Interest Rate 6.50%
 Mortgage Amortization (Years) 30
 Debt Coverage Ratio 1.00
 Prototype Development Cost per Net SF (3) \$368

Income Levels by Family Size	1.0 Persons	1.5 Persons	2.0 Persons	2.5 Persons	3.0 Persons	4.0 Persons	5.0 Persons
Household Size Income Adjust. Factor	70%	75%	80%	85%	90%	100%	108%
30% of Median	\$18,850	\$20,200	\$21,550	\$22,900	\$24,250	\$26,900	\$29,100
60% of Median	\$37,680	\$40,350	\$43,020	\$45,720	\$48,420	\$53,760	\$58,080
80% of Median	\$46,100	\$49,375	\$52,650	\$55,950	\$59,250	\$65,800	\$71,100

Affordability Gap Calculations	Studio	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom
Average Unit Size (3)	650	800	1,200
Average Per Unit Development Cost	\$239,200	\$294,400	\$441,600

30% of Median

Annual Income Limit	\$18,850	\$20,200	\$24,250
Affordable Monthly Housing Expense	\$471	\$505	\$606
Less: Monthly Utility Allowance	(\$110)	(\$110)	(\$160)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$361	\$395	\$446
Annual Gross Rental Income Per Unit	\$4,332	\$4,740	\$5,352
Less: Vacancy	(\$130)	(\$142)	(\$161)
Less: Annual Unit Operating Costs	(\$6,760)	(\$6,760)	(\$6,760)
Net Operating Income Per Unit	(\$2,558)	(\$2,162)	(\$1,569)
Available for Debt Service	(\$2,558)	(\$2,162)	(\$1,569)
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit	(\$33,700)	(\$28,500)	(\$20,700)
Per Unit Affordability Gap (4)	\$239,200	\$294,400	\$441,600

60% of Median

Annual Income Limit	\$37,680	\$40,350	\$48,420
Affordable Monthly Housing Expense	\$942	\$1,009	\$1,211
Less: Monthly Utility Allowance	(\$110)	(\$110)	(\$160)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$832	\$899	\$1,051
Annual Gross Rental Income Per Unit	\$9,984	\$10,788	\$12,612
Less: Vacancy	(\$300)	(\$324)	(\$378)
Less: Annual Unit Operating Costs	(\$6,760)	(\$6,760)	(\$6,760)
Net Operating Income Per Unit	\$2,924	\$3,704	\$5,474
Available for Debt Service	\$2,924	\$3,704	\$5,474
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit	\$38,600	\$48,800	\$72,200
Per Unit Affordability Gap (4)	\$200,600	\$245,600	\$369,400

80% of Median

Annual Income Limit	\$46,100	\$49,375	\$59,250
Affordable Monthly Housing Cost	\$1,153	\$1,234	\$1,481
Less: Monthly Utility Allowance	(\$110)	(\$110)	(\$160)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$1,043	\$1,124	\$1,321
Annual Gross Rental Income Per Unit	\$12,516	\$13,488	\$15,852
Less: Vacancy	(\$375)	(\$405)	(\$476)
Less: Annual Unit Operating Costs	(\$6,760)	(\$6,760)	(\$6,760)
Net Operating Income Per Unit	\$5,381	\$6,323	\$8,616
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit	\$70,900	\$83,400	\$113,600
Per Unit Affordability Gap (4)	\$168,300	\$211,000	\$328,000

(1) Source: Seattle Housing Authority, effective 11/1/2013.

(2) Includes electricity, heating, water, and garbage.

(3) From DRA[®] Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis,[®] 2014. Represents average cost per net SF for low- and mid-rise rental prototypes. Per NSF development costs escalated 5% from \$350 in 2014 to \$368 in 2015.

(4) Equals per unit development cost less per unit supportable mortgage.

Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development; Seattle Housing Authority; DRA

Table 18
Development Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
Economic Analysis
2014

Prototype Number (1)	Downtown/HR				South Lake Union		Residential Prototype 5A With Incentive
	Resid. Rental	Resid. Owner	Office	Hotel	Residential Rental		
	Prototype 1A With Incentive	Prototype 2A With Incentive	Prototype 3A With Incentive		Prototype 4A With Incentive	Prototype 4B No Incentive	
Zoning	In DMC 240/290-400 and HR	In DMC 240/290-400 and HR	In DOC 2 500/300-500	In DOC 2 500/300-500	in SM 160/85-240	in SM 160/85-240	in SM 160/85-240
Zip Code(s)	98121/ 98191 / 98101	98121/ 98191 / 98101	98121 / 98101	98121 / 98101	98109	98109	98109
Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea	Downtown Urban Center / First Hill	Downtown Urban Center / First Hill	Downtown Urban Center	Downtown Urban Center	SLU Urban Center	SLU Urban Center	SLU Urban Center
Primary Land Use(s)	Residential	Residential	Office	Hotel	Residential	Residential	Residential
Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner)	Renter	Owner			Renter	Renter	Ownership
Total Site Area (Acre)	0.34 Acres	0.34 Acres	0.74 Acres	0.34 Acres	0.48 Acres	0.48 Acres	0.48 Acres
Total Site Area (SF)	15,000	15,000	32,400	15,000	21,000	21,000	21,000
Construction Type	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type V over Type I	Type I
Approximate Building Stories	40 Stories	40 Stories	8 Stories	14 Stories	24 Stories	7 Stories	24 Stories
Total Gross Building SF, Including Parking (2)	509,500	524,500	447,000	206,000	341,250	153,000	341,250
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground (Incl. Pkg) (3)	449,500	449,500	324,000	206,000	278,250	132,000	278,250
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.) (3)	29.97	29.97	10.00	13.73	13.25	6.29	13.25
Total Gross Building SF (Excluding All Parking) (4)	344,500 SF	296,500 SF	201,000 SF	147,000 SF	204,250 SF	99,000 SF	179,250 SF
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground	449,500	449,500	324,000	206,000	278,250	132,000	278,250
Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground	45,000	78,000	0	0	12,000	12,000	36,000
Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking	404,500	371,500	324,000	206,000	266,250	120,000	242,250
Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking	311,000	286,000	249,000	164,800	205,000	92,000	187,000
Office or Hotel Space (Gross SF)	0	0	324,000	147,000	0	0	0
Ground Floor Retail Space (Gross SF)	3,000	3,000	3,000	2,500	3,000	3,000	3,000
Ground Floor Service/Lobby Space	12,000	12,000	32,400	15,000	12,750	0	12,750
Residential Space (Gross SF)	389,500	356,500	0	0	250,500	117,000	226,500
Building Efficiency Ratio (%)	77%	77%	77%	80%	77%	77%	77%
Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	100%	75%
Max. Bldg Footprint, Ground Floor (Gross SF)	15,000	15,000	32,400	15,000	15,750	21,000	15,750
Max. Tower Floor Plate (Gross SF)	10,700	10,700	N/A		10,500	N/A	10,500
Assumed Floor Plate for Commercial (Gross SF)			25,000				
Levels Underground Parking	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
Levels Structured Parking Above Grade	3.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	1.7
Stories of Ground Floor Retail/Lobby/Service Space	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.1	1.0
Stories of Office Space	0.0	0.0	10.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Residential Space	36.0	33.8	0.0	0.0	22.4	5.6	21.3
Total Stories Above Ground	40.0	40.0	11.0	14.0	24.0	6.3	24.0
Net Rentable SF Retail	2,100 SF	2,100 SF	2,100 SF	2,000 SF	2,100 SF	2,100 SF	2,100 SF
Net Rentable SF Office	0 SF	0 SF	249,480 SF	117,600 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net SF Residential	308,900 SF	283,900 SF	0 SF	0 SF	202,900 SF	89,900 SF	184,900 SF
Net SF Total	311,000 SF	286,000 SF	251,580 SF	119,600 SF	205,000 SF	92,000 SF	187,000 SF
Unit Bedroom Count Distribution							
Studio	25%	33%	0	0	25%	25%	25%
One Bedroom	50%	50%	0	0	50%	50%	55%
Two Bedroom	25%	15%	0	0	25%	25%	18%
Three Bedroom	0%	2%	0	0	0%	0%	2%
Total	100%	100%	0	0	100%	100%	100%
Units by BR Count							
Studio	107	114	0	0	70	31	55
One Bedroom	213	172	0	0	140	62	120
Two Bedroom	106	52	0	0	70	31	39
Three Bedroom	0	6	0	0	0	0	4
Total Residential Units	426	344	0	0	280	124	218
Residential Density (units per acre) (1)	1237 du/a	999 du/a	0 du/a	0 du/a	581 du/a	257 du/a	452 du/a
Unit Size (Net SF)							
Studio	500 SF	650 SF	0 SF	0 SF	500 SF	500 SF	650 SF
One Bedroom	700 SF	800 SF	0 SF	0 SF	700 SF	700 SF	800 SF
Two Bedroom	1,000 SF	1,200 SF	0 SF	0 SF	1,000 SF	1,000 SF	1,200 SF
Three Bedroom	0 SF	1,500 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	1,500 SF
Average Unit Size	725 SF	825 SF	0 SF	0 SF	725 SF	725 SF	849 SF
Parking Ratio - Residential (Spaces/Unit)	0.65	1.17	0	0	0.70	0.70	1.20
Parking Ratio - Office (Spaces/1000 GSF)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Parking Ratio - Hotel (Spaces/Room)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Parking Spaces Per Floor	39 Spaces/Floor	39 Spaces/Floor	85 Spaces/Floor	37 Spaces/Floor	55 Spaces/Floor	55 Spaces/Floor	55 Spaces/Floor
No. of Underground Parking Spaces	158 Spaces	197 Spaces	324 Spaces	147 Spaces	166 Spaces	55 Spaces	166 Spaces
No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces	119 Spaces	205 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	30 Spaces	32 Spaces	95 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Provided	277 Spaces	402 Spaces	324 Spaces	147 Spaces	196 Spaces	87 Spaces	261 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Required	277 Spaces	402 Spaces	324 Spaces	0 Spaces	196 Spaces	87 Spaces	261 Spaces
Gross SF/Parking Space (Incl. Circulation)	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF	400 SF	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF
Total Parking SF	105,000 SF	153,000 SF	123,000 SF	58,800 SF	74,000 SF	33,000 SF	99,000 SF
Total Underground Parking SF	60,000 SF	75,000 SF	123,000 SF	58,800 SF	63,000 SF	21,000 SF	63,000 SF
Total Parking SF Above Grade	45,000 SF	78,000 SF	0 SF	0 SF	11,000 SF	12,000 SF	36,000 SF

(1) Represents prototype number from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014. That study does not include a hotel prototype.

(2) Includes below-grade and above-grade parking.

(3) Includes above-grade parking; excludes underground parking. Excludes modest ground floor retail for commercial prototypes.

(4) Excludes above-grade and below-grade parking.

Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development; DRA

Table 18
Development Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
Economic Analysis
2014

Prototype Number (1)	South Lake Union		Lowrise to Midrise		4 Stories to 6 Stories		
	Ownership	Commercial	Residential Rental		Residential Rental		Residential
	Prototype 5B No Incentive	Prototype 6A With Incentive	Prototype 7A With Incentive	Prototype 7B No Incentive	Prototype 9A With Incentive	Prototype 9B No Incentive	Prototype 10A With Incentive
Zoning	in SM 160/85-240	in SM 160/85-240	in MR	in LR3	in NC 65	in NC 40	in NC 65
Zip Code(s)	98109	98109	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU.	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU.	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU.	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU.	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU.
Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea	SLU Urban Center	SLU Urban Center	Outside Downtown and Urban Villages Citywide	Urban Centers Outside Downtown and Urban Villages Citywide	Outside Downtown and Urban Villages Citywide	Outside Downtown and Urban Villages Citywide	Outside Downtown and Urban Villages Citywide
Primary Land Use(s)	Residential	Commercial	Residential	Residential	Res over Retail	Res over Retail	Res over Retail
Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner)	Ownership	n/a	Renter	Renter	Renter	Renter	Ownership
Total Site Area (Acres)	0.48 Acres	0.99 Acres	0.33 Acres	0.33 Acres	0.46 Acres	0.46 Acres	0.46 Acres
Total Site Area (SF)	21,000	43,000	14,400	14,400	20,000	20,000	20,000
Construction Type	Type V over Type I	Type I	Type V over Type I	Type V	Type V over Type I	Type V	Type V over Type I
Approximate Building Stories	7 Stories	8 Stories	7 Stories	4 Stories	6 Stories	4 Stories	6 Stories
Total Gross Building SF, Including Parking (2)	148,000	414,000	77,200	36,800	119,000	81,000	127,000
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground (Incl. Pkg.) (3)	119,000	301,000	61,200	28,800	95,000	65,000	95,000
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.) (3)	5.67	7.00	4.25	2.00	4.75	3.25	4.75
Total Gross Building SF (Excluding All Parking) (4)	76,000 SF	188,000 SF	45,200 SF	20,800 SF	71,000 SF	49,000 SF	63,000 SF
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground	119,000	301,000	61,200	28,800	95,000	65,000	95,000
Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground	13,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking	106,000	301,000	61,200	28,800	95,000	65,000	95,000
Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking	82,000	241,000	46,000	22,000	71,000	49,000	71,000
Office or Hotel Space (Gross SF)	0	298,000	0	0	0	0	0
Ground Floor Retail Space (Gross SF)	3,000	3,000	0	0	3,000	3,000	3,000
Ground Floor Service/Lobby Space	0	43,000	0	0	0	0	0
Residential Space (Gross SF)	103,000	0	61,200	28,800	92,000	62,000	92,000
Building Efficiency Ratio (%)	77%	80%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%
Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (%)	100%	100%	66%	50%	100%	100%	100%
Max. Bldg Footprint, Ground Floor (Gross SF)	21,000	43,000	9,540	7,200	20,000	20,000	20,000
Max. Tower Floor Plate (Gross SF)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assumed Floor Plate for Commercial (Gross SF)		25,000					
Levels Underground Parking	1.4	3.0	1.1	0.5	1.2	0.8	1.6
Levels Structured Parking Above Grade	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Ground Floor Retail/Lobby/Service Space	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2
Stories of Office Space	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Residential Space	4.9	0.0	6.4	4.0	4.6	3.1	4.6
Total Stories Above Ground	5.7	7.9	6.4	4.0	5.8	3.3	4.8
Net Rentable SF Retail	2,100 SF	2,100 SF	0 SF	0 SF	2,100 SF	2,100 SF	2,100 SF
Net Rentable SF Office	0 SF	238,400 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net SF Residential	79,900 SF	0 SF	46,000 SF	22,000 SF	68,900 SF	46,900 SF	68,900 SF
Net SF Total	82,000 SF	240,500 SF	46,000 SF	22,000 SF	71,000 SF	49,000 SF	71,000 SF
Unit Bedroom Count Distribution							
Studio	25%	0	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%
One Bedroom	55%	0	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Two Bedroom	18%	0	25%	25%	25%	25%	40%
Three Bedroom	2%	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%
Total	100%	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Units by BR Count							
Studio	24	0	18	9	27	18	0
One Bedroom	52	0	36	17	53	36	42
Two Bedroom	17	0	17	8	26	18	34
Three Bedroom	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total Residential Units	94	0	71	34	106	72	84
Residential Density (units per acre) (1)	195 du/a	0 du/a	215 du/a	103 du/a	231 du/a	157 du/a	183 du/a
Unit Size (Net SF)							
Studio	650 SF	0 SF	450 SF	450 SF	450 SF	450 SF	0 SF
One Bedroom	800 SF	0 SF	650 SF	650 SF	650 SF	650 SF	700 SF
Two Bedroom	1,200 SF	0 SF	850 SF	850 SF	850 SF	850 SF	900 SF
Three Bedroom	1,500 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	1,100 SF
<i>Average Unit Size</i>	<i>849 SF</i>	<i>0 SF</i>	<i>650 SF</i>	<i>650 SF</i>	<i>650 SF</i>	<i>650 SF</i>	<i>820 SF</i>
Parking Ratio - Residential (Spaces/Unit)	1.19	0	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	1.0
Parking Ratio - Office (Spaces/1000 GSF)	0	Max 1	0	0	0	0	0
Parking Ratio - Hotel (Spaces/Room)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking Spaces Per Floor	55 Spaces/Floor	113 Spaces/Floor	38 Spaces/Floor	38 Spaces/Floor	53 Spaces/Floor	53 Spaces/Floor	53 Spaces/Floor
No. of Underground Parking Spaces	77 Spaces	298 Spaces	43 Spaces	20 Spaces	64 Spaces	43 Spaces	84 Spaces
No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces	35 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Provided	112 Spaces	298 Spaces	43 Spaces	20 Spaces	64 Spaces	43 Spaces	84 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Required	112 Spaces	298 Spaces	43 Spaces	20 Spaces	64 Spaces	43 Spaces	84 Spaces
Gross SF/Parking Space (Incl. Circulation)	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF
Total Parking SF	43,000 SF	113,000 SF	16,000 SF	8,000 SF	24,000 SF	16,000 SF	32,000 SF
Total Underground Parking SF	29,000 SF	113,000 SF	16,000 SF	8,000 SF	24,000 SF	16,000 SF	32,000 SF
Total Parking SF Above Grade	13,000 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF

(1) Represents prototype number from DRA's "Affordable

(2) Includes below-grade and above-grade parking.

(3) Includes above-grade parkin; excludes underground p

(4) Excludes above-grade and below-grade parking.

Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Devel

Table 18
Development Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
Economic Analysis
2014

Prototype Number (1)	6 Stories to 7 Stories		
	Ownership	Residential Rental	Residential Owner
	Prototype 10B No Incentive	Prototype 11A With Incentive	Prototype 12A With Incentive
Zoning	in NC 40	in NC 85	in NC 85
Zip Code(s)	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU. Outside Downtown and Urban Villages	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU. Outside Downtown and Urban Villages	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU. Outside Downtown and Urban Villages
Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea	Citywide	Citywide	Citywide
Primary Land Use(s)	Res over Retail	Res over Retail	Res over Retail
Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner)	Ownership	Renter	Ownership
Total Site Area (Acre)	0.46 Acres	0.46 Acres	0.46 Acres
Total Site Area (SF)	20,000	20,000	20,000
Construction Type	Type V	Type V over Type I	Type V over Type I
Approximate Building Stories	4 Stories	7 Stories	7 Stories
Total Gross Building SF, Including Parking (2)	87,000	171,000	161,000
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground (Incl. Pkg) (3)	65,000	120,000	120,000
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.) (3)	3.25	6.00	6.00
Total Gross Building SF (Excluding All Parking) (4)	43,000 SF	69,000 SF	79,000 SF
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground	65,000	120,000	120,000
Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground	0	0	0
Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking	65,000	120,000	120,000
Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking	49,000	90,000	90,000
Office or Hotel Space (Gross SF)	0	0	0
Ground Floor Retail Space (Gross SF)	3,000	3,000	3,000
Ground Floor Service/Lobby Space			
Residential Space (Gross SF)	62,000	117,000	117,000
Building Efficiency Ratio (%)	75%	75%	75%
Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (%)	100%	100%	100%
Max. Bldg Footprint, Ground Floor (Gross SF)	20,000	20,000	20,000
Max. Tower Floor Plate (Gross SF)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assumed Floor Plate for Commercial (Gross SF)			
Levels Underground Parking	1.1	2.6	2.0
Levels Structured Parking Above Grade	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Ground Floor Retail/Lobby/Service Space	0.2	0.2	0.2
Stories of Office Space	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Residential Space	3.1	5.9	5.9
Total Stories Above Ground	3.3	6.0	6.0
Net Rentable SF Retail	2,100 SF	2,100 SF	2,100 SF
Net Rentable SF Office	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net SF Residential	46,900 SF	87,900 SF	87,900 SF
Net SF Total	49,000 SF	90,000 SF	90,000 SF
Unit Bedroom Count Distribution			
Studio	0%	25%	0%
One Bedroom	50%	50%	50%
Two Bedroom	40%	25%	40%
Three Bedroom	10%	0%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Units by BR Count			
Studio	0	34	0
One Bedroom	29	68	54
Two Bedroom	23	33	43
Three Bedroom	5	0	10
Total Residential Units	57	135	107
Residential Density (units per acre) (1)	124 du/a	294 du/a	233 du/a
Unit Size (Net SF)			
Studio	0 SF	450 SF	0 SF
One Bedroom	700 SF	650 SF	700 SF
Two Bedroom	900 SF	850 SF	900 SF
Three Bedroom	1,100 SF	0 SF	1,100 SF
<i>Average Unit Size</i>	<i>820 SF</i>	<i>650 SF</i>	<i>820 SF</i>
Parking Ratio - Residential (Spaces/Unit)	1.0	1.0	1.0
Parking Ratio - Office (Spaces/1000 GSF)	0	0	0
Parking Ratio - Hotel (Spaces/Room)	0	0	0
Parking Spaces Per Floor	53 Spaces/Floor	53 Spaces/Floor	53 Spaces/Floor
No. of Underground Parking Spaces	57 Spaces	135 Spaces	107 Spaces
No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Provided	57 Spaces	135 Spaces	107 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Required	57 Spaces	135 Spaces	107 Spaces
Gross SF/Parking Space (Incl. Circulation)	380 SF	380 SF	380 SF
Total Parking SF	22,000 SF	51,000 SF	41,000 SF
Total Underground Parking SF	22,000 SF	51,000 SF	41,000 SF
Total Parking SF Above Grade	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF

(1) Represents prototype number from DRA's "Affordable
(2) Includes below-grade and above-grade parking.
(3) Includes above-grade parkin; excludes underground p
(4) Excludes above-grade and below-grade parking.
Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Deve

Table 19
Additional Development Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Residential Owner			Resid. Rental	Mixed-Use / Grocery Store	Mixed-Use / Restaurant	Mixed-Use / Entertainment	Single-Story Stand Alone Retail
	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	Owner Flats	Rental Flats				
Zoning	SF-5000	LR2	LR2	LR2	SM / C / NC - 65	9b in NC 65	SM / C / NC - 65	IG / IC / C
Zip Code(s)	Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106	Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106	Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106	Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106	Multiple	Zips throughout the city except downtown and SLU.	Multiple	Multiple
Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea	Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge	Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge	Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge	Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge	Multiple	Urban Centers Outside Downtown and Urban Villages Citywide	Multiple	Multiple
Primary Land Use(s)	Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential	Rental Apts. Grocery Store	Rental Apts. Restaurant	Rental Apts. Entertainment	Retail
Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner)	Owner	Owner	Owner	Renter	Rental	Rental	Rental	N/A
Total Site Area (Acre)	0.11 Acres	0.22 Acres	0.22 Acres	0.22 Acres	1.15 Acres	0.46 Acres	0.46 Acres	1.15 Acres
Total Site Area (SF)	5,000	9,600	9,600	9,600	50,000	20,000	20,000	50,000
Construction Type	Type VB	Type VB	Type VB	Type VB	Type V over Type I	Type V over Type I	Type V over Type I	Type VB
Parking Type	Above Grade Garage	Above Grade Garage	Subterranean	Subterranean	Subterranean	Subterranean	Subterranean	Surface
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	6 Stories	4 Stories	6 Stories	1 Stories
Total Gross Building SF, Including Subt. Parking (1)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	310,000 SF	81,740 SF	128,200 SF	25,000 SF
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground (Incl. Pkg)					50,000	65,000	95,000	25,000
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.00	3.25	4.75	0.50
Total Gross Building SF (Excluding Parking)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	210,000 SF	65,400 SF	95,000 SF	25,000 SF
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Excl. Pkg.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.20	3.27	4.75	0.50
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground						65,000		
Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground					200,000	0		
Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking						65,000		
Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking								
Building Efficiency Ratio (%)	100%	100%	80%	80%	75%	75%	75%	80%
Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
Max. Bldg Footprint, Ground Floor (Gross SF)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	50,000			
Average Floor Plate Above Ground Floor								
Max. Tower Floor Plate (Gross SF)								
Assumed Floor Plate for Commercial (Gross SF)								
Levels Underground Parking	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Levels Structured Parking Above Grade	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Ground Floor Retail/Lobby/Service Space	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Stories of Non-Residential Space (2nd Story and Above)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stories of Residential Space	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
Total Stories Above Ground	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	1.0	6.0	1.0
Net Rentable SF R&D	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF General Office	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Medical Office	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Retail	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	20,000 SF
Net Rentable SF Grocery Store	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	37,500 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Restaurant	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	2,250 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Entertainment	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	11,250 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Residential	2,200 SF	8,400 SF	9,300 SF	9,500 SF	112,500 SF	46,800 SF	60,000 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Total	2,200 SF	8,400 SF	9,300 SF	9,500 SF	150,000 SF	49,050 SF	71,250 SF	20,000 SF
Net SF Community Space	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	7,500 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Total Net Bldg. SF	2,200 SF	8,400 SF	9,300 SF	9,500 SF	157,500 SF	49,050 SF	71,250 SF	20,000 SF
Gross SF R&D	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Office	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Medical Office	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Retail	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	25,000 SF
Gross SF Grocery Store	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	50,000 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Restaurant	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	3,000 SF	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Entertainment	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	15,000 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Residential	2,200 SF	8,400 SF	11,625 SF	11,875 SF	150,000 SF	62,400 SF	80,000 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Community Space								
Total Gross Bldg. SF	2,200 SF	8,400 SF	11,625 SF	11,875 SF	200,000 SF	65,400 SF	95,000 SF	25,000 SF
Unit Bedroom Count Distribution								
Studio	0%	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	25%	N/A
One Bedroom	0%	0%	67%	33%	50%	50%	50%	N/A
Two Bedroom	0%	100%	0%	17%	25%	25%	25%	N/A
Three Bedroom	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Units by BR Count								
Studio	0	0	0	6	43	18	22	N/A
One Bedroom	0	0	6	4	87	36	44	N/A
Two Bedroom	0	6	3	2	43	18	22	N/A
Three Bedroom	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Total Residential Units	1	6	9	12	173	72	88	N/A
Residential Density (units per acre)	9 du/a	27 du/a	41 du/a	54 du/a	151 du/a	157 du/a	192 du/a	N/A
Unit Size (Net SF)								
Studio	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	650 SF	450 SF	450 SF	450 SF	N/A
One Bedroom	0 SF	0 SF	800 SF	800 SF	650 SF	650 SF	650 SF	N/A
Two Bedroom	0 SF	1,400 SF	1,500 SF	1,200 SF	850 SF	850 SF	850 SF	N/A
Three Bedroom	2,200 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF	N/A
Average Unit Size	2,200 SF	1,400 SF	1,033 SF	792 SF	650 SF	650 SF	650 SF	N/A
Parking Spaces Per Floor								
No. of Underground Parking Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	9 Spaces	5 Spaces	125 Spaces/Floor	53 Spaces/Floor	50 Spaces/Floor	N/A
No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces	2 Spaces	6 Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces	250 Spaces	43 Spaces	83 Spaces	0 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Provided	2 Spaces	6 Spaces	9 Spaces	5 Spaces	250 Spaces	43 Spaces	83 Spaces	105 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Required	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Gross SF/Subt. Parking Space (Incl. Circulation)	N/A	N/A	400 SF	400 SF	400 SF	380 SF	400 SF	0 SF
Total Parking SF	N/A	N/A	3,600 SF	2,000 SF	100,000 SF	16,340 SF	33,200 SF	0 SF
Total Underground Parking SF	N/A	N/A	3,600 SF	2,000 SF	100,000 SF	16,340 SF	33,200 SF	0 SF
Total Parking SF Above Grade	N/A	N/A	0 SF	0 SF	0 SF		0 SF	0 SF

(1) Includes below-grade and above-grade parking.
Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development; DRA

Table 19
Additional Development Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact
2015

	R&D Laboratory	Medical Office
Zoning	SM 85	SM/NC/C-85
Zip Code(s)	98104, 98109, 98105, 98122	98104, 98109, 98105, 98122
Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea	First Hill, South Lake Union, University District, Capitol Hill	First Hill, South Lake Union, University District, Capitol Hill
Primary Land Use(s)	R&D Laboratory	Medical Office Grnd. Floor Retail
Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner)	N/A	N/A
Total Site Area (Acre)	0.46 Acres	0.46 Acres
Total Site Area (SF)	20,000	20,000
Construction Type	Type I	Type I
Parking Type	Subterranean	Subterranean
Approximate Building Stories	7 Stories	6 Stories
Total Gross Building SF, Including Subt. Parking (1)	187,000 SF	162,000 SF
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground (Incl. Pkg)	130,000	90,000
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.)	8.45	8.00
Total Gross Building SF (Excluding Parking)	130,000 SF	90,000 SF
Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Excl. Pkg.)	6.50	4.50
Total Gross Building SF Above Ground		
Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground		
Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking		
Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking		
Building Efficiency Ratio (%)	80%	80%
Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (%)	100%	100%
Max. Bldg Footprint, Ground Floor (Gross SF)		
Average Floor Plate Above Ground Floor		
Max. Tower Floor Plate (Gross SF)		
Assumed Floor Plate for Commercial (Gross SF)		
Levels Underground Parking	4.0	4.0
Levels Structured Parking Above Grade	0.0	0.0
Stories of Ground Floor Retail/Lobby/Service Space	1.0	1.0
Stories of Non-Residential Space (2nd Story and Above)	6.0	5.0
Stories of Residential Space	0.0	0.0
Total Stories Above Ground	7.0	6.0
Net Rentable SF R&D	80,000 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF General Office	8,000 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Medical Office	0 SF	69,600 SF
Net Rentable SF Retail	16,000 SF	2,400 SF
Net Rentable SF Grocery Store	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Restaurant	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Entertainment	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Residential	0 SF	0 SF
Net Rentable SF Total	104,000 SF	72,000 SF
Net SF Community Space	0 SF	0 SF
Total Net Bldg. SF	104,000 SF	72,000 SF
Gross SF R&D	100,000 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Office	10,000 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Medical Office	0 SF	87,000 SF
Gross SF Retail	20,000 SF	3,000 SF
Gross SF Grocery Store	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Restaurant	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Entertainment	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Residential	0 SF	0 SF
Gross SF Community Space		
Total Gross Bldg. SF	130,000 SF	90,000 SF
Unit Bedroom Count Distribution		
Studio	N/A	N/A
One Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Two Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Three Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Total	N/A	N/A
Units by BR Count		
Studio	N/A	N/A
One Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Two Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Three Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Total Residential Units	N/A	N/A
Residential Density (units per acre)	N/A	N/A
Unit Size (Net SF)		
Studio	N/A	N/A
One Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Two Bedroom	N/A	N/A
Three Bedroom	N/A	N/A
<i>Average Unit Size</i>	N/A	N/A
Parking Spaces Per Floor	36.75 Spaces/Floor	45 Spaces/Floor
No. of Underground Parking Spaces	147 Spaces	180 Spaces
No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces	0 Spaces	0 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Provided	147 Spaces	180 Spaces
Total Parking Spaces Required		
Gross SF/Subt. Parking Space (Incl. Circulation)	388 SF	400 SF
Total Parking SF	57,000 SF	72,000 SF
Total Underground Parking SF	57,000 SF	72,000 SF
Total Parking SF Above Grade	0 SF	0 SF

(1) Includes below-grade and above-grade parking.
Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Deve

Table 20
Disposable Household Income of New Homebuyers
Owner Housing Prototypes
Seattle Residential Nexus Analysis
2014

	Downtown	South Lake Union		Midrise		
	Prototype 2A With Incentive	Prototype 5A With Incentive	Prototype 5B No Incentive	Prototype 10A With Incentive	Prototype 10B No Incentive	Prototype 12A With Incentive
Average Unit Size (SF)	825	849	849	820	820	820
Average Sales Price Per SF (1)	\$741	\$641	\$538	\$400	\$400	\$400
Average Sales Price Per Unit (2)	\$611,000	\$543,900	\$456,500	\$328,000	\$328,000	\$328,000
Mortgage Amount (3)	\$549,900	\$489,510	\$410,850	\$295,200	\$295,200	\$295,200
Monthly Principal and Interest Payment (4)	\$2,952	\$2,628	\$2,206	\$1,585	\$1,585	\$1,585
Monthly Property Taxes (5)	\$611	\$544	\$457	\$328	\$328	\$328
Monthly HOA Dues Plus Insurance (6)	\$400	\$400	\$275	\$275	\$275	\$275
Total Monthly Housing Cost	\$3,963	\$3,572	\$2,937	\$2,188	\$2,188	\$2,188
Estimated Average Annual Income (7)	\$136,000	\$122,000	\$101,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Sales Price to Income Ratio	4.49	4.46	4.52	4.37	4.37	4.37
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (8)	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%
Ave. Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$88,400	\$79,300	\$65,650	\$48,750	\$48,750	\$48,750
Number of Units in Prototype	344	218	94	84	57	107
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$30,409,600	\$17,287,400	\$6,171,100	\$4,095,000	\$2,778,750	\$5,216,250

(1) For low- and mid-rise prototypes, price based on middle priced scenario of Version B from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014.

(2) Estimated average sales price of homes for this prototype, based on Version B from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014.

(3) At a 90% loan to value (price) ratio, assuming a 10% buyer downpayment.

(4) Monthly mortgage principal and interest payment assuming a 5.0% fixed-rate loan for 30 years.

(5) Monthly property taxes estimated at 1.2% annual tax rate.

Table 21
Disposable Household Income of New Renter Households
Rental Housing Prototypes
Seattle Residential Nexus Analysis
2014

	Downtown	South Lake Union		Lowrise and Midrise				
	Prototype 1A With Incentive	Prototype 4A With Incentive	Prototype 4B No Incentive	Prototype 7A With Incentive	Prototype 7B No Incentive	Prototype 9A With Incentive	Prototype 9B No Incentive	Prototype 11A With Incentive
Average Unit Size (SF)	725	725	725	650	650	650	650	650
Average Monthly Rent Per SF	\$3.25	\$3.20	\$2.85	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$2.60
Average Monthly Rent Per Unit (1)	\$2,400	\$2,300	\$2,100	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700
Average Household Income (2)	\$96,000	\$92,000	\$84,000	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$68,000
Annual Household Income to Rent Ratio	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (3)	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%
Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$62,400	\$59,800	\$54,600	\$44,200	\$44,200	\$44,200	\$44,200	\$44,200
Number of Units in Prototype	426	280	124	71	34	106	72	135
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$26,582,400	\$16,744,000	\$6,770,400	\$3,138,200	\$1,502,800	\$4,685,200	\$3,182,400	\$5,967,000

(1) Estimated average rent for each prototype, based on Version B from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014. For low- and mid-rise prototypes, represents middle scenario.

(2) Assumes rent at 33% of household income.

(3) After deductions for federal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and person savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing prototypes.

Source: DRA

Table 22
Disposable Household Income of New Homebuyers
Additional Owner Housing Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	Owner Flats
Average Unit Size (SF)	2,200	1,400	1,033
Average Sales Price Per SF (1)	\$325	\$340	\$350
Average Sales Price Per Unit (2)	\$715,000	\$476,000	\$361,700
Mortgage Amount (3)	\$643,500	\$428,400	\$325,530
Monthly Principal and Interest Payment (4)	\$3,454	\$2,300	\$1,748
Monthly Property Taxes (5)	\$715	\$476	\$362
Monthly HOA Dues Plus Insurance	\$75	\$400	\$275
Total Monthly Housing Cost	\$4,244	\$3,176	\$2,384
Estimated Average Annual Income (6)	\$146,000	\$109,000	\$82,000
Sales Price to Income Ratio	4.90	4.37	4.41
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (7)	65%	65%	65%
Ave. Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$94,900	\$70,850	\$53,300
Number of Units in Prototype	1	6	9
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$94,900	\$425,100	\$479,700

(1) Townhome sales price based on median sales price per square foot for new homes sold in Seattle during the first quarter of 2015 of \$340 for an average-sized new unit of 1,300 SF, according to Redfin. Estimated per SF sales prices for single-family infill homes and owner flats estimated at \$325 and \$350, respectively.

(3) At a 90% loan to value (price) ratio, assuming a 10% buyer downpayment.

(4) Monthly mortgage principal and interest payment assuming a 5.0% fixed-rate loan for 30 years.

(5) Monthly property taxes estimated at 1.2% annual tax rate.

Table 23
Disposable Household Income of New Renter Households
Additional Rental Housing Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Rental Flats	Mixed-Use / Grocery Store	Mixed-Use / Restaurant	Mixed-Use / Entertainment
Average Unit Size (SF)	792	650	650	650
Average Monthly Rent Per SF	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$2.60
Average Monthly Rent Per Unit (1)	\$2,100	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700
Average Household Income (2)	\$84,000	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$68,000
Annual Household Income to Rent Ratio	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (3)	65%	65%	65%	65%
Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$54,600	\$44,200	\$44,200	\$44,200
Number of Units in Prototype	12	173	72	88
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$655,200	\$7,646,600	\$3,182,400	\$3,889,600

(1) Estimated average rent for low- and mid-rise prototypes, Version B, Middle Scenario from DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis", 2014.

(2) Assumes rent at 33% of household income.

(3) After deductions for federal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and person savings. Based on data from the Tax at the income levels projected for the housing prototypes.

Source: DRA

Table 24
Projected Economic Impact by Prototype
Residential Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2013

	Downtown/HR		South Lake Union				Lowrise to Midrise	
	Resid. Rental	Resid. Owner	Residential Rental		Residential Ownership		Residential Rental	
	Prototype 1A With Incentive	Prototype 2A With Incentive	Prototype 4A With Incentive	Prototype 4B No Incentive	Prototype 5A With Incentive	Prototype 5B No Incentive	Prototype 7A With Incentive	Prototype 7B No Incentive
Employment (Number of Employees)	129.3	135.4	81.5	32.9	77.0	27.5	17.5	8.4
Total Industry Output	\$18,721,015	\$19,135,456	\$11,792,189	\$4,768,146	\$10,878,219	\$3,883,208	\$2,531,614	\$1,212,322
Payroll	\$7,555,910	\$7,813,826	\$4,759,395	\$1,924,451	\$4,442,042	\$1,585,680	\$1,023,152	\$489,960
Average Payroll Per Employee	\$58,419	\$57,702	\$58,419	\$58,419	\$57,702	\$57,702	\$58,595	\$58,595

Source: IMPLAN Input/Output Model; DRA.

Table 24
Projected Economic Impact by Prototype
Residential Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2013

	4 Stories to 6 Stories				6 Stories to 7 Stories	
	Residential Rental		Residential Ownership		Resid. Rental	Resid. Owner
	Prototype 9A With Incentive	Prototype 9B No Incentive	Prototype 10A With Incentive	Prototype 10B No Incentive	Prototype 11A With Incentive	Prototype 12A With Incentive
Employment (Number of Employees)	26.1	17.7	22.8	15.5	33.2	29.0
Total Industry Output	\$3,779,593	\$2,567,271	\$3,303,473	\$2,241,642	\$4,813,632	\$4,207,996
Payroll	\$1,527,523	\$1,037,563	\$1,335,099	\$905,960	\$1,945,430	\$1,700,662
Average Payroll Per Employee	\$58,595	\$58,595	\$58,595	\$58,595	\$58,595	\$58,595

Table 25
Projected Employment Generation
Additional Residential Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	Owner Flats	Rental Flats	Mixed-Use / Grocery Store	Mixed-Use / Restaurant	Mixed-Use / Entertainment
Total Household Expenditures	\$94,900	\$425,100	\$479,700	\$655,200	\$7,646,600	\$3,182,400	\$3,889,600
Total Jobs Generated by Industry (1)							
Manufacturing	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.74	0.31	0.37
Wholesale Trade	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.13	1.55	0.64	0.79
Retail Trade	0.08	0.39	0.43	0.59	8.52	3.54	4.33
Transportation	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.73	0.31	0.37
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.03	0.04
Information and Communication	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.09	1.24	0.52	0.63
Finance and Insurance	0.02	0.10	0.12	0.16	2.17	0.90	1.10
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.03	0.16	0.18	0.25	4.05	1.69	2.06
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.02	0.08	0.09	0.13	1.78	0.74	0.91
Management and Administrative Services	0.02	0.10	0.11	0.15	2.04	0.85	1.04
Educational Services	0.01	0.06	0.06	0.09	1.19	0.50	0.61
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.10	0.52	0.59	0.80	11.42	4.75	5.81
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.02	0.09	0.10	0.13	1.74	0.72	0.89
Other Services	0.09	0.45	0.51	0.69	8.97	3.73	4.56
Government	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.70	0.29	0.36
Total	0.44	2.19	2.48	3.38	46.92	19.52	23.87

(1) Includes total employment, full-time and part-time.

Source: IMPLAN Input/Output Model; DRA.

Table 26
Wages by Occupational Grouping
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division
May, 2013

SOC Code Prefix (1)	Occupational Category	2013 Employ- ment Estimates	% of Total Employ- ment	Mean Hourly Wage	Mean Annual Wage	10th Percentile Hourly Wage	25th Percentile Hourly Wage	Median (50th Percentile) Hourly Wage	75th Percentile Hourly Wage	90th Percentile Hourly Wage
11	Management	78,480	5%	\$59.30	\$123,340	\$28.17	\$39.15	\$54.11	\$72.47	N/A
13	Business and Financial Operations	107,980	7%	\$38.00	\$79,050	\$20.65	\$26.36	\$34.85	\$45.72	\$59.45
15	Computer and Mathematical	115,870	8%	\$49.35	\$102,640	\$26.81	\$37.53	\$49.34	\$59.90	\$70.97
17	Architecture and Engineering	50,710	3%	\$42.51	\$88,420	\$24.94	\$32.28	\$41.52	\$52.40	\$63.40
19	Life, Physical and Social Science	17,990	1%	\$34.54	\$71,840	\$18.08	\$22.38	\$31.04	\$42.34	\$55.14
21	Community and Social Services	19,460	1%	\$21.56	\$44,840	\$12.07	\$15.18	\$20.20	\$26.36	\$33.57
23	Legal	12,690	1%	\$49.49	\$102,950	\$20.79	\$29.08	\$39.22	\$63.40	N/A
25	Education, Training, and Library	73,840	5%	\$26.67	\$55,470	\$13.76	\$17.38	\$23.66	\$32.29	\$40.70
27	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, Media	27,790	2%	\$27.87	\$57,970	\$11.57	\$16.39	\$24.01	\$35.31	\$46.95
29	Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	68,090	5%	\$40.93	\$85,130	\$19.43	\$26.55	\$36.72	\$47.42	\$61.69
31	Healthcare Support	31,940	2%	\$17.43	\$36,260	\$11.52	\$13.29	\$16.29	\$20.39	\$25.52
33	Protective Service	25,600	2%	\$25.27	\$52,550	\$10.48	\$13.21	\$21.27	\$36.13	\$44.56
35	Food Preparation and Serving-Related	114,810	8%	\$12.74	\$26,500	\$9.24	\$9.37	\$10.92	\$14.19	\$18.50
37	Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	34,380	2%	\$14.84	\$30,870	\$9.42	\$10.86	\$13.80	\$17.55	\$21.74

Table 26
Wages by Occupational Grouping
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division
May, 2013

SOC Code Prefix (1)	Occupational Category	2013 Employ- ment Estimates	% of Total Employ- ment	Mean Hourly Wage	Mean Annual Wage	10th Percentile Hourly Wage	25th Percentile Hourly Wage	Median (50th Percentile) Hourly Wage	75th Percentile Hourly Wage	90th Percentile Hourly Wage
39	Personal Care and Service	43,790	3%	\$14.53	\$30,210	\$9.36	\$10.15	\$11.75	\$16.23	\$24.67
40	Sales and Related	148,800	10%	\$22.15	\$46,080	\$9.51	\$11.13	\$16.11	\$26.20	\$44.26
43	Office and Administrative Support	196,340	14%	\$19.38	\$40,320	\$11.34	\$14.29	\$18.29	\$23.17	\$28.47
45	Farming, Fishing, Forestry	1,360	0%	\$16.12	\$33,530	\$9.22	\$9.31	\$11.99	\$21.47	\$29.70
47	Construction and Extraction	53,680	4%	\$27.38	\$56,960	\$14.82	\$19.16	\$26.98	\$34.49	\$42.00
49	Installation, Maintenance and Repair	47,390	3%	\$25.58	\$53,210	\$13.79	\$17.82	\$24.63	\$32.33	\$40.16
51	Production	88,040	6%	\$21.04	\$43,770	\$10.50	\$13.52	\$18.70	\$27.53	\$35.59
53	Transportation and Material Moving	90,730	6%	\$19.92	\$41,430	\$9.64	\$12.04	\$16.89	\$23.52	\$33.96
TOTAL		1,449,770	100%							

(1) The first two digits of the six digit Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) code.

(2) Based on the following income limits adjusted for a 2.5 person household: \$22,500 at 30% AMI; \$44,950 at 60%AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI. and Wage Estimates, Seattle-Bellevue-Everett,

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2013 Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Area Occupational Employment
Washington Metropolitan Division; 2013; DRA

Table 26
Wages by Occupational Grouping
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division
May, 2013

SOC Code Prefix (1)	Occupational Category	2013 Employment Estimates	10th Percentile Annual Wage	25th Percentile Annual Wage	Median (50th Percentile) Annual Wage	75th Percentile Annual Wage	90th Percentile Annual Wage	Est. % of Jobs Below 30% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 30%-60% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 60%-80% AMI (2)
11	Management	78,480	\$58,594	\$81,432	\$112,549	\$150,738	N/A	0%	0%	10%
13	Business and Financial Operations	107,980	\$42,952	\$54,829	\$72,488	\$95,098	\$123,656	0%	10%	20%
15	Computer and Mathematical	115,870	\$55,765	\$78,062	\$102,627	\$124,592	\$147,618	0%	0%	10%
17	Architecture and Engineering	50,710	\$51,875	\$67,142	\$86,362	\$108,992	\$131,872	0%	0%	15%
19	Life, Physical and Social Science	17,990	\$37,606	\$46,550	\$64,563	\$88,067	\$114,691	5%	10%	25%
21	Community and Social Services	19,460	\$25,106	\$31,574	\$42,016	\$54,829	\$69,826	7%	43%	30%
23	Legal	12,690	\$43,243	\$60,486	\$81,578	\$131,872	N/A	0%	10%	15%
25	Education, Training, and Library	73,840	\$28,621	\$36,150	\$49,213	\$67,163	\$84,656	5%	35%	20%
27	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, Media	27,790	\$24,066	\$34,091	\$49,941	\$73,445	\$97,656	8%	32%	25%
29	Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	68,090	\$40,414	\$55,224	\$76,378	\$98,634	\$128,315	0%	15%	15%
31	Healthcare Support	31,940	\$23,962	\$27,643	\$33,883	\$42,411	\$53,082	10%	70%	20%
33	Protective Service	25,600	\$21,798	\$27,477	\$44,242	\$75,150	\$92,685	10%	40%	25%
35	Food Preparation and Serving-Related	114,810	\$19,219	\$19,490	\$22,714	\$29,515	\$38,480	50%	50%	0%
37	Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	34,380	\$19,594	\$22,589	\$28,704	\$36,504	\$45,219	25%	60%	15%

Table 26
Wages by Occupational Grouping
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metropolitan Division
May, 2013

SOC Code Prefix	(1) Occupational Category	2013 Employment Estimates	10th Percentile Annual Wage	25th Percentile Annual Wage	Median (50th Percentile) Annual Wage	75th Percentile Annual Wage	90th Percentile Annual Wage	Est. % of Jobs Below 30% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 30%-60% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 60%-80% AMI (2)
39	Personal Care and Service	43,790	\$19,469	\$21,112	\$24,440	\$33,758	\$51,314	35%	55%	10%
40	Sales and Related	148,800	\$19,781	\$23,150	\$33,509	\$54,496	\$92,061	25%	40%	15%
43	Office and Administrative Support	196,340	\$23,587	\$29,723	\$38,043	\$48,194	\$59,218	10%	50%	30%
45	Farming, Fishing, Forestry	1,360	\$19,178	\$19,365	\$24,939	\$44,658	\$61,776	35%	40%	10%
47	Construction and Extraction	53,680	\$30,826	\$39,853	\$56,118	\$71,739	\$87,360	5%	30%	20%
49	Installation, Maintenance and Repair	47,390	\$28,683	\$37,066	\$51,230	\$67,246	\$83,533	15%	20%	25%
51	Production	88,040	\$21,840	\$28,122	\$38,896	\$57,262	\$74,027	10%	5%	65%
53	Transportation and Material Moving	90,730	\$20,051	\$25,043	\$35,131	\$48,922	\$70,637	20%	45%	15%
	TOTAL	1,449,770								

Table 27
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 1A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	1.80	1.13	\$20,966	\$33,336	10%	5%	65%	0.11	0.06	0.74
Wholesale Trade	4.90	3.08	\$25,838	\$41,083	20%	45%	15%	0.62	1.39	0.46
Retail Trade	22.10	13.90	\$10,428	\$16,580	25%	40%	15%	3.47	5.56	2.08
Transportation	2.60	1.64	\$14,789	\$23,515	20%	45%	15%	0.33	0.74	0.25
Warehousing and Storage	0.20	0.13	\$19,601	\$31,165	20%	45%	15%	0.03	0.06	0.02
Information and Communication	3.80	2.39	\$25,378	\$40,351	10%	50%	30%	0.24	1.19	0.72
Finance and Insurance	7.20	4.53	\$16,313	\$25,937	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.45	0.91
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	7.80	4.91	\$6,509	\$10,350	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.49	0.98
Professional, Scientific and Technical	5.20	3.27	\$20,611	\$32,772	5%	10%	25%	0.16	0.33	0.82
Management and Administrative Services	5.60	3.52	\$13,954	\$22,187	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.35
Educational Services	4.00	2.52	\$6,524	\$10,373	5%	35%	20%	0.13	0.88	0.50
Health Care and Social Assistance	29.30	18.43	\$16,453	\$26,161	10%	70%	20%	1.84	12.90	3.69
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	5.60	3.52	\$5,948	\$9,457	8%	32%	25%	0.28	1.13	0.88
Other Services	27.20	17.11	\$8,275	\$13,157	35%	55%	10%	5.99	9.41	1.71
Government	2.00	1.26	\$23,475	\$37,325	10%	50%	30%	0.13	0.63	0.38
Total/Average	127.50	80.19	\$13,339	\$21,208				13.21	35.15	13.74

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 28
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 2A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	1.80	1.13	\$93,349	\$148,426	10%	5%	65%	0.11	0.06	0.74
Wholesale Trade	3.90	2.45	\$103,776	\$165,004	20%	45%	15%	0.49	1.10	0.37
Retail Trade	25.30	15.91	\$46,719	\$74,284	25%	40%	15%	3.98	6.36	2.39
Transportation	2.80	1.76	\$69,824	\$111,020	20%	45%	15%	0.35	0.79	0.26
Warehousing and Storage	0.20	0.13	\$87,247	\$138,723	20%	45%	15%	0.03	0.06	0.02
Information and Communication	3.90	2.45	\$115,359	\$183,421	10%	50%	30%	0.25	1.23	0.74
Finance and Insurance	7.90	4.97	\$74,703	\$118,777	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.50	0.99
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	6.50	4.09	\$24,581	\$39,084	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.41	0.82
Professional, Scientific and Technical	5.60	3.52	\$91,143	\$144,918	5%	10%	25%	0.18	0.35	0.88
Management and Administrative Services	5.80	3.65	\$60,364	\$95,979	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.36
Educational Services	5.00	3.14	\$34,315	\$54,561	5%	35%	20%	0.16	1.10	0.63
Health Care and Social Assistance	30.00	18.87	\$71,056	\$112,980	10%	70%	20%	1.89	13.21	3.77
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	6.00	3.77	\$27,043	\$42,998	8%	32%	25%	0.30	1.21	0.94
Other Services	28.60	17.99	\$38,840	\$61,755	35%	55%	10%	6.30	9.89	1.80
Government	2.10	1.32	\$99,729	\$158,569	10%	50%	30%	0.13	0.66	0.40
Total/Average	133.60	84.03	\$57,709	\$91,758				14.04	36.87	14.37

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 29
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 4A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	1.10	0.69	\$96,047	\$152,715	10%	5%	65%	0.07	0.03	0.45
Wholesale Trade	3.10	1.95	\$102,408	\$162,829	20%	45%	15%	0.39	0.88	0.29
Retail Trade	13.90	8.74	\$46,782	\$74,384	25%	40%	15%	2.19	3.50	1.31
Transportation	1.60	1.01	\$69,548	\$110,582	20%	45%	15%	0.20	0.45	0.15
Warehousing and Storage	0.20	0.13	\$53,630	\$85,271	20%	45%	15%	0.03	0.06	0.02
Information and Communication	2.40	1.51	\$115,062	\$182,949	10%	50%	30%	0.15	0.75	0.45
Finance and Insurance	4.50	2.83	\$76,435	\$121,532	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.28	0.57
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	4.90	3.08	\$24,339	\$38,699	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.31	0.62
Professional, Scientific and Technical	3.30	2.08	\$91,666	\$145,749	5%	10%	25%	0.10	0.21	0.52
Management and Administrative Services	3.60	2.26	\$60,380	\$96,004	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.23
Educational Services	2.50	1.57	\$34,094	\$54,210	5%	35%	20%	0.08	0.55	0.31
Health Care and Social Assistance	18.50	11.64	\$72,261	\$114,894	10%	70%	20%	1.16	8.14	2.33
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	3.50	2.20	\$27,090	\$43,073	8%	32%	25%	0.18	0.70	0.55
Other Services	17.10	10.75	\$38,550	\$61,295	35%	55%	10%	3.76	5.92	1.08
Government	1.30	0.82	\$98,992	\$157,397	10%	50%	30%	0.08	0.41	0.25
Total/Average	80.40	50.57	\$58,397	\$92,852				8.32	22.16	8.67

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 30
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 4B
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.46	0.29	\$92,870	\$147,663	10%	5%	65%	0.03	0.01	0.19
Wholesale Trade	1.30	0.82	\$98,744	\$157,002	20%	45%	15%	0.16	0.37	0.12
Retail Trade	5.60	3.52	\$46,953	\$74,655	25%	40%	15%	0.88	1.41	0.53
Transportation	0.70	0.44	\$64,278	\$102,202	20%	45%	15%	0.09	0.20	0.07
Warehousing and Storage	0.10	0.06	\$43,370	\$68,958	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.03	0.01
Information and Communication	1.00	0.63	\$111,660	\$177,540	10%	50%	30%	0.06	0.31	0.19
Finance and Insurance	1.80	1.13	\$77,266	\$122,853	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.11	0.23
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	2.00	1.26	\$24,111	\$38,337	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.13	0.25
Professional, Scientific and Technical	1.30	0.82	\$94,088	\$149,599	5%	10%	25%	0.04	0.08	0.20
Management and Administrative Services	1.40	0.88	\$62,780	\$99,821	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.09
Educational Services	1.00	0.63	\$34,465	\$54,799	5%	35%	20%	0.03	0.22	0.13
Health Care and Social Assistance	7.50	4.72	\$72,072	\$114,595	10%	70%	20%	0.47	3.30	0.94
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.40	0.88	\$27,384	\$43,541	8%	32%	25%	0.07	0.28	0.22
Other Services	6.90	4.34	\$38,630	\$61,422	35%	55%	10%	1.52	2.39	0.43
Government	0.50	0.31	\$104,070	\$165,472	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.16	0.09
Total/Average	32.50	20.44	\$58,387	\$92,836				3.37	8.99	3.50

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 31
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 5A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)		Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)		Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	1.00	0.63	\$95,522	\$151,880	10%	5%	65%	0.06	0.03	0.41	
Wholesale Trade	2.20	1.38	\$104,583	\$166,286	20%	45%	15%	0.28	0.62	0.21	
Retail Trade	14.40	9.06	\$46,663	\$74,194	25%	40%	15%	2.26	3.62	1.36	
Transportation	1.60	1.01	\$69,464	\$110,448	20%	45%	15%	0.20	0.45	0.15	
Warehousing and Storage	0.10	0.06	\$99,197	\$157,724	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.03	0.01	
Information and Communication	2.20	1.38	\$116,255	\$184,846	10%	50%	30%	0.14	0.69	0.42	
Finance and Insurance	4.50	2.83	\$74,554	\$118,540	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.28	0.57	
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	3.70	2.33	\$24,549	\$39,033	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.23	0.47	
Professional, Scientific and Technical	3.20	2.01	\$90,674	\$144,171	5%	10%	25%	0.10	0.20	0.50	
Management and Administrative Services	3.30	2.08	\$60,313	\$95,898	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.21	
Educational Services	2.80	1.76	\$34,835	\$55,388	5%	35%	20%	0.09	0.62	0.35	
Health Care and Social Assistance	17.10	10.75	\$70,867	\$112,679	10%	70%	20%	1.08	7.53	2.15	
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	3.40	2.14	\$27,130	\$43,136	8%	32%	25%	0.17	0.68	0.53	
Other Services	16.20	10.19	\$38,980	\$61,979	35%	55%	10%	3.57	5.60	1.02	
Government	1.20	0.75	\$99,215	\$157,752	10%	50%	30%	0.08	0.38	0.23	
Total/Average	75.90	47.74	\$58,387	\$92,836				7.97	20.95	8.17	

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 32
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 5B
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.40	0.25	\$85,246	\$135,542	10%	5%	65%	0.03	0.01	0.16
Wholesale Trade	0.80	0.50	\$102,666	\$163,238	20%	45%	15%	0.10	0.23	0.08
Retail Trade	5.10	3.21	\$47,033	\$74,782	25%	40%	15%	0.80	1.28	0.48
Transportation	0.60	0.38	\$66,124	\$105,138	20%	45%	15%	0.08	0.17	0.06
Warehousing and Storage	0.10	0.06	\$35,411	\$56,303	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.03	0.01
Information and Communication	0.80	0.50	\$114,124	\$181,458	10%	50%	30%	0.05	0.25	0.15
Finance and Insurance	1.60	1.01	\$74,850	\$119,012	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.10	0.20
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.30	0.82	\$24,942	\$39,657	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.08	0.16
Professional, Scientific and Technical	1.10	0.69	\$94,161	\$149,716	5%	10%	25%	0.03	0.07	0.17
Management and Administrative Services	1.20	0.75	\$59,208	\$94,140	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.08
Educational Services	1.00	0.63	\$34,818	\$55,361	5%	35%	20%	0.03	0.22	0.13
Health Care and Social Assistance	6.10	3.84	\$70,916	\$112,757	10%	70%	20%	0.38	2.69	0.77
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.20	0.75	\$27,440	\$43,629	8%	32%	25%	0.06	0.24	0.19
Other Services	5.80	3.65	\$38,866	\$61,796	35%	55%	10%	1.28	2.01	0.36
Government	0.40	0.25	\$106,251	\$168,939	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.13	0.08
Total/Average	27.10	17.04	\$58,387	\$92,836				2.85	7.49	2.91

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 33
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 7A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.20	0.13	\$113,522	\$180,500	10%	5%	65%	0.01	0.01	0.08
Wholesale Trade	0.70	0.44	\$108,814	\$173,014	20%	45%	15%	0.09	0.20	0.07
Retail Trade	3.00	1.89	\$46,215	\$73,481	25%	40%	15%	0.47	0.75	0.28
Transportation	0.30	0.19	\$77,112	\$122,608	20%	45%	15%	0.04	0.08	0.03
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$0	\$0	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.50	0.31	\$116,035	\$184,495	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.16	0.09
Finance and Insurance	0.90	0.57	\$78,513	\$124,835	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.06	0.11
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.30	0.82	\$23,497	\$37,360	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.08	0.16
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.70	0.44	\$92,115	\$146,462	5%	10%	25%	0.02	0.04	0.11
Management and Administrative Services	0.80	0.50	\$58,766	\$93,439	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.05
Educational Services	0.50	0.31	\$31,400	\$49,926	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.11	0.06
Health Care and Social Assistance	4.00	2.52	\$72,508	\$115,287	10%	70%	20%	0.25	1.76	0.50
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.70	0.44	\$28,627	\$45,517	8%	32%	25%	0.04	0.14	0.11
Other Services	3.50	2.20	\$38,688	\$61,514	35%	55%	10%	0.77	1.21	0.22
Government	0.30	0.19	\$94,153	\$149,704	10%	50%	30%	0.02	0.09	0.06
Total/Average	17.20	10.82	\$58,387	\$92,836				1.74	4.69	1.86

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 34
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 7B
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.10	0.06	\$108,725	\$172,873	10%	5%	65%	0.01	0.00	0.04
Wholesale Trade	0.40	0.25	\$91,189	\$144,990	20%	45%	15%	0.05	0.11	0.04
Retail Trade	1.40	0.88	\$47,424	\$75,403	25%	40%	15%	0.22	0.35	0.13
Transportation	0.20	0.13	\$55,390	\$88,070	20%	45%	15%	0.03	0.06	0.02
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$0	\$0	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.20	0.13	\$138,915	\$220,874	10%	50%	30%	0.01	0.06	0.04
Finance and Insurance	0.50	0.31	\$67,676	\$107,604	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.03	0.06
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.60	0.38	\$24,379	\$38,763	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.04	0.08
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.30	0.19	\$102,926	\$163,653	5%	10%	25%	0.01	0.02	0.05
Management and Administrative Services	0.40	0.25	\$56,283	\$89,491	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.03
Educational Services	0.20	0.13	\$37,592	\$59,771	5%	35%	20%	0.01	0.04	0.03
Health Care and Social Assistance	1.90	1.19	\$73,099	\$116,227	10%	70%	20%	0.12	0.84	0.24
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.40	0.25	\$23,990	\$38,145	8%	32%	25%	0.02	0.08	0.06
Other Services	1.70	1.07	\$38,143	\$60,648	35%	55%	10%	0.37	0.59	0.11
Government	0.10	0.06	\$135,263	\$215,068	10%	50%	30%	0.01	0.03	0.02
Total/Average	8.30	5.22	\$58,387	\$92,836				0.84	2.25	0.89

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 35
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 9A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.40	0.25	\$84,742	\$134,740	10%	5%	65%	0.03	0.01	0.16
Wholesale Trade	1.10	0.69	\$103,380	\$164,374	20%	45%	15%	0.14	0.31	0.10
Retail Trade	4.40	2.77	\$47,043	\$74,799	25%	40%	15%	0.69	1.11	0.42
Transportation	0.50	0.31	\$69,075	\$109,829	20%	45%	15%	0.06	0.14	0.05
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$0	\$0	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.80	0.50	\$108,272	\$172,152	10%	50%	30%	0.05	0.25	0.15
Finance and Insurance	1.40	0.88	\$75,353	\$119,812	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.09	0.18
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.90	1.19	\$24,002	\$38,163	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.12	0.24
Professional, Scientific and Technical	1.00	0.63	\$96,266	\$153,063	5%	10%	25%	0.03	0.06	0.16
Management and Administrative Services	1.10	0.69	\$63,808	\$101,455	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.07
Educational Services	0.70	0.44	\$33,485	\$53,241	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.15	0.09
Health Care and Social Assistance	5.90	3.71	\$73,390	\$116,691	10%	70%	20%	0.37	2.60	0.74
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.10	0.69	\$27,198	\$43,244	8%	32%	25%	0.06	0.22	0.17
Other Services	5.20	3.27	\$38,877	\$61,814	35%	55%	10%	1.14	1.80	0.33
Government	0.40	0.25	\$105,425	\$167,626	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.13	0.08
Total/Average	25.50	16.04	\$58,387	\$92,836				2.59	6.98	2.76

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 36
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 9B
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.20	0.13	\$115,121	\$183,042	10%	5%	65%	0.01	0.01	0.08
Wholesale Trade	0.80	0.50	\$96,553	\$153,519	20%	45%	15%	0.10	0.23	0.08
Retail Trade	3.00	1.89	\$46,866	\$74,516	25%	40%	15%	0.47	0.75	0.28
Transportation	0.30	0.19	\$78,198	\$124,335	20%	45%	15%	0.04	0.08	0.03
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$0	\$0	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.50	0.31	\$117,669	\$187,094	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.16	0.09
Finance and Insurance	1.00	0.63	\$71,657	\$113,934	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.06	0.13
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.30	0.82	\$23,828	\$37,886	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.08	0.16
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.70	0.44	\$93,412	\$148,525	5%	10%	25%	0.02	0.04	0.11
Management and Administrative Services	0.80	0.50	\$59,594	\$94,755	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.05
Educational Services	0.50	0.31	\$31,842	\$50,629	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.11	0.06
Health Care and Social Assistance	4.00	2.52	\$73,529	\$116,911	10%	70%	20%	0.25	1.76	0.50
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.80	0.50	\$25,402	\$40,389	8%	32%	25%	0.04	0.16	0.13
Other Services	3.50	2.20	\$39,233	\$62,381	35%	55%	10%	0.77	1.21	0.22
Government	0.30	0.19	\$95,480	\$151,812	10%	50%	30%	0.02	0.09	0.06
Total/Average	17.50	11.01	\$58,387	\$92,836				1.76	4.75	1.90

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 37
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 10A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.30	0.19	\$98,756	\$157,022	10%	5%	65%	0.02	0.01	0.12
Wholesale Trade	1.00	0.63	\$98,744	\$157,002	20%	45%	15%	0.13	0.28	0.09
Retail Trade	3.90	2.45	\$46,953	\$74,655	25%	40%	15%	0.61	0.98	0.37
Transportation	0.40	0.25	\$64,278	\$102,202	20%	45%	15%	0.05	0.11	0.04
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$43,370	\$68,958	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.70	0.44	\$111,660	\$177,540	10%	50%	30%	0.04	0.22	0.13
Finance and Insurance	1.20	0.75	\$77,266	\$122,853	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.08	0.15
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.70	1.07	\$24,111	\$38,337	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.11	0.21
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.90	0.57	\$94,088	\$149,599	5%	10%	25%	0.03	0.06	0.14
Management and Administrative Services	1.00	0.63	\$62,780	\$99,821	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.06
Educational Services	0.60	0.38	\$34,465	\$54,799	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.13	0.08
Health Care and Social Assistance	5.20	3.27	\$72,072	\$114,595	10%	70%	20%	0.33	2.29	0.65
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.00	0.63	\$27,384	\$43,541	8%	32%	25%	0.05	0.20	0.16
Other Services	4.60	2.89	\$38,630	\$61,422	35%	55%	10%	1.01	1.59	0.29
Government	0.40	0.25	\$104,070	\$165,472	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.13	0.08
Total/Average	22.60	14.21	\$58,387	\$92,836				2.30	6.18	2.45

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 38
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 10B
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.20	0.13	\$92,870	\$147,663	10%	5%	65%	0.01	0.01	0.08
Wholesale Trade	0.70	0.44	\$98,744	\$157,002	20%	45%	15%	0.09	0.20	0.07
Retail Trade	2.60	1.64	\$46,953	\$74,655	25%	40%	15%	0.41	0.65	0.25
Transportation	0.30	0.19	\$64,278	\$102,202	20%	45%	15%	0.04	0.08	0.03
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$43,370	\$68,958	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.40	0.25	\$111,660	\$177,540	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.13	0.08
Finance and Insurance	0.80	0.50	\$77,266	\$122,853	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.05	0.10
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.10	0.69	\$24,111	\$38,337	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.07	0.14
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.60	0.38	\$94,088	\$149,599	5%	10%	25%	0.02	0.04	0.09
Management and Administrative Services	0.70	0.44	\$62,780	\$99,821	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.04
Educational Services	0.40	0.25	\$34,465	\$54,799	5%	35%	20%	0.01	0.09	0.05
Health Care and Social Assistance	3.50	2.20	\$72,072	\$114,595	10%	70%	20%	0.22	1.54	0.44
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.70	0.44	\$27,384	\$43,541	8%	32%	25%	0.04	0.14	0.11
Other Services	3.10	1.95	\$38,630	\$61,422	35%	55%	10%	0.68	1.07	0.19
Government	0.20	0.13	\$104,070	\$165,472	10%	50%	30%	0.01	0.06	0.04
Total/Average	15.10	9.50	\$58,387	\$92,836				1.54	4.13	1.63

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 39
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 11A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Average Payroll Per Employee (3)	Estimated Household Income (4)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.50	0.31	\$92,870	\$147,663	10%	5%	65%	0.03	0.02	0.20
Wholesale Trade	1.40	0.88	\$98,744	\$157,002	20%	45%	15%	0.18	0.40	0.13
Retail Trade	5.60	3.52	\$46,953	\$74,655	25%	40%	15%	0.88	1.41	0.53
Transportation	0.60	0.38	\$64,278	\$102,202	20%	45%	15%	0.08	0.17	0.06
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$43,370	\$68,958	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	1.00	0.63	\$111,660	\$177,540	10%	50%	30%	0.06	0.31	0.19
Finance and Insurance	1.80	1.13	\$77,266	\$122,853	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.11	0.23
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	2.40	1.51	\$24,111	\$38,337	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.15	0.30
Professional, Scientific and Technical	1.30	0.82	\$94,088	\$149,599	5%	10%	25%	0.04	0.08	0.20
Management and Administrative Services	1.50	0.94	\$62,780	\$99,821	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.09
Educational Services	0.90	0.57	\$34,465	\$54,799	5%	35%	20%	0.03	0.20	0.11
Health Care and Social Assistance	7.60	4.78	\$72,072	\$114,595	10%	70%	20%	0.48	3.35	0.96
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.80	0.50	\$27,384	\$43,541	8%	32%	25%	0.04	0.16	0.13
Other Services	6.60	4.15	\$38,630	\$61,422	35%	55%	10%	1.45	2.28	0.42
Government	0.50	0.31	\$104,070	\$165,472	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.16	0.09
Total/Average	32.00	20.13	\$58,387	\$92,836				3.27	8.78	3.44

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 40
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Prototype 12A
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development	No. of New Households	Average Payroll Per Employee	Estimated Household Income	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)(6)	(5)(6)	(5)(6)			
Manufacturing	0.30	0.19	\$92,870	\$147,663	10%	5%	65%	0.02	0.01	0.12
Wholesale Trade	1.00	0.63	\$98,744	\$157,002	20%	45%	15%	0.13	0.28	0.09
Retail Trade	3.90	2.45	\$46,953	\$74,655	25%	40%	15%	0.61	0.98	0.37
Transportation	0.40	0.25	\$64,278	\$102,202	20%	45%	15%	0.05	0.11	0.04
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	\$43,370	\$68,958	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.70	0.44	\$111,660	\$177,540	10%	50%	30%	0.04	0.22	0.13
Finance and Insurance	1.20	0.75	\$77,266	\$122,853	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.08	0.15
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.70	1.07	\$24,111	\$38,337	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.11	0.21
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.90	0.57	\$94,088	\$149,599	5%	10%	25%	0.03	0.06	0.14
Management and Administrative Services	1.00	0.63	\$62,780	\$99,821	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.06
Educational Services	0.60	0.38	\$34,465	\$54,799	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.13	0.08
Health Care and Social Assistance	5.20	3.27	\$72,072	\$114,595	10%	70%	20%	0.33	2.29	0.65
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.00	0.63	\$27,384	\$43,541	8%	32%	25%	0.05	0.20	0.16
Other Services	4.60	2.89	\$38,630	\$61,422	35%	55%	10%	1.01	1.59	0.29
Government	0.40	0.25	\$104,070	\$165,472	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.13	0.08
Total/Average	22.60	14.21	\$58,387	\$92,836				2.30	6.18	2.45

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 41
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Single-Family Infill
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.01	0.01	10%	5%	65%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wholesale Trade	0.01	0.01	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Retail Trade	0.08	0.05	25%	40%	15%	0.01	0.02	0.01
Transportation	0.01	0.01	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.01	0.01	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Finance and Insurance	0.02	0.01	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.03	0.02	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.02	0.01	5%	10%	25%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Management and Administrative Services	0.02	0.01	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Educational Services	0.01	0.01	5%	35%	20%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.10	0.06	10%	70%	20%	0.01	0.04	0.01
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.02	0.01	8%	32%	25%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Services	0.09	0.06	35%	55%	10%	0.02	0.03	0.01
Government	0.01	0.01	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total/Average	0.43	0.27				0.04	0.12	0.05

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 42
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Owner Townhomes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.03	0.02	10%	5%	65%	0.00	0.00	0.01
Wholesale Trade	0.08	0.05	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.02	0.01
Retail Trade	0.39	0.25	25%	40%	15%	0.06	0.10	0.04
Transportation	0.04	0.03	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.01	0.00
Warehousing and Storage	0.00	0.00	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.06	0.04	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.02	0.01
Finance and Insurance	0.10	0.06	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.16	0.10	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.02
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.08	0.05	5%	10%	25%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Management and Administrative Services	0.10	0.06	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.01
Educational Services	0.06	0.04	5%	35%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.52	0.33	10%	70%	20%	0.03	0.23	0.07
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.09	0.06	8%	32%	25%	0.00	0.02	0.01
Other Services	0.45	0.28	35%	55%	10%	0.10	0.16	0.03
Government	0.03	0.02	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Total/Average	2.16	1.36				0.22	0.60	0.23

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 43
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Owner Flats
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.04	0.03	10%	5%	65%	0.00	0.00	0.02
Wholesale Trade	0.09	0.06	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.03	0.01
Retail Trade	0.43	0.27	25%	40%	15%	0.07	0.11	0.04
Transportation	0.04	0.03	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.01	0.00
Warehousing and Storage	0.01	0.01	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.07	0.04	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.02	0.01
Finance and Insurance	0.12	0.08	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.02
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.18	0.11	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.02
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.09	0.06	5%	10%	25%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Management and Administrative Services	0.11	0.07	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.01
Educational Services	0.06	0.04	5%	35%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.59	0.37	10%	70%	20%	0.04	0.26	0.07
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.10	0.06	8%	32%	25%	0.01	0.02	0.02
Other Services	0.51	0.32	35%	55%	10%	0.11	0.18	0.03
Government	0.04	0.03	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.01	0.01
Total/Average	2.44	1.53				0.25	0.68	0.26

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 44
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Rental Flats
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.05	0.03	10%	5%	65%	0.00	0.00	0.02
Wholesale Trade	0.13	0.08	20%	45%	15%	0.02	0.04	0.01
Retail Trade	0.59	0.37	25%	40%	15%	0.09	0.15	0.06
Transportation	0.06	0.04	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.02	0.01
Warehousing and Storage	0.01	0.01	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Information and Communication	0.09	0.06	10%	50%	30%	0.01	0.03	0.02
Finance and Insurance	0.16	0.10	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.01	0.02
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.25	0.16	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.02	0.03
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.13	0.08	5%	10%	25%	0.00	0.01	0.02
Management and Administrative Services	0.15	0.09	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.01
Educational Services	0.09	0.06	5%	35%	20%	0.00	0.02	0.01
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.80	0.50	10%	70%	20%	0.05	0.35	0.10
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.13	0.08	8%	32%	25%	0.01	0.03	0.02
Other Services	0.69	0.43	35%	55%	10%	0.15	0.24	0.04
Government	0.05	0.03	10%	50%	30%	0.00	0.02	0.01
Total/Average	3.33	2.09				0.34	0.92	0.36

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 45
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Mixed-Use / Grocery Store
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.74	0.47	10%	5%	65%	0.05	0.02	0.30
Wholesale Trade	1.55	0.97	20%	45%	15%	0.19	0.44	0.15
Retail Trade	8.52	5.36	25%	40%	15%	1.34	2.14	0.80
Transportation	0.73	0.46	20%	45%	15%	0.09	0.21	0.07
Warehousing and Storage	0.08	0.05	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.02	0.01
Information and Communication	1.24	0.78	10%	50%	30%	0.08	0.39	0.23
Finance and Insurance	2.17	1.36	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.14	0.27
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	4.05	2.55	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.25	0.51
Professional, Scientific and Technical	1.78	1.12	5%	10%	25%	0.06	0.11	0.28
Management and Administrative Services	2.04	1.28	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.13
Educational Services	1.19	0.75	5%	35%	20%	0.04	0.26	0.15
Health Care and Social Assistance	11.42	7.18	10%	70%	20%	0.72	5.03	1.44
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.74	1.09	8%	32%	25%	0.09	0.35	0.27
Other Services	8.97	5.64	35%	55%	10%	1.97	3.10	0.56
Government	0.70	0.44	10%	50%	30%	0.04	0.22	0.13
Total/Average	46.18	29.04				4.63	12.67	5.01

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 46
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Mixed-Use / Restaurant
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.31	0.19	10%	5%	65%	0.02	0.01	0.13
Wholesale Trade	0.64	0.40	20%	45%	15%	0.08	0.18	0.06
Retail Trade	3.54	2.23	25%	40%	15%	0.56	0.89	0.33
Transportation	0.31	0.19	20%	45%	15%	0.04	0.09	0.03
Warehousing and Storage	0.03	0.02	20%	45%	15%	0.00	0.01	0.00
Information and Communication	0.52	0.33	10%	50%	30%	0.03	0.16	0.10
Finance and Insurance	0.90	0.57	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.06	0.11
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	1.69	1.06	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.11	0.21
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.74	0.47	5%	10%	25%	0.02	0.05	0.12
Management and Administrative Services	0.85	0.53	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.05
Educational Services	0.50	0.31	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.11	0.06
Health Care and Social Assistance	4.75	2.99	10%	70%	20%	0.30	2.09	0.60
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.72	0.45	8%	32%	25%	0.04	0.14	0.11
Other Services	3.73	2.35	35%	55%	10%	0.82	1.29	0.23
Government	0.29	0.18	10%	50%	30%	0.02	0.09	0.05
Total/Average	19.21	12.08				1.93	5.27	2.08

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 47
Estimated Qualifying Very Low and Low Income Households
Mixed-Use / Entertainment
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Percent of HH Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI (5)(6)	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Below 30% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 31% and 60% AMI	Estimated Households Earning Incomes Between 61% and 80% AMI
Manufacturing	0.37	0.23	10%	5%	65%	0.02	0.01	0.15
Wholesale Trade	0.79	0.50	20%	45%	15%	0.10	0.22	0.07
Retail Trade	4.33	2.72	25%	40%	15%	0.68	1.09	0.41
Transportation	0.37	0.23	20%	45%	15%	0.05	0.10	0.03
Warehousing and Storage	0.04	0.03	20%	45%	15%	0.01	0.01	0.00
Information and Communication	0.63	0.40	10%	50%	30%	0.04	0.20	0.12
Finance and Insurance	1.10	0.69	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.07	0.14
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	2.06	1.30	0%	10%	20%	0.00	0.13	0.26
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.91	0.57	5%	10%	25%	0.03	0.06	0.14
Management and Administrative Services	1.04	0.65	0%	0%	10%	0.00	0.00	0.07
Educational Services	0.61	0.38	5%	35%	20%	0.02	0.13	0.08
Health Care and Social Assistance	5.81	3.65	10%	70%	20%	0.37	2.56	0.73
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.89	0.56	8%	32%	25%	0.04	0.18	0.14
Other Services	4.56	2.87	35%	55%	10%	1.00	1.58	0.29
Government	0.36	0.23	10%	50%	30%	0.02	0.11	0.07
Total/Average	23.50	14.78				2.36	6.44	2.55

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(3) From IMPLAN input/output model.

(4) Average payroll per employee multiplied by 1.59 employees per worker household.

(5) Based on 2.5 persons per household and income limits of \$22,500 at 30% AMI, \$44,950 at 60% AMI and \$59,950 at 80% AMI.

(6) Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013; DRA.

Table 48
National Office and Hotel Worker Distribution by Occupation
2015

Industry/Occupation Category	Office Workers	Hotel Workers
Management	9%	5%
Business and Financial Operations	10%	0%
Computer and Mathematical	3%	0%
Architecture and Engineering	5%	0%
Life, Physical and Social Science	0%	0%
Community and Social Services	0%	0%
Legal	4%	0%
Education, Training, and Library	0%	0%
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	0%	0%
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	9%	0%
Healthcare Support	4%	0%
Protective Service	0%	0%
Food Preparation and Serving Related	0%	27%
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	0%	29%
Personal Care and Service	0%	7%
Sales and Related	7%	3%
Office and Administrative Support	37%	17%
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	0%	0%
Construction and Extraction	0%	0%
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	4%	4%
Production	0%	0%
Transportation and Material Moving	0%	0%
All Other Office Related Occupations	8%	8%
Industry Total	100%	100%

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.

Table 49
Estimated Distribution of Employees by Occupation
Additional Non-Residential Land Uses
2015

Industry/Occupation Category	Grocery Store	Restaurant	Entertainment	Retail	R&D Laboratory	Medical Office
Management	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%	8.9%	8.9%
Business and Financial Operations	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	9.7%
Computer and Mathematical	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%
Architecture and Engineering	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	4.9%
Life, Physical and Social Science	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Community and Social Services	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Legal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%
Education, Training, and Library	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.9%	8.9%
Healthcare Support	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	4.4%
Protective Service	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Food Preparation and Serving Related	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal Care and Service	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Sales and Related	29.1%	29.1%	29.1%	29.1%	6.6%	6.6%
Office and Administrative Support	8.9%	8.9%	8.9%	8.9%	37.4%	37.4%
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Construction and Extraction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	3.8%	3.8%
Production	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Transportation and Material Moving	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
All Other Office Related Occupations	4.4%	4.4%	4.4%	4.4%	8.4%	8.4%
Industry Total	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%

Notes: Based on 2012 national industry occupation distributions from the BLS for office and retail workers. The retail distribution is used for grocery store, restaurant and entertainment uses. The office distribution is used for R&D laboratory and medical office uses.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates; DRA.

Table 50
Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households
Non-Residential Nexus Fee Analysis
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study
2015

Steps	Factor	Office Prototype 3A			Office Prototype 6A			Hotel Prototype		
		%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units
1. Grost Square Feet			249,480			238,400			117,600	
2. Employment Density Factor			250	GSF/Emp.		250	GSF/Emp.		1.00	Emp./Rm. 500 GSF/Room
Number of Employees			998	Emp.		954	Emp.		235	Emp.
3. Employees Living in Seattle (1)	50.6%		505	Emp.		483	Emp.		119	Emp.
4. Adjustment for Number of Employees Per Household	1.59 Emp/HH		318	HH		304	HH		75	HH
5. Household Occupational Distribution (2)										
Management		9%	28.3	HH	9%	27.1	HH	5%	3.7	HH
Business and Financial Operations		10%	31.0	HH	10%	29.6	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Computer and Mathematical		3%	10.8	HH	3%	10.3	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Architecture and Engineering		5%	15.6	HH	5%	14.9	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Life, Physical and Social Science		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Community and Social Services		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Legal		4%	11.5	HH	4%	11.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Education, Training, and Library		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical		9%	28.2	HH	9%	26.9	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Healthcare Support		4%	14.1	HH	4%	13.4	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Protective Service		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Food Preparation and Serving-Related		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	27%	20.3	HH
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	29%	21.7	HH
Personal Care and Service		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	7%	5.5	HH
Sales and Related		7%	20.8	HH	7%	19.9	HH	3%	2.3	HH
Office and Administrative Support		37%	118.7	HH	37%	113.5	HH	17%	12.6	HH
Farming, Fishing and Forestry		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Construction and Extraction		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Installation, Maintenance and Repair		4%	12.1	HH	4%	11.5	HH	4%	2.9	HH
Production		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Transportation and Material Moving		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
All Other Occupations		8%	26.5	HH	8%	25.4	HH	8%	5.9	HH
Total		100%	317.6		100%	303.5		100%	74.9	

Legend: HH = households; SF = square feet; Emp = employees.

(1) Source: American Community Survey, five-year estimates, 2006-2010.

(2) From Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.

Source: American Community Survey; Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA.

Table 51
Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households
Non-Residential Uses in Mixed-Use Prototypes
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Steps	Factor	Grocery Store			Restaurant			Entertainment		
		%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units
1. Gross Square Feet			50,000			3,000			15,000	
2. Employment Density Factor			500	GSF/Emp.		500	GSF/Emp.		750	GSF/Emp.
Number of Employees			100	Emp.		6	Emp.		20	Emp.
3. Employees Living in Seattle (1)	50.6%		51	Emp.		3	Emp.		10	Emp.
4. Adjustment for Number of Employees Per Household	1.59 Emp/HH		32	HH		2	HH		6	HH
5. Adjustment for Overlap with Residential Nexus Fee: Retail Uses (2)	70%		10	HH		1	HH		2	HH
6. Household Occupational Distribution (3)										
Management		2%	0.2	HH	2%	0.0	HH	2%	0.0	HH
Business and Financial Operations		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Computer and Mathematical		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Architecture and Engineering		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Life, Physical and Social Science		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Community and Social Services		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Legal		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Education, Training, and Library		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Healthcare Support		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Protective Service		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Food Preparation and Serving-Related		40%	3.8	HH	40%	0.2	HH	40%	0.8	HH
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Personal Care and Service		3%	0.2	HH	3%	0.0	HH	3%	0.0	HH
Sales and Related		29%	2.8	HH	29%	0.2	HH	29%	0.6	HH
Office and Administrative Support		9%	0.8	HH	9%	0.1	HH	9%	0.2	HH
Farming, Fishing and Forestry		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Construction and Extraction		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Installation, Maintenance and Repair		4%	0.4	HH	4%	0.0	HH	4%	0.1	HH
Production		3%	0.3	HH	3%	0.0	HH	3%	0.1	HH
Transportation and Material Moving		6%	0.6	HH	6%	0.0	HH	6%	0.1	HH
All Other Occupations		4%	0.4	HH	4%	0.0	HH	4%	0.1	HH
Total		100%	9.5		100%	0.5		100%	2.0	

Legend: HH = households; SF = square feet; Emp = employees.

(1) Source: American Community Survey, five-year estimates, 2006-2010.

(2) Adjustment to eliminate potential overlap with residential nexus fee in retail and medical office uses. Assumes 70% overlap, with 30% of demand coming from sources other than local residents.

(3) From Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.

Source: American Community Survey; Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA.

Table 52
Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households
Additional Non-Residential Uses
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Steps	Factor	Stand-Alone Retail			R&D Laboratory			Medical Office		
		%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units
1. Gross Square Feet			25,000			100,000			87,000	
2. Employment Density Factor			500 GSF/Emp.			350 GSF/Emp.			350 GSF/Emp.	
Number of Employees			50	Emp.		286	Emp.		249	Emp.
3. Employees Living in Seattle (1)	50.6%		25	Emp.		145	Emp.		126	Emp.
4. Adjustment for Number of Employees Per Household	1.59 Emp/HH		16	HH		91	HH		79	HH
5. Adjustment for Overlap with Residential Nexus Fee: Retail Uses (2)	70%		5	HH		91	HH		24	HH
6. Household Occupational Distribution (3)										
Management		2%	0.1	HH	9%	8.1	HH	9%	2.1	HH
Business and Financial Operations		0%	0.0	HH	10%	8.8	HH	10%	2.3	HH
Computer and Mathematical		0%	0.0	HH	3%	3.1	HH	3%	0.8	HH
Architecture and Engineering		0%	0.0	HH	5%	4.5	HH	5%	1.2	HH
Life, Physical and Social Science		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Community and Social Services		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Legal		0%	0.0	HH	4%	3.3	HH	4%	0.9	HH
Education, Training, and Library		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical		0%	0.0	HH	9%	8.1	HH	9%	2.1	HH
Healthcare Support		0%	0.0	HH	4%	4.0	HH	4%	1.0	HH
Protective Service		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Food Preparation and Serving-Related		40%	1.9	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Personal Care and Service		3%	0.1	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Sales and Related		29%	1.4	HH	7%	6.0	HH	7%	1.6	HH
Office and Administrative Support		9%	0.4	HH	37%	34.0	HH	37%	8.9	HH
Farming, Fishing and Forestry		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Construction and Extraction		0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Installation, Maintenance and Repair		4%	0.2	HH	4%	3.5	HH	4%	0.9	HH
Production		3%	0.1	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
Transportation and Material Moving		6%	0.3	HH	0%	0.0	HH	0%	0.0	HH
All Other Occupations		4%	0.2	HH	8%	7.6	HH	8%	2.0	HH
Total		100%	4.7		100%	91.0		100%	23.8	

Legend: HH = households; SF = square feet; Emp = employees.

(1) Source: American Community Survey, five-year estimates, 2006-2010.

(2) Adjustment to eliminate potential overlap with residential nexus fee in retail and medical office uses. Assumes 70% overlap, with 30% of demand coming from sources other than local residents.

(3) From Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.
Source: American Community Survey; Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA.

Table 53
Estimated Households Earning Up to 30% AMI
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study

2014

Steps	% of	Office		Office		Hotel	
	Employees	Prototype 3A		Prototype 3A		Prototype	
	Earning Up to 30% AMI	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
6. Households Earning Up to 30% AMI							
Management	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Business and Financial Operations	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Computer and Mathematical	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Architecture and Engineering	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Life, Physical and Social Science	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Community and Social Services	7%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Legal	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Education, Training, and Library	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	8%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Support	10%	0%	0.1	0%	0.1	0%	0.0
Protective Service	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Food Preparation and Serving Related	50%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	14%	5.1
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	7%	1.4
Personal Care and Service	35%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	3%	0.7
Sales and Related	25%	2%	1.3	2%	1.2	1%	0.1
Office and Administrative Support	10%	4%	1.2	4%	1.1	2%	0.1
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	35%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Construction and Extraction	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	15%	1%	0.3	1%	0.3	1%	0.1
Production	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Transportation and Material Moving	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Total		6%	2.9	6%	2.7	26%	7.5

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning less than 30% AMI.

(2) Percent of occupation earning less than 30% AMI by land use multiplied by total employee households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 54
Estimated Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study

2014

Steps	% of Employees Earning 31% to 60% AMI	Office Prototype 3A		Office Prototype 6A		Hotel Prototype	
		Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
6. Households Earning Between 31% AMI and 60% AMI							
Management	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Business and Financial Operations	10%	1%	0.3	1%	0.3	0%	0.0
Computer and Mathematical	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Architecture and Engineering	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Life, Physical and Social Science	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Community and Social Services	43%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Legal	10%	0%	0.1	0%	0.1	0%	0.0
Education, Training, and Library	35%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	32%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	15%	1%	0.6	1%	0.6	0%	0.0
Healthcare Support	70%	3%	6.9	3%	6.6	0%	0.0
Protective Service	40%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Food Preparation and Serving Related	50%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	14%	5.1
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	60%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	17%	7.8
Personal Care and Service	55%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	4%	1.7
Sales and Related	40%	3%	3.3	3%	3.2	1%	0.4
Office and Administrative Support	50%	19%	29.7	19%	28.4	8%	3.2
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	40%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Construction and Extraction	30%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	20%	1%	0.5	1%	0.5	1%	0.1
Production	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Transportation and Material Moving	45%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Total		28%	41.4	28%	39.7	45%	18.3

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 31% and 60% AMI.

(2) Percent of occupation earning between 31% and 60% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 55
Estimated Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study

2014

Steps	% of Employees Earning 61 % to 80% AMI	Office Prototype 3A		Office Prototype 6A		Hotel Prototype	
		Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
6. Households Earning Between 61% AMI and 80% AMI							
Management	10%	1%	0.3	1%	0.3	0%	0.0
Business and Financial Operations	20%	2%	1.2	2%	1.2	0%	0.0
Computer and Mathematical	10%	0%	0.1	0%	0.1	0%	0.0
Architecture and Engineering	15%	1%	0.4	1%	0.3	0%	0.0
Life, Physical and Social Science	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Community and Social Services	30%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Legal	15%	1%	0.3	1%	0.2	0%	0.0
Education, Training, and Library	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	15%	1%	0.6	1%	0.6	0%	0.0
Healthcare Support	20%	1%	0.6	1%	0.5	0%	0.0
Protective Service	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Food Preparation and Serving Related	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	4%	0.5
Personal Care and Service	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	0.1
Sales and Related	15%	1%	0.5	1%	0.4	0%	0.1
Office and Administrative Support	30%	11%	10.7	11%	10.2	5%	1.1
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Construction and Extraction	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	25%	1%	0.8	1%	0.7	1%	0.2
Production	65%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Transportation and Material Moving	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Total		20%	15.5	20%	14.5	12%	2.0

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 61% and 80% AMI.

(2) Percent of occupation earning between 61% and 80% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 56
Estimated Households Earning Up to 30% AMI
Additional Non-Residential Land Uses
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study

2015

	% of Employees Earning Up to 30% AMI	Grocery Store		Restaurant		Entertainment		Stand-Alone Retail		R&D Laboratory		Medical Office	
Steps		Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
6. Households Earning Up to 30% AMI													
Management	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Business and Financial Operations	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Computer and Mathematical	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Architecture and Engineering	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Life, Physical and Social Science	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Community and Social Services	7%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Legal	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Education, Training, and Library	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	8%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Support	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.4	0%	0.1
Protective Service	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	50%	20%	1.9	20%	0.1	20%	0.4	20%	1.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Personal Care and Service	35%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Sales and Related	25%	7%	0.7	7%	0.1	7%	0.2	7%	0.4	2%	1.5	2%	0.4
Office and Administrative Support	10%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	4%	3.4	4%	0.9
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	35%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Construction and Extraction	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	15%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.5	1%	0.1
Production	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Transportation and Material Moving	20%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.1	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Total		31%	3.0	31%	0.2	31%	0.6	31%	1.5	6%	5.8	6%	1.5

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning less than 30% AMI.

(2) Percent of occupation earning less than 30% AMI by land use multiplied by total employee households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 57
Estimated Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI
Additional Non-Residential Land Uses
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Steps	% of Employees Earning 31% to 60% AMI	Grocery Store		Restaurant		Entertainment		Stand-Alone Retail		R&D Laboratory		Medical Office	
		Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
6. Households Earning Between 31% AMI and 60% AMI													
Management	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Business and Financial Operations	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	0.9	1%	0.2
Computer and Mathematical	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Architecture and Engineering	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Life, Physical and Social Science	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Community and Social Services	43%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Legal	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.3	0%	0.1
Education, Training, and Library	35%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	32%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	1.2	1%	0.3
Healthcare Support	70%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	3%	2.8	3%	0.7
Protective Service	40%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	50%	20%	1.9	20%	0.1	20%	0.4	20%	1.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	60%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Personal Care and Service	55%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.1	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Sales and Related	40%	12%	1.1	12%	0.1	12%	0.2	12%	0.6	3%	2.4	3%	0.6
Office and Administrative Support	50%	4%	0.4	4%	0.1	4%	0.1	4%	0.2	19%	17.0	19%	4.5
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	40%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Construction and Extraction	30%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	20%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.7	1%	0.2
Production	5%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Transportation and Material Moving	45%	3%	0.3	3%	0.0	3%	0.0	3%	0.1	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Total		41%	3.9	41%	0.2	41%	0.8	41%	1.9	28%	25.3	28%	6.6

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 31% and 60% AMI.

(2) Percent of occupation earning between 31% and 60% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 58
Estimated Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI
Additional Non-Residential Land Uses
Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus and Economic Impact Study
2015

Steps	% of Employees Earning 61% to 80% AMI												
		Grocery Store		Restaurant		Entertainment		Stand-Alone Retail		R&D Laboratory		Medical Office	
		Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
6. Households Earning Between 61% AMI and 80% AMI													
Management	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	0.8	1%	0.2
Business and Financial Operations	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	2%	1.8	2%	0.5
Computer and Mathematical	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.3	0%	0.1
Architecture and Engineering	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	0.7	1%	0.2
Life, Physical and Social Science	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Community and Social Services	30%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Legal	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	0.5	1%	0.1
Education, Training, and Library	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	1.2	1%	0.3
Healthcare Support	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	1%	0.8	1%	0.2
Protective Service	25%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	15%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Personal Care and Service	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Sales and Related	15%	4%	0.4	4%	0.0	4%	0.1	4%	0.2	1%	0.9	1%	0.2
Office and Administrative Support	30%	3%	0.2	3%	0.0	3%	0.1	3%	0.1	11%	10.2	11%	2.7
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	10%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Construction and Extraction	20%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	25%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.1	1%	0.9	1%	0.2
Production	65%	2%	0.2	2%	0.0	2%	0.1	2%	0.1	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Transportation and Material Moving	15%	1%	0.1	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	1%	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	0.0
Total		11%	1.1	11%	0.1	11%	0.3	11%	0.5	20%	18.0	20%	4.7

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 61% and 80% AMI.

(2) Percent of occupation earning between 61% and 80% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA