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INTRODUCTION
I. INTRODUCTION

In commissioning the Urban League feasibility study, Southeastern Economic Development Corporation’s (SEDC’s) goals were twofold:

- To identify a feasible option to satisfy the Urban League’s facility needs; and
- To accelerate the revitalization of the Market Street corridor.

In order to accomplish these goals, the feasibility study was necessarily multi-disciplinary. The consultant team was led by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA), real estate economists. KMA was responsible for the market and financial evaluations. KMA prepared a financial assessment for the Market Street Corridor Urban Design Study in 1990-1991. Architects/planners Westberg + White, Inc. was responsible for all planning and design analyses. Hubbard Communications, public relations specialists, conducted the review of the Urban League’s operations and led the community outreach effort. In addition, KMA was assisted in the financial feasibility analysis by Causby & Company.

The consultant team work program consisted of the following principal tasks:

1. Field inspections of the Urban League’s facilities and potential alternative sites and buildings.

2. An assessment of the Urban League’s operations and space needs. This portion of the report involved extensive interviews and surveys with Urban League staff.

3. An analysis of the potential site and facility options available to the Urban League and preparation of preliminary concepts for three development schemes.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Goals and Requirements of the Urban League

- The San Diego Urban League is a social service organization established in San Diego in 1953 to assist African-Americans and other people of color in achieving social and economic equality through advocacy, bridge building, program services, and research.

- The San Diego Urban League’s defining mission is to provide economic development, education, and family services to persons of color in San Diego County. The organization’s 57 employees provide employment training, youth and family counseling, and crisis intervention.

- The Urban League funding is derived from Federal, State, and County grants; the Private Industry Council; and charitable contributions and fund-raising.

- The Urban League has been located on Market Street since 1968. The facilities consist of five buildings in poor to fair condition, totaling 12,765 square feet, on two sides of the street.

- The Urban League has identified an intensive program to expand its services in the next few years. This expansion will require new, and larger, facilities.

B. Economic Impacts of the Urban League

- Economic impacts of the Urban League on the Market Street corridor include delivery of services to community residents and enhanced image and security resulting from the presence of a major anchor on Market Street.

- Currently, the Market Street corridor captures only nominal spending from the Urban League due to the limited retail and service establishments in the corridor.
(5) Review of market conditions for potential private uses on the Urban League site.

(6) Financial evaluation of the alternative development schemes and an implementation strategy for the preferred scheme.

(7) Preparation of a final development concept and elevation for the preferred scheme.

(8) Ongoing meetings with SEDC, the Urban League, and community groups to explain the objectives and findings of the study as well as to receive input and feedback.

Following this Introduction, Section II summarizes the consultant team’s principal findings and recommendations. The balance of the report has been organized along the lines of the three disciplines involved. Section III contains the social analysis undertaken by Hubbard Communications. Section IV presents the planning analysis and development concepts prepared by Westberg + White. In Section V, KMA presents its economic analysis, including the economic impact assessment, market overview, and financial feasibility analysis. Finally, Section VI offers a series of appendices with supporting technical data for all three analyses.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Urban League’s presence on Market Street offers the possibility of a joint development of its property in accordance with SEDC’s revitalization goals for the area.

C. Market Support for Private Uses

Southeastern San Diego has been historically under-served by retail facilities. The Lucky supermarket currently under construction in the Southcrest area will be the first major chain grocery store in the community.

Potential support for retail space on Market Street is enhanced by the corridor’s strong traffic and freeway access; three successful business parks; and the Urban League facility. However, the local trade area is constrained by freeways, cemeteries, and the trolley.

Analysis of retail expenditures potential of Mount Hope households and local employees indicates the potential to capture demand for about 15,000 to 20,000 SF of convenience retail space. Appropriate businesses would provide food and drug, eating establishments, general merchandise, and basic services.

Southeastern San Diego is not an established office market. The options available to office tenants range from older storefront-style buildings to adaptations of newer retail or industrial buildings.

The largest, and highest-end, private office building in the market area is Gateway Medical Center in the Gateway Center business park. Despite historical financial and legal difficulties, this building has recently attracted several new tenants.

KMA estimates that a new office building on Market Street could capture demand for 5,000 to 10,000 SF of office space (excluding the Urban League’s requirements). This space would most likely consist of small professional firms, including non-profits and neighborhood-serving businesses.
D. Analysis of Development Schemes

- The range of potential facility options initially identified for the Urban League included: owned vs. leased space; on- vs. off-site locations; and rehabilitation vs. new development.

- Urban League officials expressed their strong preference to remain in the Mount Hope community, to build a new facility, and to own their facility. Based on the Urban League’s strong desire to remain on Market Street, the study considered two alternatives on the Urban League’s existing property and another Mount Hope alternative, the rehabilitation of the California Curl Building.

- Schemes A and B both assume that the Urban League’s existing property would be assembled with adjoining parcels and developed with new office/retail buildings. The schemes differ only in intensity: Scheme A assumes a parking deck on the south block to support a 32,000-SF office building; Scheme B assumes a 21,000-SF office building that relies only on surface parking.

- Both Schemes A and B propose a 20,000-SF mixed-use development on the north block, consisting of convenience retail space and upper-level office suites. The total (north/south) building area is therefore 52,000 SF in Scheme A and 41,000 SF in Scheme B.

- Scheme C assumes that the Urban League sells its existing properties for private development and acquires and rehabilitates the existing California Curl Building one block away. The proposed renovation scheme results in 29,700 SF of space, inclusive of new retail space on the street frontage.

- The least expensive scheme is Scheme C, the California Curl renovation, at $3.8 million. Both on-site alternatives are more costly: the high-density development would cost $7.3 million, and the lower-density project would cost $5.3 million.

- Scheme C also has the lowest financing gap, approximately $1.5 million, followed by Scheme B, at $2.0 million.
Scheme B can be phased (south block/north block), while this option does not exist for Scheme C. The lowest overall financing gap would be to commence with a first-phase, lower-density building on the south block of the existing Urban League property.

**E. Final Design Concept**

- SEDC staff, the Urban League, and the consultant team identified Scheme B as the preferred scheme. The 21,000-SF office building proposed for the south block was selected as the first phase. Detailed concept plans, elevations, and an axonometric (three-dimensional rendering) for the preferred scheme were prepared by Westberg + White. (Refer to Exhibits IV-1 through IV-4.)

- The Urban League’s near- to mid-term space needs have been identified as 21,000 SF. This need could be accommodated by the entire south block building or portions of the north and south block developments. Under either approach, about 20,000 SF would ultimately be available for occupancy by private tenants. KMA’s market forecast indicates sufficient existing local demand for this office and retail space.

- The principal funding source for the proposed development would be conventional debt secured by rent paid by both private tenants and the Urban League.

- These revenues would need to be supplemented by other capital funds raised by the League. KMA estimated approximate financing gaps of $1.1 million for the south side and $1.1 million for the north side, or a total of about $2.2 million for the preferred scheme.

- The financial feasibility and potential absorption for a mixed-use development on the Urban League property would be greatly enhanced if the League were successful in attracting a second major anchor use.

- Any implementation strategy for the Urban League facility should consider SEDC’s objectives for the Market Street corridor, including generating new tax increment and catalyzing new development and investment.
SOCIAL ANALYSIS
III. SOCIAL ANALYSIS

A. Background

Hubbard Communications prepared an evaluation of the Urban League’s current and anticipated facility and locational requirements with respect to their programs and constituency. This evaluation relied on interviews with Urban League staff; review of relevant documents, reports, brochures, and other materials; and surveys of department heads as well as local residents and businesses.

The report that follows is a result of review and analysis of information provided by the Urban League, SEDC, City and County agencies, and business and community studies and reports. Several meetings or interviews were conducted with representatives of SEDC, the Urban League, the Mount Hope/Helix Heights Residents Association, community and social service organizations, government agencies, community foundations, selected residents, business operators, and other stakeholders.

Following this introduction, Hubbard Communications outlines a summary of the key findings, challenges, and considerations resulting from the social analysis. The body of the report presents an overview of the Mount Hope community in which the Urban League is located (Section C) and a profile of the Urban League and its facility requirements (Section D).

Special appreciation is extended to SEDC and Urban League staff members, and other individuals and agencies who so willingly provided the information for this study.
B. Summary of Findings

(1) Principal Conclusions

(a) The Urban League has a very energetic and success-driven Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who is committed to stabilizing and repositioning the League as a major social service organization in San Diego.

(b) The Urban League has a hard-working staff that expresses strong support and commitment to the mission of the League and service to its clientele.

(c) Many of the Urban League employees are relatively new to their positions. Some in key positions are part-time or temporary employees.

(d) The present facility is a poor and inadequate working facility, lacking in space and accommodations.

(e) A majority of the staff cite compelling reasons for remaining in the Market Street corridor.

(f) The Urban League desires to be a part of the revitalization of the Market Street corridor.

(g) The Urban League’s service area is defined as San Diego County. Its primary client feeder community, once defined as Southeastern San Diego, is shifting, and a growing number of its clients come from the Mid-City area. Shifts in the client feeder communities may continue to occur due to social and economic trends.

(h) The major portion of the Urban League’s funding comes from government sources.

(i) A large portion of the Urban League’s funding comes from the United Way.
There is some duplication of the services that are offered or planned by the League; however, further study would be needed to determine if the duplicated services target the same populations.

Challenges

The Urban League is likely to face several challenges as it moves toward fulfillment of its immediate goals and long-range mission, including the following:

(a) Today's political climate makes government funding levels and policies uncertain for the Urban League and other non-profit social service agencies.

(b) Public and private funding for social service programs is in a state of flux and could affect the Urban League either positively or negatively. (The United Way plans to shift to a zero-based funding system in 1996. Although the League expects to do "as well or better," it is impossible to know if, or how, the League's funding will be impacted in the long run.)

(c) There is a dramatic increase in the number and types of organizations that now conduct fund-raising.

(d) Compared to other large cities, San Diego does not have a strong corporate or philanthropic base.

(e) The competition for public and private dollars is expected to become more challenging in the future.

(f) The "window of opportunity" to take advantage of Federal funding for social service and community development programs may be short.

(g) Attracting and keeping a high-quality staff is a major challenge in most organizations.
(h) The ability to acquire and incorporate modern technology in its operation is a challenge for most non-profit organizations.

(3) Considerations

This analysis suggests that tremendous benefits may be gained by the Urban League, SEDC, and the community in the consideration of the following:

(a) That a community partnership collaborative be established to bring together representatives of SEDC, the Urban League, other social service agencies, educational institutions, and business and residential stakeholders to meet regularly for the purpose of planning and coordinating unified strategies for serving the community and revitalizing the Market Street corridor.

(b) That SEDC continue its effort to attract to the Market Street corridor light commercial enterprises that will service residents and provide business-to-business support.

(c) That a business or marketplace "theme" be established to give focus to the Market Street corridor revitalization.

(d) That the convenient location of the Market Street corridor and its proximity to the San Diego Convention Center be used to attract tourists and locals to the revitalized area.

(e) That the Urban League engage in a long-range strategy planning session to chart its course for the next 10 to 20 years. The plan should also be reviewed periodically.

(f) That the Urban League determine ways to increase and diversify its revenue base. Consideration could be given to establishment of "for-profit" operations that can subsidize its non-profit programs.

(g) That the Urban League determine the program areas in which it can attract the resources and staff to offer the highest quality programs and services.
(h) That the Urban League build or find a suitable facility within the Market Street corridor that can accommodate a mix of small businesses, educational opportunities, and consumer services that will attract business and pedestrian activity to the corridor. This mixed-use development could help to diversify the League’s funding base. However, consideration must be given to the parking needs of these diverse uses.

(i) That Urban League staff members be given the opportunity to help plan the interior space to ensure a functional layout. An expert on "Smart Space" design also should be consulted.

(j) That special efforts be made to make the exterior and interior of any new Urban League facility client-friendly.

(k) That the new facility be equipped to accommodate new technology, with special attention to the job training facility.

(l) That the League consider establishing a community outreach and membership service to increase public awareness of its services and offer opportunities for the broader community to demonstrate ownership, support, and commitment in the League.
C. Community Setting

(1) City Profile

Based on a projected 1996 population of 1,213,000, the City of San Diego is the sixth largest city in the United States and the second largest city in the State of California. The City is a center for education, research, and tourism. City reports indicate that San Diego's economic base "has undergone a transformation based on international trade, high-tech manufacturing, professional services, and tourism, with a strong convention trade component." Further reports indicate "these areas have registered growth despite the recent recession, and together they should provide the basis for the City’s future economic growth."

(2) SEDC Redevelopment Goals

SEDC’s goal for the Mount Hope community is to improve the quality of life and bring to the area some of the same high-quality neighborhood amenities found in other neighborhoods. The vision is to transform the Market Street corridor into a thriving commercial/residential community with a business- and pedestrian-friendly atmosphere to live, work, learn, shop, dine, and entertain, both day and night. This vision is described in the Market Street Corridor Urban Design Study (1992).

(3) Mount Hope Community

Mount Hope is a community of San Diego, identified as Census Tract 34.02. The area is bounded by the Mount Hope Cemetery and three freeway systems: the Martin Luther King Jr. Freeway (State Highway 94), Interstate 805, and State Highway 15. The 1990 U.S. Census report describes the area’s physical condition as blighted, deteriorating, and lacking in public facilities.

Mount Hope is located within the Fourth Supervisorial District of San Diego County and the Fourth City Council District of the City of San Diego.

Further study and visual observations revealed an urban community with a mixture of new and longtime residents and low- to moderate-rate housing. Commercial activity is limited in number and variety but includes the attractive Gateway Center East
complex on the western end, several churches, small businesses and residences, and the Urban League facilities near the eastern edge. Gateway Center East includes a Price Club, Burger King, and the College of Retailing.

The area is conveniently located near downtown San Diego and is serviced by the San Diego Trolley System and the San Diego Bus Transit System. The easy access to downtown provides connecting public transportation to almost all areas of San Diego. Average weekday traffic volume along the Market Street corridor is reported to exceed 20,000.

In a meeting with the Mount Hope/Helix Heights Residents Association, the following concerns regarding the community were identified:

- Need for financial institutions
- Need for child care services
- Need for youth-oriented programs and services
- Concern for pedestrian safety, especially in the area near the Urban League
- Lack of connection or association with the Urban League and little knowledge of the League’s programs and services

It should be noted that there is a Navy Federal Credit Union branch located in the area. Also, during the progress of this study, Great Western Bank opened a small branch office in the Gateway Center East complex adjacent to the Price Club.

In verbal conversations, some business owners indicated the biggest attraction to the area for them is "affordable space."

To gather a broader sample of opinions, questionnaires were distributed at community meetings or were mailed to Mount Hope residents. Similarly, opinions were solicited from several businesses in the Mount Hope area. Responses to these questionnaires are attached as Appendix A. Although the responses represent a small return of the questionnaires, they do mirror the perspective of other voices that participated in this report.

Responses to the questionnaires revealed the need for residential and community business and services, such as grocery, drug, and discount stores; restaurants; gasoline stations; jobs; better street lighting; and a community youth center.
Some of the problems identified were vacant property, speeding traffic, drug dealings, gangs, homelessness; and lack of activities for youths.

Respondents identified the following among the valuable assets in the community: stability, home owners, residents organization, park landscaping, the Gateway Center, and the Price Club.

The questionnaire responses demonstrated support of the Urban League’s services and presence in the Mount Hope community by those who are familiar with it but a lack of knowledge about the Urban League by a number of residents.

In sum, the Mount Hope community is an inner-city neighborhood that suffers from social and economic deprivation. The negative conditions that impact the City as a whole tend to have a more profound effect on this community and its residents. Yet, the social infrastructure appears partially intact, evidenced by the churches, schools, and longtime residents and business activity in the area, which represent strengths and assets in the community.
D. Profile of the Urban League and its Facility Requirements

(1) Description

The San Diego Urban League is a social service organization that was established in June 1953 to assist African-Americans and other people of color throughout San Diego County in the achievement of social and economic equality, through advocacy, bridge building, program services, and research in the areas of education, employment and training, economic development, health care, and housing. While its primary constituency is African-American, its services are open to all. All of its services are provided free of charge.

The late Dr. J.J. Kimbrough served as the San Diego Urban League’s first president. Mr. Percy H. Steele, Jr. was its first executive director.

A non-profit (501(c)3) organization, the San Diego League is one of 113 affiliates of the National Urban League which was founded in 1910. The local organization is governed by a 30-member Board of Directors that meets monthly.

After a period of transition, in 1993 the Board of Directors of the San Diego Urban League appointed a former League executive (Mr. John Johnson) to serve as President and CEO. Since his arrival, the CEO and the Board agreed upon a five-year strategic plan which included several initiatives. The League is presently in a mode of continuous expansion of programs and staff, representing implementation of many of these initiatives. In April 1995, the Urban League staff indicated that 22 new program proposals were in the pipeline. If funded, some would replace or augment existing programs.

A fact sheet on the San Diego Urban League is presented as Exhibit III-1 at the conclusion of this section.

(2) Mission

The Urban League describes its mission as:
To be recognized as one of San Diego County’s leading community organizations by providing the best in economic development, education, and family services to African Americans and other people of color... To be recognized as a leading advocate for African American equality by building partnerships that provide a constant collective vigilance and response.

(3) Service Areas

The League presently provides programs and services in the following areas:

- Education
- Pregnancy Prevention
- Crisis Prevention, Intervention, and Referral
- Family Services
- AIDS Awareness
- African Refugee Assistance
- Employment and Training

On-site activities include:

- Administration
- Resource development
- Job training
- Employment referral
- Individual and family counseling
- Educational services and support
- Advocacy
- Meetings and conferences (Program, Board, Staff, Community)
- Maintenance
(4) **Staff and Organization**

The Fiscal/Personnel Manager reports a total staff of 57 with 40 of these housed at the Urban League, as of March 31, 1995. The remaining employees are located at County of San Diego facilities or other locations. Thirty-seven of the 40 on-site staff members at the League are full-time. There also are several contracted and volunteer workers.

(5) **Clientele**

The Urban League reports that it serves approximately 15,000 persons each year. A large portion of this service is provided at locations other than the League’s offices, such as its annual career fair held in downtown San Diego and services provided to children and families at local school sites.

A general profile of Urban League clients shows the following characteristics:

- Poor
- High school graduate or less
- African American, Hispanic, or African Refugee
- Reside within 10 miles of the League’s office (in Mid-City or in the corridor between Highway 94, I-805, Plaza Boulevard, and S.R. 15)
- Use personal car or public transportation to get to the League office

Urban League staff report a large and growing number of clients from the North Park/Mid-City area.

(6) **Funding Sources**

The Urban League operates on a fiscal year that runs from October 1 to September 30. The organization has a 1994-95 budget of
approximately $1.2 million. Some of its major funding comes from the Private Industry Council, United Way, and special events such as an annual fund-raising dinner.

(7) Facilities

The League operates in several adjacent buildings that face each other on opposite sides (north and south) of Market Street. There are several separate entrances to various areas of the facility, including one second-floor suite on the south block.

There are three separate parking lots: the southwest corner of Market and Denby, the northeast corner of Market and Toyne, and a smaller lot to the rear of the buildings on the north block.

The present facilities, which are owned and solely occupied by the League, are grossly inadequate for the staff, clients, and programs of the League and are in constant need of repair. Although efforts are made to spruce up the League facilities, and their exteriors appear in a better condition than some of the other buildings in the area, redevelopment or rehabilitation is needed to improve the appearance of the Market Street corridor.

The League is not presently leasing facilities at any other location; however, staff report plans are being made to lease space in the Mid-City area of San Diego.

In interviews with Urban League staff, the following were identified as major facility concerns:

- Need for more office space
- Need for more filing and storage space
- Need for private office space for interviewing and counseling
- Need for more conference rooms
- Need for a multiple purpose/community room
- Need for space to accommodate young children who accompany parents to the League
- Need for enhanced security
The CEO and department heads of the Urban League were asked to complete questionnaires detailing facility requirements for their departments. Their responses are attached as Appendix B.

(8) **Location**

While acknowledging the inadequacy of the present facilities and the increased clientele in the Mid-City area, the Urban League staff (with few exceptions) expressed the need and desire to remain in the present location. The following reasons were cited:

- The League’s history and established identity/location in the area
- Proximity to target clientele
- Accessibility to freeways and public transit lines
- The community’s need for Urban League services
- Desire to be a part of the revitalization of the area

The CEO concurred with the desire to remain in the Mount Hope area and the need to more adequate facilities. He also expressed the desire for the Urban League to continue to own its own facility.

(9) **Long-Range Vision**

In 1993, the Urban League developed a five-year strategic plan which included the purpose, vision, and mission stated above. The plan calls for new initiatives in education, health care, mental health services, and housing.

The League petitioned, and was approved, by the San Diego City Schools to operate a charter school at Johnson Elementary School in the Emerald Hills community. The charter school will operate under the Urban League’s Education Department. Because it will operate at a public school site, the League does not expect its charter school to have a significant impact on its physical facility. Since charter schools are a relatively new phenomenon, there are questions within the broader San Diego community and nationwide regarding the charter school’s
ability to operate efficiently and improve educational achievement as intended by charter schools legislation.

(10) **Future Program Plans**

The Urban League’s CEO has described a number of initiatives which he plans to pursue during the next three to five years. These initiatives are still in the concept stage. Their fruition will depend on the League’s ability to attract funding.

These future programs/ideas include the addition of the following:

- Housing Program (rehabilitation of housing for seniors, veterans, and people with AIDS)
- Community Organization Program Office
- Street Academies (storefront schools in non-traditional settings)
- Advocacy Program
- Youth Center
- Childcare Center
- Cottage Industries Program
- Expansion of present department/program services

The CEO envisions that implementation of these programs/ideas will result in an organizational structure that consists of the following departments:

- Administration Department
- Six (6) Program Departments
- Fiscal/Accounting Department
- Maintenance Department

The above initiatives could result in a growth from the present 57 employees to approximately 100 employees over the next five to ten years.
San Diego Urban League, Inc.
1995 Fact Sheet

HISTORY

- One of 113 affiliates of the National Urban League, a movement founded in 1910 to provide the most basic of human rights - equal education, equal housing, fair employment and the right to vote - to citizens of color
- San Diego affiliate founded in 1953 by Dr. Jack Kimbrough, when redlining was a common practice and Woolworth’s lunch counter was segregated
- Forty-two years as San Diego's premier social service agency for African Americans, serving an estimated 22,000 constituents annually

MISSION

- To assist African Americans and other people of color to achieve social and economic equality, through advocacy, bridge building, program services and research
- To focus on the family unit and treat clients with an holistic approach

LEADERSHIP & SUPPORT

- A 30-member board of directors, led by Chair Leroy T. Brady, Ph.D., reflecting the diversity of the Urban League’s constituency
- President and Chief Executive Officer John W. Johnson, who had served as the Urban League’s Executive Director in 1964-1970, returned in June 1993 to revitalize the agency and rededicate it to service
- Funding and technical support provided by hundreds of individual members, by more than 100 local corporations, by local and national foundations, through special events such as the Equal Opportunity Dinner and the Golden Pyramid Awards, and through grants from City, County, State and Federal government agencies and United Way.

PROGRAMS

- Crisis Intervention & Referral: Assist individuals in issues of job discrimination, racial discrimination, and make referrals for legal, housing and utility assistance. Since 1953.

- Education Services: Toward development of a model educational dropout prevention, recovery and intervention program, education services staff members provide test-taking skills workshops, career counseling sessions, mediate conflicts, manage a financial aid library, and operate a cultural enrichment academy with an Afro-centric focus. Since 1960.

- Golden Pyramid: Recognition program for African American males in high school who achieve a 3.0+ grade point average. A year-round series of workshops, seminars and special programs to assist these young men in their pursuit of higher education options culminates in an annual awards ceremony. Since 1990.

- Home/School Partnership: Through advocacy, promotes communication linkages between schools, parents and students, with the goals to increase parental involvement in their children's education and motivate students to strive for academic excellence. A collaborative effort with six other agencies and institutions and the San Diego Unified School District. Since 1989.

- Charter School: A demonstration model school employing innovative teaching methods with an ethno-centric curriculum to provide a nurturing educational environment in which African Americans and other children of color can realize their full potential. The charter school incorporates a pre-school component and a family service center to treat the family holistically. Operated independently by the League within the San Diego Unified School District, the Charter will take effect in September 1995.

- Project TRUTH: Through street outreach, risk reduction sessions, and community education intervention forums, health educators work to bring about knowledge enhancement, attitude change and skill development as it relates to HIV infection to influence behavioral risk taking among substance abusers. Begun in 1988 as AIDS Awareness Project.
• Mental Health-Spiritual Support Services: Provides a safe network and environment for trained clergy and lay religious persons to counsel African Americans infected or affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Urban League health educators also train mental health staff from other agencies. Since 1993.

• BirthWrite: Support groups take the format of a 9-month writing workshop in a safe environment. Open to underserved women HIV infected or affected. Weekly sessions led by creative writing facilitator and licensed clinical therapist. Individual counseling provided as needed. Begun September 1994.

• Single Parent Services: Aids single parents to become self-sufficient and effective parents through individual counseling, support groups, family sessions, parenting skills classes and information and referral services. Goal is family reunification. Works in conjunction with Child Protective Services. Since 1977.

• Cooperative Community Project: A team of coordinator, parent educator, counselor and project assistant provide case management for families at risk of child abuse. Services include individual and family in-home skills building, crisis intervention, parent education/classes, children’s workshops, support groups, respite care, and resource referral. Operated in conjunction with New Alternatives, Inc. Begun August 1994.

• Information & Education (I&E): Through community presentations, workshops and in-school seminars, parent and peer educators assist parents, adolescents and staff in dealing effectively with family life education to reduce the rate of unintended pregnancies. Scope of work includes ENABL for grade 6, "Reducing the Risk" for high schoolers, a Male Responsibility program for youth 14-18, and Culture Arts Self Esteem (CASE) Builders for youth up to age 25. Since 1978.

• ENABL (Education Now And Babies Later): Parent and peer educators increase awareness among youth 12-14 in understanding and resisting peer pressure to be sexually involved, thereby reducing risk of unintended teen pregnancies and encouraging continuance of education. Students who complete 5-part curriculum receive continued support through Kujichagulia and TRYBE ENABL after school. Since 1990.

• Outreach to African Refugees: An outreach case manager assists the more than 15,000 legal immigrants from the African continent residing in San Diego County to secure employment and housing, access medical services and meet emergency needs. Collaborates with the Coalition of African Organizations to provide acculturation, language classes and other programs to foster assimilation of Africans into the African American community. Begun September 1994.

• Mid-City Juvenile Crime Prevention Project: A five-tiered program aimed at preventing juvenile crime by early identification and intervention with at-risk children and families. Includes outreach to young mothers, group counseling & recreation for elementary school families, after school programs, in-home counseling & support for single mothers & sons, and intensive in-home counseling for first offenders ages 8-18. A collaboration of 12 agencies and four schools beginning in February 1995.

• Family Self-Sufficiency: Case managers will work with poor families in Encanto, Southeast San Diego, Paradise Hills & surrounding communities to meet their emergency needs, provide crisis intervention and ensure coordination of area resources to stabilize each family’s situation. Case managers will work with selected families to build their education and employment skills, and resolve issues such as family violence and substance abuse, so that the family can move beyond stability to establish self-sufficiency. Scheduled to begin in February 1995.

• Customized Refugee Training Program: Provides individualized customized training in electronics assembly and word processing for eligible refugees residing in San Diego County. Services offered include Vocational English language training, work preparation skills, cultural orientation and job placement. Volunteer assistance provided by members of the National Civilian Community Corps. Begun December 1994.

• Career Fair: Annual event bringing together more than 100 area employers with thousands of interested applicants. Day-long fair includes free workshops on topical subjects such as: job search strategies, resume preparation, investment dressing and career assessment. Since 1990.


* All programs are offered free of charge.
FUTURE INITIATIVES

- **Housing**: Through the Urban Housing Corp., a separate non-profit subsidiary established in 1994, will renovate and/or build housing in Southeast San Diego to provide temporary shelter for low income families, youth in transition and/or the homeless. All services offered by the Urban League will be available on site.

- **Street Academies**: Alternative educational programs to address underachieving and dropout problems among African American youth.

- **New Headquarters**: Based on the results of a site study conducted by the Southeast Economic Development Corp., the Urban League will begin planning to either construct or relocate to new facilities within the next three years.
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IV. PLANNING ANALYSIS

A. Existing Setting

The existing Urban League facility consists of five separate structures in the 4200 block of Market Street, between Toyne and Denby Streets. These buildings contain a total of about 12,765 SF. The Urban League’s total site area is 37,760 SF (0.87 acres), of which about 14,160 SF is used for off-street surface parking.

The Urban League owns approximately four-fifths of the commercial block frontage between Toyne and Denby on either side of Market Street. On the north side, the easternmost parcel is privately owned; it is occupied by a motorcycle club. On the south side, the westernmost parcel is occupied by a now defunct restaurant. Single-family residential uses abut the Urban League property at both its northern and southern edges.

The property on the north side of the block has a significant grade change (a six-foot gain) at a depth of about 100 feet from Market Street. The southern side of the street slopes gently downward from Toyne to Denby. A power line utility easement runs east-west through the southern property at the rear property line.

Three of the existing buildings are one-story wood-frame structures with stucco exterior finish; one is a one-story concrete block building; and one is a two-story concrete block structure. The buildings range in size from 1,855 SF to 3,154 SF and are generally subdivided into administrative offices and training classrooms.

The buildings, which date from 1948 to 1965, are in poor to very poor condition. Several important physical or design features are noted:

- All buildings are in various stages of disrepair, e.g., leaky roofs and deteriorated plumbing and structural wood members. Some of the buildings show evidence of water damage in the walls and ceilings.
• Added electrical power is exposed over interior walls.

• None of the buildings meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

• Urban League staff must enter/exit various buildings and cross Market Street repeatedly throughout the business day.

• The buildings do not fit the design criteria of the Market Street Corridor Urban Design Study.

• The building facades have a non-descript character, offering little image of the Urban League or of what it represents.
B. Identification of Alternative Development Schemes

(1) Range of Potential Facility Options

The range of potential facility options for the Urban League initially reviewed by the consultant team is quite broad, including: owned vs. leased space; on- vs. off-site locations; and rehabilitation vs. new development.

In terms of rehabilitation, the consultant team determined at an early stage that rehabilitation of the Urban League’s existing buildings was not a viable option. The principal reason is the excessive physical obsolescence of the facilities, including factors that cannot easily be remedied at any cost. Many rooms are too small to appropriately accommodate clients. Efficiency of operations is very poor due to the lack of continuity of spaces: one has to travel outdoors and across streets to access and interface with other departments; as well as climb exterior stairs to access the second floor.

In terms of off-site locations, numerous conceptual options were reviewed. Early discussions among SEDC, the Urban League, and the consultant team focused on the potential for any of the following:

- Purchase of an existing office or industrial building for adaptive rehabilitation;
- Combining rehabilitation or new development on the Urban League’s existing site with leased facilities at satellite locations elsewhere in the City; or
- Development of a new facility on an available pad site in the Gateway Center business park.

The first and second options may actually be among the most cost-effective available to the Urban League. Numerous existing office and industrial buildings in the San Diego market can be purchased at prices substantially below replacement cost. Few of these buildings, however, are located in Southeastern San Diego. Leasing, on the other hand, offers the greatest flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of the Urban League’s programs and clientele.
In meetings with Urban League officials, they expressed their strong preference to remain in the Mount Hope community, to build a new facility, and to own their facility. For these reasons, the study considered two schemes for the existing Urban League site and another Mount Hope alternative, the rehabilitation of the California Curl Building. The California Curl Building was selected for several reasons:

- It is close to the Urban League’s existing location (one block away);
- It is currently being offered for sale; and
- Its rehabilitation and re-use could serve as a benefit to the Market Street revitalization effort.

The consultant team worked with SEDC staff to determine appropriate factors such as: site assembly, facility size, balance of office and retail uses, mix of private space, and project phasing.

Each of the three schemes is summarized below. Conceptual plans and elevations (reduced versions) are presented in Appendix C.

(2) **Scheme A: 52,000 SF on Existing Site**

Scheme A is the highest-intensity scheme among the three options evaluated. It assumes that development will occur on the land already owned by the Urban League, with the acquisition of four adjacent residential units and two commercial sites. The higher density of the project requires the construction of a 140-space parking structure. The proposed program includes:

- A 32,000-SF building on the south block, with 9,000 SF of retail space on the ground floor and 23,000 SF of office space on levels two and three. This south block facility would be designed as the Urban League’s principal headquarters/classroom facility. This scheme was designed to provide easy access to a two-level parking structure from Toyne Street on the west and Denby Street on the east (which is lower than Toyne Street). The size of this facility should accommodate the Urban League’s future growth needs.
- A 20,000-SF mixed-use center on the north block. This would consist of about 8,500 SF of retail space on the ground floor and 11,500 SF of office suites on the levels two and three. This north block development would provide the Urban League with leasable private office/retail space and/or additional space for future growth.

(3) **Scheme B: 41,000 SF on Existing Site**

Scheme B is similar to Scheme A, in that it is built on the Urban League’s existing property combined with four adjacent residential units and two commercial sites. However, Scheme B relies solely on surface parking, therefore supporting a maximum of 41,000 SF of space on the two sides of the street. The program is assumed to be as follows:

- A two- or three-story office building on the south block containing 21,000 SF. About 7,000 SF would be dedicated to retail space, with the balance (14,000 SF) as office space. The development would be served by a surface parking lot running from Toyne to Denby to the rear of the building.

- The program for the north block would be the same as in Scheme A.

(4) **Scheme C: 29,700-SF Rehabilitation of California Curl Building**

Scheme C assumes that the Urban League would acquire and renovate the California Curl Building. The existing building contains about 33,300 SF of industrial and office space on a 22,000-SF parcel. It is served by an additional 14,100-SF unimproved parcel to the west used for parking.

The California Curl Building is a two-story industrial building consisting of a concrete block first floor with a wood-frame second floor. The existing structure is basically two buildings built together. Separation in the center for a pedestrian pathway/"galleria" is feasible, and would enhance both the indoor and outdoor space. Substantial additional alteration would be required for the following:
Creation of retail spaces on the lower level. Due to the absence of voids for windows and doors, new openings must be created.

Finishing interior space.

Development of a facade that is consistent with the Market Street Corridor Urban Design Study.

Implementation of ADA requirements.

The proposed scheme would reduce the gross building area to approximately 29,700 SF. The existing dirt parking lot would need to be graded, paved, and improved with landscaping. However, this lot is not adequate to provide sufficient off-street parking. Therefore, two additional residential units would be required to provide parking and circulation area.

The completed renovation of the California Curl Building would provide adequate office space for the Urban League’s foreseeable expansion needs. In addition, leasable retail space would be created on the ground floor.
C. Final Design Concept

Following the planning and financial analyses (see Section V below), the consultant team, SEDC staff, and the Urban League selected Scheme B as the preferred scheme. This scheme would result in 41,000 SF of office and retail space on the existing Urban League property with all surface parking.

The office building on the south block was identified as the first phase of the project. The preferred scheme eliminates the need for a three-story building that would be required in the higher-intensity option (Scheme A). The 21,000-SF office building can be developed on two levels, with the second level cantilevered over a portion of the surface parking lot in the rear. This first-phase project allows the Urban League the flexibility to phase into a new building, while perhaps receiving rental income from retail tenants in the interim. It is assumed that development of the north block will proceed as a separate phase at a later date.

Detailed plans, elevations, and an axonometric drawing for the south block of the preferred scheme are presented in Exhibits IV-1 through IV-4.

The proposed development of Scheme B is consistent with the Market Street Corridor Urban Design Study. The overall concept is in character with the surrounding community and pedestrian-friendly in design. The proposed structure type would be masonry and stucco with metal roofs. A large entry "galleria" and retail spaces with large windows have been included.
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ECONOMIC ANALYSIS
V. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

A. Economic Impacts of the Urban League

This section of the study was intended to assess the economic impacts of the Urban League on the Market Street corridor. Examples of the ways in which the Urban League potentially affects the surrounding area include: direct delivery of programs and services to community residents; direct and indirect impacts resulting from spending by the League, its employees, and clients; and less tangible impacts resulting from the presence of a major anchor use on Market Street.

Table V-1 profiles the Market Street corridor in terms of physical setting, demographic patterns, land use plans, revitalization goals, and redevelopment accomplishments to date.

Table V-2 addresses existing, and potential future, economic impacts of the Urban League on the Market Street corridor. These have been organized as follows: programs and services to the community; employee and client retail expenditures; organizational spending for supplies and services; image and presence; and joint opportunities for revitalization.

Key findings of the assessment include:

- The counseling and employment training programs by the League are open and available, at no cost, to all San Diegans, including Mount Hope residents.

- The Urban League, its employees, and clients presently spend nominal amounts within the Market Street corridor, due to the limited existing supply of shops and services.

- As the largest single institution in the corridor, the Urban League’s presence provides a stabilizing influence. This presence has beneficial impacts in terms of image and security.

- The lack of significant revitalization along Market Street is most likely a result of regional economic conditions and the difficulties of developing in an older inner-city area.
The Urban League’s commitment to its headquarters location offers a possible opportunity for joint development of its property to the common good of both the League and SEDC’s revitalization agenda.
### Location

Immediate neighborhood ("Mount Hope Trade Area") is bounded by freeways on three sides and cemeteries and trolley tracks on the fourth side.

Mount Hope Trade Area includes the Gateway Center (East) Business Park and the Market Street Industrial Park.

### Existing Commercial Uses

Small businesses such as convenience stores, restaurants, and automotive uses and repair facilities.

Vacant parcels and surface parking lots.

A number of churches in both storefronts and traditional buildings.

The former California Curl industrial facility between Morrison and 42nd Streets.

The Urban League's facilities between Toyne and Denby.

Many commercial buildings in the corridor are older, in need of repair, and lack off-street parking.

### Side Street Residential Uses

Predominance of 1,000-1,500 SF single-family homes.

Constructed in the pre-World War II era.

Many exhibit signs of deferred maintenance.

### Demographic Trends (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Mount Hope Trade Area</strong></th>
<th><strong>2-Mile Radius</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>About 6,200 residents</td>
<td>About 117,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households</strong></td>
<td>Nearly 1,600 households</td>
<td>About 34,500 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>Median household income of $20,500</td>
<td>Median income of $24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per capita income of $6,900</td>
<td>Per capita income of $9,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevant Land Use Plans

- Mount Hope Redevelopment Plan (1982)
- Mount Hope Planned District Ordinance (PDO) (1984)
- Market Street Corridor Urban Design Study (1992)
- Mount Hope Redevelopment Project AB 1290 Implementation Plan (1994)

(1) 1994 estimates, based on Strategic Mapping Demographics System. See Table E-2 in appendix.
### Redevelopment Goals

Create a "Main Street" for the community that combines retail, service, and entertainment uses in a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Provide shopping, services, and employment opportunities for local residents.

Provide retail and service amenities for local businesses.

### Market Support for Retail Uses

**Pluses**

- Traffic generated by Urban League
- Demand for retail, services, & eateries from business park employees
- Lack of competition; businesses and residents are under-served in terms of shopping and services
- High vehicle traffic count on Market Street and access to I-805 and I-15

**Minuses**

- Truncated market area
- Limited disposable incomes of area residents
- Small, narrow parcel configuration with inadequate parking
- Difficult to finance new development without anchors or credit tenants
- Perceptions of the area as unsafe

### Status of Redevelopment

Completion of the WRT/RNP Urban Design Study (1992)

Attraction of new and expanding businesses to the two business parks

Development of new single-family homes on Morrison Street

Loans to single-family home owners for rehabilitation

Silent second home loans to first-time buyers

Installation of major street improvements west of Boundary Street

Several blocks between Boundary/I-805 remain substantially vacant or underutilized

---

**Source:** Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.

**Date:** 14-Sep-95

**File:** c:\data\sedc\urban\impacts
### Programs and Services to the Community

The Urban League is a direct provider of economic development, education, and family services. No fees are charged to clients who participate.

Specific programs available to community residents include: job training and placement, youth and family counseling, education, and crisis intervention.

Individual employers may contract with the Urban League to train skilled workers for specified positions. This program is a potential benefit to employers in the area's business parks.

### Employee and Client Retail Expenditures

Urban League employees and clients are potential consumers for convenience retail, restaurants, and service establishments in the Market Street corridor.

**Employees**

The League currently employs approximately 40 people (37 full-time/3 part-time) at the Market Street location. Near-term plans to expand the League's programs would greatly increase this number.

Spending by Urban League employees in the Market Street corridor is presumed to be nominal due to the limited supply of retail and services currently available.

Market analysts typically estimate potential daily spending for office employees in a downtown setting averaging $5-$7/person/day. A lower estimate would apply in a neighborhood setting.

**Clients**

The Urban League serves approximately 15,000 persons/year, mostly at off-site career fairs. A specific count of clientele at the Market Street location was not available.

Existing spending by Urban League clients is presumed to be minimal for several reasons:

- Limited financial resources
- High transit patronage (unlikely to shop for larger items)
- Limited range of retail and food outlets available

### Organizational Spending for Supplies and Services

The Urban League has an annual budget of about $1.2 million. Most of these funds are earmarked for staff salaries and benefits.

The League spends a relatively small amount each year on equipment, supplies, and services. At present, virtually all of these expenditures are exported to providers located outside the Mount Hope area.

Expansion of the Urban League and attraction of new office tenants to this area will support small businesses such as copy and print shops, mailing and packaging services, office supplies, equipment repair, etc.
| Image and Security | The Urban League is the largest single institution in the Market Street corridor (defined as Boundary to I-805).

  - Generates pedestrian and automobile traffic throughout the day.
  - Strengthens local perceptions of security.
  - Enhances the overall image of the area.

As a long-term property owner (since 1968), the Urban League is invested in the community and is willing to participate in the area’s revitalization.

The corridor contains numerous under-utilized properties; it is not likely that the League’s presence has discouraged new development.

| Potential for Joint Development/Revitalization | The Urban League’s commitment to the area, combined with its relatively large property holdings, affords an opportunity for joint development.

With an expanding Urban League as an anchor user, it may be possible to:

  - Develop a mixed-use “demonstration" project on Market Street
  - Attract other retail and office tenants
  - Generate the “critical mass" required to initiate revitalization of the corridor

Complementary uses might include:

  - Neighborhood-serving private office tenants such as realtors, insurance agents, and accountants
  - Non-profit office space
  - Small retail, food, and convenience stores
  - Health club

Source: Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.
Date: 14-Sep-95
File: c:\data\sedc\urban\impacts
B. Market Potential for Development of Private Uses

(1) Overview

KMA prepared an overview of market conditions and demographic trends in order to determine the potential level of support for new retail and/or office development on the Urban League property.

Appendix D presents a detailed survey of prevailing property values and rental rates for Southeastern San Diego retail and office markets. In compiling this information, KMA conducted a series of interviews with knowledgeable real estate brokers and property owners.

Appendix E presents information on demographic trends in the Mount Hope trade area and surrounding neighborhoods. This includes an estimate of the amount of convenience retail space potentially supported by the existing retail expenditures of area residents.

Based on these analyses, KMA estimates the current level of market support for office and retail space in the Market Street corridor as follows:

- About 15,000 to 20,000 SF of convenience retail space, providing food and drug, eating establishments, general merchandise, and basic services to area residents and employees.

- About to 5,000 to 10,000 SF of professional office space, excluding the Urban League’s requirements. This space could be targeted for small businesses, non-profits, and neighborhood-serving firms.

We estimate that a well-conceived development incorporating the above mix of uses could be absorbed in a period of 18 months to three years. However, the ultimate success of such a project would depend to a great extent on the appropriate tenant mix and the ability to attract anchor users.
Our salient conclusions with respect to the retail and office markets are outlined below.

(2) **Retail Space**

- Much of Southeastern San Diego remains under-served by retail facilities. For example, no major chain grocery store is represented within the community. Residents rely on small-scale food stores or travel outside the area.

- Two strip centers have opened in the market area within the past five years: Euclid Plaza and the center at the northwest corner of 47th and Market Streets. Both projects fared poorly in the recession.

- A major community commercial center is currently under construction in the Southcrest neighborhood. This 128,000-SF, Lucky-anchored center was sponsored by SEDC as part of the redevelopment of the former Highway 252 Corridor.

- Newer retail space in Southeastern San Diego can expect to command maximum rents of about $1.00-$1.25/SF/month, triple-net (NNN). Such centers tend to attract non-retail uses such as office tenants, police substations, and the U.S. Post Office.

- Older retail space, which frequently lacks off-street parking, rents at a substantial discount.

- The Market Street corridor enjoys several positive attributes in support of new private development: high traffic volumes and strong freeway access; the existence of three successful business parks; and the presence of the Urban League. In addition, SEDC’s Urban Design Study designates the corridor for development of business- and neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

- On the negative side, the market area for any new development is constrained by the existence of freeways, cemeteries, and the trolley line ("Mount Hope trade area"). Median household income in the Mount Hope trade area is approximately one-half of the Citywide median.
KMA's analysis of retail expenditures potential in the Mount Hope trade area indicates total support for about 35,000 to 40,000 SF of convenience retail space. KMA estimates that about one-third of this space could potentially be captured within the immediate area. The balance of household expenditures for grocery and drug, eating establishments, and general merchandise can be expected to flow to surrounding communities.

Support for new retail, restaurants, and services would be augmented by daytime employment in the area. KMA therefore estimates total support for approximately 15,000 to 20,000 SF of retail space.

(3) **Office Space**

Southeastern San Diego is not an established office market. The options available to office tenants are few, ranging from older storefront-style buildings, which typically lack parking, to adaptations of newer retail or industrial buildings.

The prevalence of office users in the area's retail centers and industrial parks indicates the shortage of neighborhood professional office space.

The largest, and highest-end, private office building in the market area is Gateway Medical Center in the Gateway Center (East) business park. Although this building has experienced financial and legal difficulties, its recent experience in attracting new tenants has been fairly positive.

Office tenants in the market area are typically price-sensitive. Top-of-the-market rents, as demonstrated by Gateway Medical Center, appear to be $1.25/SF/month, full-service gross (FSG).

Based on existing levels of pent-up demand, KMA estimates that an appropriately designed and marketed office building could capture on the order of 5,000 to 10,000 SF of office tenants over a period of several years. This demand estimate excludes the Urban League's space requirements.
A mixed-use development combining the Urban League’s facilities, private office space, and retail uses could potentially experience stronger absorption.
C. Financial Feasibility Analysis

(1) Potential Funding Sources

The principal sources of funding considered for a new Urban League facility are reviewed as follows:

- Equity: Although the Urban League owns its existing facility, the properties are of limited value and are encumbered by an existing debt.

  The properties were appraised in 1991 at $563,000, which equates to nearly $15/SF of building area. The appraiser assumed that the existing buildings could be re-used for private tenants. KMA believes that the more likely scenario would be clearance for new development. Based on historical comparable sales, we estimate that a developer might pay a land value as high as $10/SF, or say $380,000 in total.

  The properties are encumbered by a five-year note placed in 1991 with an outstanding balance of about $285,000. The Urban League’s equity in its property can therefore be estimated at about $95,000.

  Although our financial analysis assumes that the Urban League contributes this equity amount, it is important to note that it would be extremely difficult for the Urban League to sell its property, and realize this equity, in the current market.

- Urban League "Rent": A majority of the organization’s budget is derived on an annual basis from Federal, State, and County allocations. Although these funds typically include an amount dedicated to occupancy costs, the uncertainties associated with the League’s programs and their funding sources makes it difficult to raise conventional debt. The problem is further compounded by the fact that the extremely conservative posture of the capital markets at this time.

  Our financial analysis assumes that the Urban League will have the ability to dedicate program funding as "rent" for its own space. Under each scheme, we have assumed rent of $1.00/SF/month, or about $21,000/month. This rent substantially exceeds the League’s current estimate of its own rent-paying capacity of about $5,000/month.
Sub-Leasing: By including a significant proportion of private rental space (both retail and office) in a new facility, the Urban League may be able to raise additional conventional financing.

Fund-Raising: The Urban League hopes to secure additional funding from other public and private sources.

(2) Financial Evaluation of Preliminary Concepts

Table V-3, following, presents preliminary financial analyses of the three preliminary development concepts. The table includes a summary of development programs, a financial model for each scheme, and a summary of the assumptions used in the analysis.

The financial evaluation indicates that the least expensive alternative, in terms of total project costs, is Scheme C, at an estimated cost of $3.9 million. Both on-site alternatives are more costly: Scheme A would cost approximately $7.3 million, and Scheme B would cost an estimated $5.5 million.

Note that the facility size and available financial resources vary considerably for the three schemes. Other factors to be considered include the potential for phasing the development, the functional layout of mixed uses on the site, parking requirements, and the ultimate funding gap.

KMA estimated the funding gap for each scheme as the shortfall in funding after considering the amount of debt and equity investment supported by the project. The funding gap is the amount of public assistance and/or capital fund-raising required to make the project feasible.

Scheme C has the lowest gap, approximately $1.5 million, followed by Scheme B, at $2.2 million. It should be noted, however, that Scheme B can be phased (south block/north block), while this option does not exist for Scheme C. Scheme A requires approximately $3.1 million in assistance.
The costs for development, construction, and rehabilitation used in this analysis are preliminary. Final estimates cannot be made until working drawings are completed. These estimates are made for the purpose of comparing the relative costs of the three schemes. They should be considered illustrative in nature.

(3) **Scheme A: 52,000 SF on Existing Site**

This scheme assumes the development will occur on the land already owned by the Urban League, with the acquisition of four adjacent residential units and two commercial sites. This development would require the pay-off of the existing Wells Fargo Bank loan secured by the properties. The higher density of the project requires the construction of a 140-space parking structure to service the site. The costs for these structured spaces (averaging $5,500/space), is considerably higher than that of surface parking. The direct impact of the costs of structured parking is to increase the average per-square-foot cost of the project from approximately $135/SF to over $140/SF.

Scheme A allows for leasing a total of 13,500 SF of office space and 17,500 SF of retail space to third-party users. The rent paid by such users would support additional permanent debt (secured by the development). For example, the projected private rental income would support $3,450,000 in value; we estimate that a lender would be willing to fund up to $2,587,000, or 75% of this value.

Similar assumptions are made regarding the 21,000 SF that would remain for use by the Urban League. The analysis assumes that Urban League "rent" would support $2,100,000 in value, of which a lender would fund 75%, or $1,575,000.

The resulting $4.2 million would provide the major source of funds for the project. A $3.1 million financing gap would remain.

It should also be noted that a structured-parking alternative may not be practical for two reasons:

- Poor market acceptance in the surrounding community for structured parking; and
- The ability to build smaller increments of office space with all-surface parking at lower cost.
(4) **Scheme B: 41,000 SF on Existing Site**

Scheme B also assumes the project will be constructed on the land already owned by the Urban League, plus the addition of four adjacent residential units and two commercial sites. This development would also require the pay-off of the existing Wells Fargo Bank loan.

The per-square-foot cost of the development is estimated at $135. This lower cost is due primarily to the lower cost of surface parking as compared to structured parking.

This lower-density alternative provides 4,500 SF of office space and 15,500 SF of retail space for third-party users. Income earned from these tenants could support an estimated value of $2,310,000; we estimated that a lender would finance up to $1,732,000, or 75% of value.

Similar assumptions are made regarding the 21,000 SF that would be used by the Urban League. The analysis assumes the Urban League’s rent payments would support $2,100,000 in value, of which a lender would fund 75%, or $1,575,000.

This debt would therefore yield a total of $3.3 million in sources of funds for the project. This leaves a financing gap of $2.2 million.

(5) **Scheme C: 29,700-SF Rehabilitation of California Curl Building**

Scheme C requires the purchase of a 33,300-SF industrial building, a 14,100-SF unimproved parcel for parking, and two additional residential units.

The purchase price of the industrial building and the parking lot was estimated at $1,175,000. This is the amount of the 1994 property appraisal completed for the owner, TOPA Thrift and Loan Association of Los Angeles. In KMA’s view, this value appears overstated in light of the inadequate supply of parking and the costs associated with re-using this unusual structure.
This scheme assumes the sale of the existing Urban League property. It is assumed that SEDC would enlist private developer interest in constructing office/retail uses on the former Urban League sites. As described above, sale of the property and pay-off of the existing debt is expected to net approximately $95,000.

The balance of the sources of funds would be drawn from the rental income on an estimated 6,000 SF of retail space and 2,700 SF of office space. As in the other two schemes, the Urban League is assumed to occupy, and "rent," 21,000 SF. These leases would support about $2.4 million in debt against total project costs of $3.9 million; the resulting financing gap is about $1.5 million.
### TABLE V-3

**SOUTHEASTERN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**URBAN LEAGUE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

**FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF PRELIMINARY CONCEPTS**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Development Program</th>
<th>OFFICE/RETAIL Building/Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Urban League Location-52,000 SF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Market St North</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheme A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Area</td>
<td>8,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Area</td>
<td>11,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>20,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds (Total Costs)</td>
<td>$2,729,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs/SF</td>
<td>$136.45 /SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Potential Sources of Funds</td>
<td>$1,627,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (Shortage) of Funding</td>
<td>($1,101,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Curl Building Rehabilitation-29,700 SF</td>
<td><strong>Office/Retail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheme C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Area</td>
<td>6,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Area</td>
<td>23,700 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>29,700 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds (Total Costs)</td>
<td>$3,680,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs/SF</td>
<td>$123.92 /SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Potential Sources of Funds</td>
<td>$2,413,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (Shortage) of Funding</td>
<td>($1,267,400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Scheme A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Urban League Property Location MARKET ST</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Development Program</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>38,350 SF</td>
<td>35,400 SF</td>
<td>73,750 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Acquisitions Required</td>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>4 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Parcel Area</td>
<td>4,720 SF</td>
<td>4,720 SF</td>
<td>9,440 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Area</td>
<td>43,070 SF</td>
<td>40,120 SF</td>
<td>83,190 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Area</td>
<td>8,500 SF</td>
<td>9,000 SF</td>
<td>17,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>20,000 SF</td>
<td>32,000 SF</td>
<td>52,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL Leased Area</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking Spaces</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Parking Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Dimensions</td>
<td>236' x 150'/175'</td>
<td>236' x 150'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio (/1,000)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses of Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Acquisition</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retire Existing Debt</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Site Acquisition</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Site Acquisition</td>
<td>$70,800</td>
<td>$70,800</td>
<td>$141,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res/Com. Relocation Costs</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Site Acquisition</td>
<td>$509,300</td>
<td>$509,300</td>
<td>$1,018,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Shell</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
<td>$2,070,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Shell</td>
<td>$487,500</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$982,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>$287,500</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$862,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking &amp; On-Sites</td>
<td>$53,750</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$171,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Parking</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Construction</td>
<td>$1,688,750</td>
<td>$3,102,500</td>
<td>$4,801,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Costs</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$521,000</td>
<td>$942,000</td>
<td>$1,463,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Uses of Funds (Total Cost)</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/SF</td>
<td>$136.45</td>
<td>$142.31</td>
<td>$140.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Value of Leased Space</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Rental Income</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$217,000</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization Rate</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of Estimated Capitalized Value</td>
<td>$1,627,500</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>$2,587,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UL Lease</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Fund Raising</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDC Contribution</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG/Sec.109</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Potential Sources of Funds</td>
<td>$1,627,500</td>
<td>$2,535,000</td>
<td>$4,162,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excess (Shortage) of Funding</th>
<th>MARKET ST</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>($1,101,550)</td>
<td>($2,018,800)</td>
<td>($3,120,350)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE V-3**

**SOUTHEASTERN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**URBAN LEAGUE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

**FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF PRELIMINARY CONCEPTS**

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT-41,000 SF, OFFICE-25,500 SF, RETAIL-15,500 SF**

Page 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Urban League Property Location</th>
<th>MARKET ST NORTH</th>
<th>MARKET ST SOUTH</th>
<th>RETAIL/OFFICE Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Density Development Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>38,350 SF</td>
<td>35,400 SF</td>
<td>73,750 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Acquisitions Required</td>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>4 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Parcel Area</td>
<td>4,720 SF</td>
<td>4,720 SF</td>
<td>9,440 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Area</td>
<td>43,070 SF</td>
<td>40,120 SF</td>
<td>83,190 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Area</td>
<td>8,500 SF</td>
<td>7,000 SF</td>
<td>15,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Area</td>
<td>11,500 SF</td>
<td>14,000 SF</td>
<td>25,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>20,000 SF</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
<td>41,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL Leased Area</td>
<td>7,000 SF</td>
<td>14,000 SF</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking Spaces</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Dimensions</td>
<td>236' x 150'/175'</td>
<td>236' x 150'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio (1,000)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses of Funds

**Site Acquisition**

- Retire Existing Debt: $141,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $141,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $282,000 (TOTAL)
- Residential Site Acquisition: $200,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $200,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $400,000 (TOTAL)
- Commercial Site Acquisition: $70,800 (MARKET ST NORTH), $0 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $70,800 (TOTAL)
- Res/Com Relocation Costs: $60,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $60,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $120,000 (TOTAL)
- Demolition: $37,500 (MARKET ST NORTH), $37,500 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $75,000 (TOTAL)
- Total: Site Acquisition: $509,300 (MARKET ST NORTH), $438,500 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $947,800 (TOTAL)

**Construction**

- Office Shell: $690,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $840,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $1,530,000 (TOTAL)
- Retail Shell: $467,500 (MARKET ST NORTH), $385,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $852,500 (TOTAL)
- Office Tenant Improvements: $287,500 (MARKET ST NORTH), $350,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $637,500 (TOTAL)
- Retail Tenant Improvements: $170,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $140,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $310,000 (TOTAL)
- Surface Parking & On-Sites: $83,750 (MARKET ST NORTH), $87,500 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $171,250 (TOTAL)
- Total: Construction: $1,696,750 (MARKET ST NORTH), $1,802,500 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $3,501,250 (TOTAL)
- Indirect Costs: $521,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $552,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $1,073,000 (TOTAL)

**Total Uses of Funds (Total Cost)**

- $2,729,050 (MARKET ST NORTH), $2,793,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $5,522,050 (TOTAL)

**Total Cost/SF**

- $136.45 (MARKET ST NORTH), $133.00 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $134.68 (TOTAL)

### Potential Funding Sources

- Capitalized Value of Leased Space
  - Retail Rental Income: $102,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $34,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $136,000 (TOTAL)
  - Office Net Rental Income: $45,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $0 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $45,000 (TOTAL)
  - Total: $147,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $34,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $201,000 (TOTAL)
  - Capitalization Rate: 10.0% (MARKET ST NORTH), 10.0% (MARKET ST SOUTH), 10.0% (TOTAL)
  - 75% of Estimated Capitalized Value: $1,102,500 (MARKET ST NORTH), $630,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $1,732,500 (TOTAL)
- UL Lease: $525,000 (MARKET ST NORTH), $1,050,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $1,575,000 (TOTAL)
- Capital Fund Raising: $0 (MARKET ST NORTH), $0 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $0 (TOTAL)
- SEDC Contribution: $0 (MARKET ST NORTH), $0 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $0 (TOTAL)
- CDBG/Sec.108: $0 (MARKET ST NORTH), $0 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $0 (TOTAL)
- Other: $0 (MARKET ST NORTH), $0 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $0 (TOTAL)

**Total Potential Sources of Funds**

- $1,627,500 (MARKET ST NORTH), $1,680,000 (MARKET ST SOUTH), $3,307,500 (TOTAL)

**Excess (Shortage) of Funding**

- ($1,101,550) (MARKET ST NORTH), ($1,113,000) (MARKET ST SOUTH), ($2,214,550) (TOTAL)

Causby & Company/Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.

July 1995
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Curl Building Rehabilitation Development Program</th>
<th>OFFICE/RETAIL 4100 Block Market Street</th>
<th>PARKING AREA 4200 Block Market Street</th>
<th>MORROW BUILDING Building/Lot Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>22,000 SF</td>
<td>14,100 SF</td>
<td>36,100 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Area</td>
<td>6,000 SF</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>6,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Area</td>
<td>23,700 SF</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>23,700 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>29,700 SF</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>29,700 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL Leased Area</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>21,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surface Parking Spaces</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area Dimensions</td>
<td>236' x 150'</td>
<td>100' x 141'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio (1/1,000)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses of Funds**

| Site Assemblage                                          | $1,034,000                             | $141,000                               | $1,175,000                      |
| Residential Site Acquisition (2 Units)                  | $200,000                               | $0                                     | $200,000                        |
| Residential Relocation (2 Units)                         | $40,000                                | $0                                     | $40,000                         |
| Total Site Acquisition                                  | $1,274,000                             | $141,000                               | $1,415,000                      |

| Office Shell Renovation                                  | $857,000                               | $0                                     | $857,000                        |
| Retail Shell Renovation                                  | $217,000                               | $0                                     | $217,000                        |
| Office Tenant Improvements                               | $592,500                               | $0                                     | $592,500                        |
| Retail Tenant Improvements                               | $120,000                               | $0                                     | $120,000                        |
| Surface Parking                                         | $65,000                                | $41,250                                | $106,250                        |
| Total: Construction                                      | $1,851,500                             | $41,250                                | $1,892,750                      |

| Indirect Costs                                           | $555,000                               | $12,000                                | $567,000                        |

**Total Uses of Funds (Total Cost)**<br>
Total: $3,680,500<br>
Total Cost/SF: $123.92<br>

**Potential Funding Sources**

| Capitalized Value of Leased Space                        | $72,000                                | $0                                     | $72,000                         |
| Office Rental Income                                    | $27,000                                | $0                                     | $27,000                         |
| Total Capitalization Rate                                | 10.0%                                  | 10.0%                                  | 10.0%                           |
| 75% of Estimated Capitalized Value                      | $74,500                                | $0                                     | $74,500                         |

| UL Lease                                                | $1,575,000                             | $0                                     | $1,575,000                      |
| Capital Fund Raising                                    | $0                                     | $0                                     | $0                              |
| SEDC Contribution                                       | $0                                     | $0                                     | $0                              |
| CDBG/Sec.106                                           | $0                                     | $0                                     | $0                              |
| UL Properties Net Sale Proceeds                         | $95,600                                | $0                                     | $95,600                         |
| Other                                                   | $0                                     | $0                                     | $0                              |

**Total Potential Sources of Funds**<br>$2,413,100<br>

**Excess (Shortage) of Funding**<br>$(1,267,400) $(194,250) $(1,461,650)
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#### EXISTING URBAN LEAGUE PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Data</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition/Residential</td>
<td>$100,000/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Costs Res/Com</td>
<td>$20,000/Unit or Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition/Commercial</td>
<td>$15.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition/Sitework</td>
<td>$37,500/Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Shell</td>
<td>$60.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Shell</td>
<td>$55.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>$25.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>$20.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking &amp; On-Sites</td>
<td>$1,250/Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Parking</td>
<td>$5,500/Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>30.0% of Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rental Income/Operating Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental Income</td>
<td>$15.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental (NNN)</td>
<td>$12.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Operating Expense</td>
<td>($5.00)/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization Rate</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interim Lease Area Requirement</td>
<td>21,000/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Lease Rate</td>
<td>$12.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months Interim Lease Costs *</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 UL Est. Mortgage Balance *</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CALIFORNIA CURL BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Data</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Land Value</td>
<td>$1,034,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Land Value</td>
<td>$34.81/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Value</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Value</td>
<td>$10.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition/Residential</td>
<td>$100,000/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Relocation Costs</td>
<td>$20,000/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Shell Renovations</td>
<td>$36.16/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Shell Renovations</td>
<td>$36.16/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>$25.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>$20.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking &amp; On-Sites</td>
<td>$1,250/Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>30.0% of Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rental Income/Operating Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental Income</td>
<td>$15.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental (NNN)</td>
<td>$12.00/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Operating Expense</td>
<td>($5.00)/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization Rate</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Lease Area Requirement</td>
<td>0/SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Included here for informational purposes, not included in the analysis.*
D. Implementation Strategy

As stated previously, the consultant team, SEDC, and the Urban League identified Scheme B, the lower-density alternative for the existing site, as the preferred scheme for a new Urban League facility.

The preferred scheme yields a total of 41,000 SF of building area, consisting of a 21,000-SF office building with ground-floor retail on the south side of Market Street and a 20,000-SF mixed-use development of retail and office space on the north side of Market Street. KMA estimated approximate financing gaps of $1.1 million for the south side and $1.1 million for the north side, or a total of about $2.2 million.

This figure exceeds the gap estimate for Scheme C, the California Curl Building rehabilitation (about $1.5 million). However, the selected scheme enjoys an advantage over the California Curl scheme in that it can be developed in phases.

The preferred scheme also represents the appropriate private re-use of the Urban League properties in the event that the League ultimately selected an alternative off-site location. It combines neighborhood-serving office and retail uses in distinct configurations, with adequate off-street parking, and in conformance with the design guidelines for the corridor. While the Urban League’s anchor tenancy is a strong plus for proceeding with the development, it is also conceivable that SEDC could acquire some or all of the property and sponsor a comparable project without the League.

This section presents KMA’s recommended approach to financing and development of the proposed project.

(1) Structure

In KMA’s view, the preferred method for implementation of the project is a sale/leaseback structure with a private developer. This structure has several advantages:

- It minimizes the risk exposure for the Urban League, particularly in terms of cost overruns and lease-up of speculative space.
It results in a fully taxable development, despite the Urban League’s tax-exempt status.

KMA recognizes the Urban League’s strong desire to retain fee simple ownership of its facility. An alternative approach, therefore, would involve a "build-to-suit" contract with a private developer for the new facility on the south block. At the same time, the League could sell the north block for private development, while retaining a participation in future project cash flow.

The financial feasibility and potential absorption for the project would be greatly enhanced if the League were successful in attracting a second major anchor use.

The Urban League will need to work cooperatively with SEDC to: assemble the total development site; define the ultimate product mix and phasing; and market the development opportunity to the private sector.

(2) Funding

As noted above, the first phase of the project would require about $1.1 million in funding from as-yet unidentified public and private sources.

This estimate assumes that conventional debt of about $1.7 million can be secured based on the projected income from retail and office tenants, as well as the Urban League. KMA recommends that the Urban League immediately enter into discussions with its existing lender, as well as other lenders interested in fulfilling Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) obligations in the community.

(3) Phasing

KMA recommends that the Urban League initially proceed with the south block development only. There are two principal reasons for this recommendation. During construction, the League may attempt to consolidate its operations on the north block in order to minimize its leasing costs for interim replacement space. Secondly, economic conditions for the north block project may improve by the time the south block project is complete.
Market Street Revitalization

In designing an implementation strategy for the Urban League’s facility, it is important not to overlook SEDC’s goals for the overall revitalization of the Market Street corridor.

It is in SEDC’s best interests that the Urban League project fulfill two specific objectives:

- Generate new tax increment; and
- Serve as a catalyst for attracting new development and investment to the corridor.

With respect to the first objective, we recommend that the Urban League and SEDC consider structures for the proposed project that would maximize tax increment generation.

With respect to the second objective, the major opportunities to attract new uses to the corridor concurrent with the Urban League’s south block project will be the north block development and future re-use of the California Curl Building. While the Urban League requires assistance and cooperation from SEDC to implement its south block project, SEDC will need the participation of the Urban League to find ways to implement the redevelopment of the north block at the soonest possible date.
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Residents’ Questionnaire

Social Analysis
Urban League Feasibility Study
Mount Hope/Helix Heights
Resident's Questionnaire

The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to vitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number you wish to be contacted for further comment.

Community:
What type businesses are most needed in your community? ALL TYPES

What type services are most needed in your community? DINING, ENTERTAINMENT (MOVIES)

Family Businesses

What are the most serious problems in your community? LACK OF BUSINESS/FINANCE

What are the most valuable assets in your community? HUMAN RESOURCE (YOUTH)

How far do you travel for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food/Grocery Shopping</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Financial Services</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education or training classes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto repair services</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining out</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline for automobiles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? N/D. If yes, please describe:

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community? N/A

Other comments:

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Note: For Spanish translation, call Chandra Clady, at SEDC, 236-7345
Mount Hope/Helix Heights
Resident’s Questionnaire

The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:

What type of businesses are most needed in your community? Grocery store

What type of services are most needed in your community? Recycling bins

What are the most serious problems in your community? Dirty yards & streets, cars speeding in residential areas, speed bumps needed

What are the most valuable assets in your community? True Club, landscaping of parks on Boundary

How far do you travel for the following:

Food/Grocery Shopping 5 mi
Banking/Financial Services 5 mi
Education or training classes 3 mi
Recreation 10 to 15 mi
Auto repair services 2 to 5 mi
Other

B. Urban League:

Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? No. If yes, please describe.

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community? We have never used your services. We don’t really have any knowledge of what services you offer.

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)

The field across the street on Boundary next to Dennis V. Allen need to be put to use. Maybe baseball field or recreation activity for children to keep them away from gangs.

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atención: Si Usted necesita más información en el Español, llámese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
Mount Hope/Heux Heights
Resident's Questionnaire

The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:
What type of businesses are most needed in your community? 
- Super-market, drug store, discount department store, building supply (Home Depot),
- A good Deli @ Gateway Center

What type of services are most needed in your community?
- Lack of convenient services

What are the most serious problems in your community?
- Stable community

How far do you travel for the following:

Food/Grocery Shopping
Business Services
Banking/Financial Services
Medical Care
Education or training classes
Health & Fitness
Recreation
Dining out
Auto repair services
Gasoline for automobiles
Other

B. Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? Yes. If yes, please describe:
- Met with John Johnson to discuss mission of S Dul and to explore appointment to the Board of Directors.

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community?
- Positive presence in the community that includes employment, training, and social work interactions.

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atencion: Si Usted necesita mas informacion en el Espanol, llamese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
Mount Hope/Helix Heights
Resident’s Questionnaire

The Southeaster Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:
What type of businesses are most needed in your community? Quality Restaurant

What type of services are most needed in your community? Cleaning, Vacation Property

What are the most serious problems in your community? Absentee homeowners

What are the most valuable assets in your community? Gateway Center

How far do you travel for the following:
Food/Grocery Shopping 2 miles
Banking/Financial Services 1 mile
Education or training classes 3 miles
Recreation 5 miles
Auto repair services 3 miles
Other ________

B. Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? No. If yes, please describe:

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community?

???

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)

most services offered are for young people, welfare recipients and ex-offenders. Unemployed sole proprietors are not included.

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atención: Si Usted necesita más información en el Español, llámese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:
What type of businesses are most needed in your community? Gas Station
What type of services are most needed in your community? Community Center for Kids
What are the most serious problems in your community? Drug Dealers, Gangs, Speed Bumps, We need Brighter Lights.
What are the most valuable assets in your community? Home Owners

How far do you travel for the following:
Food/Grocery Shopping 2-6 miles
Banking/Financial Services 10 miles
Education or training classes
Recreation
Auto repair services 8 miles
Other
Business Services 10 miles
Medical Care 2 miles
Health & Fitness
Dining out
Gasoline for automobiles 10 miles

B. Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? NO. If yes, please describe:

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community? They help at-risk people get a better education, feed kids lunches during the summer, help a person get a job.

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atención: Si Usted necesita más información en el Español, llámese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
Mount Hope/Helix Heights
Resident’s Questionnaire

The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:
What type of businesses are most needed in your community? 

What type of services are most needed in your community? 

What are the most serious problems in your community? 

What are the most valuable assets in your community?

How far do you travel for the following:
Food/Grocery Shopping 7-10 miles 
Banking/Financial Services 1 mile 
Education or training classes 3 miles 
Recreation 
Auto repair services 1 mile 
Business Services 7-8 miles 
Medical Care 1 mile 
Health & Fitness 7 miles 
Dining out 8-10 miles 
Gasoline for automobiles 1-2 miles

B. Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? [ ] Yes [ ] No. If yes, please describe:

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community?

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)

Better lighting on streets.

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atención: Si Usted necesita más información en el Español, llámese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
Mount Hope/Helix Heights
Resident's Questionnaire

The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing effort to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:
What type of businesses are most needed in your community? [gas station, shopping center]

What type of services are most needed in your community? [recreation for children]

What are the most serious problems in your community? [cracks in housing]

What are the most valuable assets in your community? [residents' organization]

How far do you travel for the following:

Food/Grocery Shopping [1/2 mi]
Banking/Financial Services [3 mi]
Education or training classes [2 mi]
Recreation [5 mi]
Auto repair services [8 mi]
Other

Business Services [25 mi]
Medical Care [15 mi]
Health & Fitness
Dining out [1 mi]
Gasoline for automobiles [7/2 mi]

B. Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? [No] If yes, please describe:

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community?

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)
[Would like to know more about Urban League benefits] Would you please send out flyers to neighborhood residents? Thank you

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atención: Si Ud. necesita más información en el Español, llámese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
Mount Hope/Helix Heights
Resident’s Questionnaire

The Southeastern Economic Development Corporation (SEDC) has commissioned a study to assist in its ongoing efforts to revitalize the Market Street Corridor of the Mount Hope Community. This study includes a facilities review of the San Diego Urban League. As a resident of the area, your opinions are important in all planning efforts.

Please take a few minutes to let us know what you think. All questions are optional. Give your name and telephone number if you wish to be contacted for further comment.

A. Community:
What type of businesses are most needed in your community? Large Footmarket

What type of services are most needed in your community? Jobs, for health

What are the most serious problems in your community? Drugs, Homelessness

What are the most valuable assets in your community? Gateway

How far do you travel for the following:
Food/Grocery Shopping
Banking/Financial Services
Education or training classes
Recreation
Auto repair services
Other

Name: Rosal L. Mullen - 263-2891

B. Urban League:
Have you had any contact with the San Diego Urban League within the past year? Yes. If yes, please describe:

What are the benefits of the Urban League in the Market Street Corridor/Mt. Hope Community? They have some classes will need to check it out

C. Other comments (Please attach additional page if necessary)
It would be nice if they could get into the Price Club, but you have to pay a fee of 125 and I can’t afford that I am on a fixed income

Please Complete and Return By June 14, 1995
To: SEDC, 930 Gateway Center Way, San Diego, CA 92102

Atención: Si Usted necesita más información en el Español, llámese a Chandra Clady a 236-7345
FACILITY REQUIREMENTS QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix B
Facility Requirements Questionnaire

Social Analysis
Urban League Feasibility Study
Urban League Facility Requirements

Questionnaire

Department/Office: Youth & Family Services

1. General Information:
   Department Head: AL WILLIAMS
   Title: DIRECTOR

   To whom does department head report? CEO John Johnson
   Office hours: 8-5

   Responsibilities of the department: OVERSEE and SUPERVISE programs

   Departments/offices with whom you now share space: NO ONE

   Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily: 
   Weekly: 

B. Staff:
   Total number: 40
   Full time: 25
   Part time: 6
   Contracted: 9
   Volunteers: 3

   Management Employees: 5
   Secretarial/Clerical: 2
   Other: 

   Residential Zip Codes represented: 

C. Type of activities the department conducts on site: COUNSELING, TRAINING, COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES, FORUMS, PUBLIC MEETINGS

   Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community? YES - COUNSELING
   If yes, please describe: REFERRAL SERVICES - CHILD DEVELOPMENT / POVERTY AID

D. Total number of programs or projects within the department: 9, NINE

   List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day.

   1. Information & Education, 3 yrs
   2. Education Now, 5 yrs
   3. AFRICAN REFUGEE
   4. Single Parent Services
   5. Family Self Sufficiency
   6. Family Services, 5 yrs
   7. HIV/STD
   8. Child Therapy
   9. Project Truth (AIDS)
   10. 

   Program Length
   Daily Average
   School & Community Base
   School & Community Base
   ON-SITE, COMMUNITY 3-5 PER
   ON-SITE, COMMUNITY 3-PER
   COMMUNITY OUTREACH
   ON-SITE, COMMUNITY BASE
   ON-SITE (groups weekly)
   ON-SITE (groups weekly)
   ON-SITE (groups weekly)
   ON-SITE (groups weekly)

   4-10 people
Urban League Facility Questionnaire

E. Clientele:
Average number of clients served per day ___ or week ______ or month ______ or year ___.
Maximum number present at same time ___.
Age Range ___-___.
Income range ___.
Percent bringing young children to UL ___.
Percent employed ___.
Range of educational levels ___.
Average travel time to UL ___.
Areas of residence (Zip Codes) ___.

Ethnicity: ___% African American ___%
Hispanic ___
African Refugee ___
Asian ___
Amer. Indian ___
White ___
Others ___

F. Offices and Conference Rooms:
Number of separate offices used by the department ___.
Number of staff desks ___.
How many would need to be seated? ___.
Average waiting time ___.
How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office ___.
How many would need to be seated? ___.
Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc) ___.

G. Training/Work Rooms:
How often does department use training rooms? ___.
Number in attendance ___.
Equipment requirements ___.

H. Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)
Storage/supply closet ___
Copy room ___
Library ___
Research room ___
Work counter ___
Lounge ___
Kitchen ___
Mail room ___
Other ___

I. Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)
Copy machine ___
Fax machine ___
Shredder ___
Computer ___
Printer ___
Phone ___
File cabinet ___
Other ___

J. Describe department’s special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
K. With which offices or departments could you share space? None

L. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

Program Additions                      Staff Additions (Net)

5-10 new programs                      25 new staff

Program Deletions                      Staff Deletions (Net)

None proposed                           None

M. How would you rate your department’s effectiveness? Poor____ Good____ Excellent ______

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities?

Physical space and staff additions

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department?

Service areas

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area? ______

Why? Remain history

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community?

Social services, teen post

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire

Thank you for your assistance!

Date 6-1-95

MHW/5/95

Al Williams PhD
Urban League Facility Requirements

Questionnaire

Department/Office: **URBAN HOUSING CORPORATION**

A. General Information:
- **Department Head**: John W. Johnson
- **Title**: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
- **To whom does department head report?**: BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF URBAN HOUSING CORP.
- **Office hours**: 8:00-5:00
- **Responsibilities of the department**: To develop housing
- **Departments/offices with whom you share space**: Fund Development, Fiscal A/C., Receptionist, Executive Assist., African Outreach, Board Room
- **Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily**: ALL
- **Weekly**: ALL

B. Staff:
- **Total number**: 1
  - Full time: 1
  - Part time: 0
  - Contracted: 0
  - Volunteers: 4
- **Management Employees**: 1
  - Secretarial/Clerical: 0
  - Other: 0
- **Residential Zip Codes represented**: 92119

C. Type of activities the department conducts on site: **HOUSING PLANNING**

Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community? _NO_

If yes please describe.

D. Total number of programs or projects within the department: _1_

List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Details</th>
<th>Program Length</th>
<th>Daily Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Housing Initiatives</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Clientele:
Average number of clients served per day ___0___ or week ___0___ or month ___0___ or year ___0___.
Maximum number present at same time ___0___ Basis on-site at same time ___0___
Age Range ___0___ Income range ___0___ Percent at children ___0___
Percent bringing young children to UL ___0___ Age range of children ___0___
Percent employed ___0___ Sample occupations ___0___
Range of educational levels ___0___
Average travel time to UL ___0___ Means of Transportation to UL ___0___
Areas of residence (Zip Codes) ___0___

Ethnicity: ___% African American ___% Hispanic ___% African Refugee ___% Asian ___% Amer. Indian ___% White
Others

F. Offices and Conference Rooms:
Number of separate offices used by the department ___0___ Number of staff desks ___0___
How often does department have visitors requiring a reception area? ___0___ How many would need to be seated? ___0___
Average waiting time ___0___
How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office? ___0___ How many would need to be seated? ___0___
Average length of meetings ___0___
Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc.) ___0___

G. Training/Work Rooms:
How often does department use training rooms? ___0___ Number in attendance ___0___
Equipment requirements ___0___

H. Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)
Storage/supply closet ___0___ Copy room ___0___ Library ___0___ Research room ___0___
Work counter ___0___ Lounge ___0___ Kitchen ___0___ Mail room ___0___
Other

I. Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)
Copy machine ___0___ Fax machine ___0___ Shredder ___0___ Computer ___0___ Printer ___0___ Phone ___0___ File cabinet ___0___
Other

J. Describe department's special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
K. With which offices or departments could you share space? [HANDWRITTEN: Food Developer]

L. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Additions</th>
<th>Staff Additions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Deletions</th>
<th>Staff Deletions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. How would you rate your department’s effectiveness? Poor [ ] Good [X] Excellent [ ]

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities?
STAFF & FUNDS TO HIRE STAFF

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department? [ ]

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area? [ ] Yes [ ]
Why? CENTRAL LOCATION

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community? [ ] ALL MH MARKET; RESTAURANTS; CLEANERS; OTHER SERVICE BUSINESSES.

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire [ ]
[ ] Other comments: [ ]

Thank you for your assistance!
Urban League Facility Requirements

Questionnaire

Department/Office: Employment & Training

A. General Information:
Department Head: BARBARA WEBB  Title: INTERIM DIRECTOR

To whom does department head report? PRESIDENT & CEO  Office hours: 8 AM - 5 PM

Responsibilities of the department: PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT & TRG PROGRAMS AND A WALK-IN JOB BANK

Departments/offices with whom you now share space: NONE

Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily: ADMINISTRATION, ACCOUNTING, YOUTH & FAMILY SERVICES

Weekly: SAME

B. Staff:
Total number: 17  Full time: 6  Part time: 3  Contracted: 7  Volunteers: 1

Management Employees: 2  Secretarial/Clerical: 1  Other: 14

Residential Zip Codes represented:
91977  92114  92116  92123  92139
92105  91942  92104  92110  92139

C. Type of activities the department conducts on site: EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING

Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community? YES

If yes, please describe: EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING, CAREER FAIR, JOB BANK

D. Total number of programs or projects within the department: 5

List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day.

1. COMPUTER TRAINING (ADULTS)  Program Length: 12-16 WEEKS  Daily Average: 20
2. COMPUTER TRAINING (YOUTH)  Program Length: 12 WEEKS  Daily Average: 15
3. COMPUTER TRAINING (LAID-OFF WORKERS)  Program Length: 12 WEEKS  Daily Average: 15
4. REFUGEE INDIV. & CUSTOMIZED TRAINING  Program Length: 12-16 WEEKS  Daily Average: 18
5. SDUL ANNUAL CAREER FAIR  Program Length: PLANNING TIME IS APPROX. 3  ONSITE WORKING
6. 28 WEEKS FOR ONE ONSITE WORKING
7. DAY EVENT ON PROJECT DAILY
8. 9.
9. 10.
E. Clientele:
Average number of clients served per day ______ or week ______ or month ______ or year ______.
Maximum number present at same time ______ or site at same time ______
Age Range 17 - 55+ Income range $0 - $15,000 (AVG) Percent with children ________glass 60%
Percent bringing young children to UL ______ Age range of children ______
Percent employed ______ Sample occupations FAST FOOD, ENTRY-LEVEL CLERICAL, BLUE COLLAR, PROFESSIONAL
Range of educational levels 8TH GRADE TO COLLEGE DEGREE
Average travel time to UL APPROX. 25 MINUTES Means of Transportation to UL BUS AND CAR PRIMARILY
Areas of residence (Zip Codes) ALL AREAS OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Ethnicity: % African American % Hispanic % African Refugee % Asian % Amer. Indian % White
Others

F. Offices and Conference Rooms:
Number of separate offices used by the department 2 Number of staff desks 8
How often does department have visitors requiring a reception area? DAILY
How many would need to be seated? 3-5 AT ONE TIME Average waiting time 5-10 MINUTES
How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office WEEKLY (2-3 TIMES)
How many would need to be seated? 7 - 15 Average length of meetings ______
Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc) = ALL OF THESE ITEMS AND COMPUTER
EQUIPMENT.

G. Training/Work Rooms:
How often does department use training rooms? DAILY
Number in attendance APPROX. 20 Equipment requirements WALLBOARD, TV, VCR, COMPUTERS

H. Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)
Storage/supply closet Copy room Library Research room
Work counter Lounge Kitchen Mail room
Other 1 - 2 CONFERENCE ROOMS

I. Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)
Copy machine Fax machine Shredder Computer 30+ Printer 10+ Phone 10+ File cabinet 10+
Other

J. Describe department’s special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
K. With which offices or departments could you share space?  

L. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Additions</th>
<th>Staff Additions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT IS EXPECTED THAT 1-2 ADDITIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS WILL BE ADDED OF THE SAME AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME AND SIZE.</td>
<td>APPROXIMATELY 2-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Deletions</th>
<th>Staff Deletions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. How would you rate your department's effectiveness?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities?

LACK OF SPACE, OUTDATED EQUIPMENT, FAULTY ELECTRICAL WIRING NECESSITATING EQUIPMENT MONITORING SO THAT NO MORE THAN A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF EQUIPMENT ARE RUNNING SIMULTANEOUSLY.

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department?

ALL OF THE ABOVE, WITH THE EMPHASIS ON SPACE.

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area?  

Why?

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community?

EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire  

Thank you for your assistance!
Urban League Facility Requirements

Questionnaire

Department/Office: EDUCATION

A. General Information:
Department Head: None
Title:
To whom does department head report? CEO
Office hours: 8:00 - 5:00
Responsibilities of the department: To conduct education initiatives for agency
Departments/offices with whom you now share space: Youth & Family Services
Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily: Youth & Family Services, Administration
Weekly:

B. Staff:
Total number: 3
Full time: 3
Part time: 0
Contracted: 1
Volunteers: 10
Management Employees: 1
Secretarial/Clerical: 1
Other:
Residential Zip Codes represented:

C. Type of activities the department conducts on site: Meetings

Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community? No

If yes, please describe:

D. Total number of programs or projects within the department: 2

List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day:

1. Charter
   Program Length: Indefinite
   Daily Average: 3 h/s

2. Golden Pyramid
   Program Length: Annually
   Daily Average: 2 h/s

3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
E. Clientele:
- Average number of clients served per day _______ or week_________ or month_________ or year______
- Maximum number present at same time _______ Average on site at same time ______
- Age Range ______ Income range ______ Percent with children ______
- Percent bringing young children to UL ______ Age range of children ______
- Percent employed ______ Sample occupations ______
- Range of educational levels ______
- Average travel time to UL ______ Means of Transportation to UL ______
- Areas of residence (Zip Codes) ________________________________

Ethnicity: _____% African American _____% Hispanic _____% African Refugee _____% Asian _____% Amer. Indian _____% White
Others ________________________________

F. Offices and Conference Rooms:
- Number of separate offices used by the department ________
- Number of staff desks _______
- How often does department have visitors requiring a reception area? DAILY
- How many would need to be seated? ________ Average waiting time ______
- How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office? WEEKLY
- How many would need to be seated? ________ Average length of meetings ______
- Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc) ________________________________

G. Training/Work Rooms:
- How often does department use training rooms? NONE
- Number in attendance ______ Equipment requirements ________________________________

H. Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)
- Storage/supply closet ______ Copy room ______ Library ______ Research room ______
- Work counter ______ Lounge ______ Kitchen ______ Mail room ______

Other ________________________________

I. Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)
- Copy machine ______ Fax machine ______ Shredder ______ Computer ______ Printer ______ Phone ______ File cabinet ______
- Other ________________________________

J. Describe department's special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
K. With which offices or departments could you share space? **YES AND BOARD ROOM SPACE**

L. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Additions</th>
<th>Staff Additions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Deletions</th>
<th>Staff Deletions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONE</strong></td>
<td><strong>NONE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. How would you rate your department’s effectiveness? Poor __ _ Good __ _ Excellent __

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities?

**SPACE AND FUNDING DEFICIENCIES**

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department?

**UNKNOWN**

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area? **YES**

Why? **CENTRAL LOCATION**

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community? **CONSUMER SERVICES**

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire **John W. Johnson** Date **6/3/85**

Thank you for your assistance!
Urban League Facility Requirements

Questionnaire

Department/Office: DEVELOPMENT ADMIN.

A. General Information:

Department Head: ANITA HIBSH
Title: DIRECTOR OF FUND DEVELOPMENT

To whom does department head report? JOHN JOHNSON
Office hours: 8 - 5

Responsibilities of the department: RESTRICTED & UNRESTRICTED FUND RAISING EFFORTS INCLUDE:

Departments/offices with whom you now share space: EXECUTIVE AST. TO PRESIDENT 

Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily: ADMIN, FINANCE, "

Weekly: E & T, YFS, & Education:

B. Staff:

Total number: 1
Full time: 1
Part time: ______
Contracted: ______
Volunteers: ______

Management Employees: 1
Secretarial/Clerical: ______
Other: ________________________

Residential Zip Codes represented: 92104

C. Type of activities the department conducts on site:

Research, grant writer meetings, with small groups, search grants, large mailings, assembly, membership renewals, small board committee meetings

Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community? No

If yes, please describe. __________________________________________

D. Total number of programs or projects within the department: N/A

List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Length</th>
<th>Daily Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban League Facility Questionnaire

E. Clientele:
Average number of clients served per day _______ or week ______ or month _______ or year _______.
Maximum number present at same time ____________________________ Average on site at same time ____________________________
Age Range___________________________ Income range___________________________ Percent with children___________________________
Percent bringing young children to UL ____________________________ Age range of children ____________________________
Percent employed ____________________________ Sample occupations ____________________________
Range of educational levels ____________________________
Average travel time to UL ____________________________ Means of Transportation to UL ____________________________
Areas of residence (Zip Codes) ____________________________

Ethnicity: ___ % African American ___ % Hispanic ___ % African Refugee ___ % Asian ___ % Amer. Indian ___ % White
Others ____________________________

F. Offices and Conference Rooms:
Number of separate offices used by the department _______. Number of staff desks _______.
How often does department have visitors requiring a reception area? 2 - 3 times per week.
How many would need to be seated? 1 - 2. Average waiting time ______ min.
How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office 2 - 3 times weekly.
How many would need to be seated? Up to 8. Average length of meetings ______ minutes.
Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc) Phone, etc.

G. Training/Work Rooms:
How often does department use training rooms? N/A.
Number in attendance ____________________________ Equipment requirements ____________________________

H. Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)
Storage/supply closet ____________________________ Copy room ____________________________ Library ____________________________ Research room ____________________________
Work counter ____________________________ Lounge ____________________________ Kitchen ____________________________ Mail room ____________________________

Other ____________________________

I. Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)
Copy machine ___ Fax machine ___ Shredder ___ Computer ___ Printer ___ Phone ___ File cabinet ___
Other ____________________________

J. Describe department's special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
Would like adequate power supply + outlets at desk space for computer + printer. Conference space for 3 - 8 people accessible.
K. With which offices or departments could you share space? **Administrative area most compatible but portion requires privacy at times, not possible now.**

L. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Additions</th>
<th>Staff Additions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower membership</td>
<td>½ time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>½ time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writer</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Deletions</th>
<th>Staff Deletions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. How would you rate your department's effectiveness? Poor Good Excellent

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities? **Lack of support staff.**

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department? **Increase storage space & add privacy.**

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area? **Remain**

Why? **History of service & access to clientele.**

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community?

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire: **Alice Hubbard**

Date 6/9/95

Thank you for your assistance!
Urban League Facility Requirements

Questionnaire

Department/Office: ____________________________

A. General Information:

Department Head: John W. Johnson

Title: Pres & CEO

To whom does department head report? BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Office hours: 8:00 to 5:00

Responsibilities of the department: ADMINISTER THE AGENCY

Departments/offices with whom you now share space:
- FUND DEVELOPMENT
- FISCAL MGT.
- RECEPTIONIST
- EXECUTIVE ASS'T
- AFRICAN OUTREACH
- BOARD ROOM

Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily: ALL

Weekly: ALL

B. Staff:

Total number: 7

Full time: 7

Part time: ______

Contracted: 2

Volunteers: N/A

Management Employees: 4

Secretarial/Clerical: 3

Other: ______

Residential Zip Codes represented:
- 92102
- 92103
- 92105
- 92119
- 92114

C. Type of activities the department conducts on site: MEETINGS ONLY & ADJ. WORK

Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community? ANNUALLY AGENCY HAS XMAS EXHIBITION. WILL BE REPLACED WITH "HOLIDAY AT THE MUSEUM."

If yes, please describe: ____________________________

D. Total number of programs or projects within the department: PRES & CEO AVG. APP'S

List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program #</th>
<th>Program Length</th>
<th>Daily Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1 HR</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban League Facility Questionnaire

E. Clientele:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average number of clients served per day</th>
<th>or week</th>
<th>or month</th>
<th>or year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number present at same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average on site at same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range: 21-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income range: W自C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent bringing young children to UL:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range of children: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent employed: all Sample occupations: EXECUTIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample occupations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of educational levels: HS TO COLLEGE GRADUATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average travel time to UL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Transportation to UL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of residence (Zip Codes):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>%African American</th>
<th>%Hispanic</th>
<th>%African Refugee</th>
<th>%Asian</th>
<th>%Amer. Indian</th>
<th>% White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Offices and Conference Rooms:

| Number of separate offices used by the department: | 5 |
| Number of staff desks: | 10 |
| How often does department have visitors requiring a reception area: | DAILY |
| How many would need to be seated: | 4-5 |
| Average waiting time: | 5 HRS |
| How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office: | 1 PER WEEK |
| How many would need to be seated: | 5-10 |
| Average length of meetings: | 2 HRS |
| Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc): | ALL |

G. Training/Work Rooms:

| How often does department use training rooms: | N/A |
| Number in attendance: | |
| Equipment requirements: | |

H. Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)

| Storage/supply closet | Copy room | Library | Research room | N/A |
| Work counter | Lounge | Kitchen | Mail room |
| Other: | | | |

I. Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy machine</th>
<th>Fax machine</th>
<th>Shredder</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>File cabinet</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

J. Describe department’s special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
L. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

Program Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Staff Additions (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Director</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Director</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Deletions


M. How would you rate your department's effectiveness? Poor ___ Good ___ Excellent ___

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities?

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department?

INCREASE STAFFING

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area? YES

Why? FOR THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE MT. HOPE WILL BE CRUCIAL FOR THE URBAN LEAGUE'S CONSTITUENCY

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community?

CLEAN FOOD; AM/PM TYPE MARKET; SMALL SERVICE BUSINESSES

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire: JOHN W. JOHNSON Date 6-3-95

Thank you for your assistance!
Department/Office: Accounting & Personnel Dept

General Information:
Department Head: Evangeline Horvath-Thomas
Title: Fiscal Manager
To whom does department head report? President & CEO
Office hours: 8:30 to 5:30
Responsibilities of the department: Budgets, financial reports and human resource
Departments/offices with whom you now share space: Executive Office
Departments/Offices with whom you interact daily: Executive office, program directors & employees

Weekly

Staff:
Total number: 3
Full time: 3
Part time: 
Contracted: 
Volunteers: 
Management Employees: 1
Secretarial/Clerical: 2
Other: 
Residential Zip Codes represented: 92020, 92114, 92139

Type of activities the department conducts on site: Accounting and Human Resource

Are any events, activities or services conducted specifically for the immediate community?

If yes, please describe.

Total number of programs or projects within the department: N/A

List and indicate length of program and average number of participants per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Daily Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ban League Facility Questionnaire

Clientele: N/A
Average number of clients served per day ___________ or week ___________ or month ___________ or year ___________.
Maximum number present at same time ___________ Average on site at same time ___________.
Age Range ___________ Income range ___________.
Percent bringing young children to UL ___________ Age range of children ___________.
Percent employed ___________ Sample occupations ___________.
Range of educational levels ___________.
Average travel time to UL ___________ Means of Transportation to UL ___________.
Areas of residence (Zip Codes) ___________.

Ethnicity: __ % African American __ % Hispanic __ % African Refugee __ % Asian __ % Amer. Indian __ % White
Others ___________.

Office and Conference Rooms:
Number of separate offices used by the department ___________.
How often does department have visitors requiring a reception area? Infrequently.
How many would need to be seated? ___________.
How often do you have meetings that cannot be accommodated in your office? Once a month.
How many would need to be seated? ___________.
Meeting room requirements (Projector, TV, VCR, Wallboard, Phone, etc) None.

Training/Work Rooms:
How often does department use training rooms? N/A.
Number in attendance ___________.
Equipment requirements ___________.

Special space required by the department: (Check all that are appropriate)
Storage/supply closet __ Copy room __ Library __ Research room __
Work counter __ Lounge __ Kitchen __ Mail room __
Other ___________.

Equipment located in your department: (Check as appropriate)
Copy machine __ Fax machine __ Shredder __ Computer __ Printer __ Phone __ File cabinet __
Other ___________.

Describe department’s special requirements (Display space, electrical outlets etc.)
J. List any Department changes planned or proposed for the next 5 years:

Program Additions

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Staff Additions (Net)

As accounting & personnel continue to expand, would like add one more full time staff member.

Program Deletions

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Staff Deletions (Net)

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

M. How would you rate your department’s effectiveness? Poor_____ Good_____ Excellent √

What is the biggest hinderance or obstacle your department faces in completing its responsibilities?
Not having our computer system networked. Currently all work stations are stand alone.

If given the opportunity, what would you change about your department?
Network computer system

N. Should the Urban League remain in the Mt. Hope community or consider relocating to a different area? ___yes_____

Why? Because it is located in the community which it serves.

O. What type businesses and services do you believe are most needed in the Mt. Hope community?
Social Services, commercial businesses, job training programs.

P. Other comments? Please provide any additional comments on the reverse side.

Q. Person completing questionnaire: Evangeline Horvath-Thomas ___________________________ Date 6/06/95

Thank you for your assistance!
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENTS
CONCEPTS
Appendix C
Preliminary Developments Concepts

Planning Analysis
Urban League Feasibility Study
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT
SCHEME A/SOUTH BLOCK

THIRD FLOOR:
10,136 S.F.

SECOND FLOOR:
18,900 S.F.

FIRST FLOOR:
9,000 S.F.

TOTAL = 38,036
EXHIBIT C-2
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:
SCHEMES A & B/NORTH BLOCK
SCHEME B/SOUTH BLOCK
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

FIRST FLOOR
8,000 SF
TOTAL

FIRST FLOOR
7,000 SF
TOTAL = 21,000 SF
EXHIBIT C-4
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS
SCHEMES A & B/NORTH BLOCK
SCHEME B/SOUTH BLOCK
CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS
RETAIL/OFFICE MARKET CONDITIONS
Appendix D
Retail/Office Market Conditions

Economic Analysis
Urban League Feasibility Study
Table D-1
Southeastern Economic Development Corporation
Urban League Feasibility Study
Survey of Retail and Office Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building SF</th>
<th>Vacant SF</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
<th>Asking Rent/SF</th>
<th>Current Rents</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Yr Built</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47th &amp; Market</td>
<td>34,310</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>NNN</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>212-220 Euclid Ave</td>
<td>28,323</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>NNN</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Euclid Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30th &amp; Market</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>NNN</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Pizza Hut only tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Side of 43rd St</td>
<td>127,650</td>
<td>(Under Construction)</td>
<td>$0.90-$1.50 (1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NNN</td>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>Proposed Lucky Supermarket Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>@ Alpha Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retail Projects:**

**Office Projects:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building SF</th>
<th>Vacant SF</th>
<th>% Vacant</th>
<th>Asking Rent/SF</th>
<th>Current Rents</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Yr Built</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>995 Gateway Center Way</td>
<td>39,878</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gateway Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) KMA estimate.

Source: Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.
Table D-2
Southeastern Economic Development Corporation
Urban League Feasibility Study
Land Sale Comparables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>$/SF</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SWC Market &amp; 32nd St.</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>$10.48</td>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>R&amp;D Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8th St. W. of Palm St.</td>
<td>Aug-92</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>$9.40</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Retail/Office Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NW Market &amp; 47th St.</td>
<td>Mar-89</td>
<td>$730,000</td>
<td>66,549</td>
<td>$10.97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shopping Center Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Market St. W. of 47th St.</td>
<td>Mar-90</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>35,892</td>
<td>$11.14</td>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>Buyer owns adjacent property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1817 Euclid Ave</td>
<td>Nov-92</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>26,572</td>
<td>$28.23</td>
<td>CA-RR</td>
<td>Existing Arco Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4689 Market St.</td>
<td>Dec-91</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>12,284</td>
<td>$22.39</td>
<td>CSF-1</td>
<td>Existing Arco Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals & Averages $2,450,000 170,277  $14.39
### Table D-3

Southeastern Economic Development Corporation  
Urban League Feasibility Study  
Retail Building Sale Comparables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Building SF</th>
<th>Building $/SF</th>
<th>Land SF</th>
<th>Land $/SF</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5065-5085 Logan Avenue</td>
<td>25-Mar-95</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>34,310</td>
<td>$26.23</td>
<td>111,949</td>
<td>$8.04</td>
<td>CT-2</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Euclid Plaza Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>212-220 Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>09-Feb-95</td>
<td>$2,160,000</td>
<td>28,323</td>
<td>$76.26</td>
<td>94,525</td>
<td>$22.85</td>
<td>CSF-2</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Euclid Plaza Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6905 Lisbon Street</td>
<td>31-Aug-94</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>$25.65</td>
<td>22,216</td>
<td>$12.38</td>
<td>CFF-1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Retail/Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2356-58 Reo Drive</td>
<td>30-Mar-93</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>$40.28</td>
<td>41,400</td>
<td>$14.01</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6975 Imperial Avenue</td>
<td>14-Feb-92</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
<td>CSF-1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6375-81 Imperial Avenue</td>
<td>17-Aug-92</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>CSR-3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1719 National Avenue</td>
<td>31-Aug-90</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>$56.60</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>$43.04</td>
<td>BLPDB</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3002-3008 Imperial Avenue</td>
<td>22-Jun-90</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>$21.52</td>
<td>CR15</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Vacant, needs rehab.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals & Averages:**  
Sales Price: $4,575,000  
Building SF: 103,155  
Building $/SF: $44.35  
Land SF: 300,482  
Land $/SF: $15.23  

---

Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.  
6/28/95
### Table D-4

**Southeastern Economic Development Corporation**  
**Urban League Feasibility Study**  
**Office Building Sale Comparables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Building SF</th>
<th>Building $/SF</th>
<th>Land SF</th>
<th>Land $/SF</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>415 Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>07-Feb-94</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>$41.67</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>$8.59</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>City is buyer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>123 Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td>21-Dec-93</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>$71.79</td>
<td>5,625</td>
<td>$24.89</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Asking $.69/SF Gross Buyer owns adjacent property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>950 Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>27-Apr-94</td>
<td>$342,000</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>$57.15</td>
<td>35,719</td>
<td>$9.57</td>
<td>Ct-2</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Vacant, needs rehab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals & Averages**  
- $757,000  
- 14,534  
- $52.08  
- 73,344  
- $10.32
DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC TRENDS
Appendix E
Demographic and Economic Trends

Economic Analysis
Urban League Feasibility Study
Table E-2
Southeastern Economic Development Corporation
Urban League Feasibility Study
1994 Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trade Area</th>
<th>2-Mile Radius</th>
<th>City of San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>116,580</td>
<td>1,164,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>34,480</td>
<td>424,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$20,460</td>
<td>$24,635</td>
<td>$40,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Income</td>
<td>$27,150</td>
<td>$30,722</td>
<td>$49,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$6,935</td>
<td>$9,227</td>
<td>$18,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Population by Ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Trade Area</th>
<th>2-Mile Radius</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Population by Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Trade Area</th>
<th>2-Mile Radius</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 17</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Households by Income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Trade Area</th>
<th>2-Mile Radius</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $34,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 plus</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Mapping Demographics System
Table E-3

Southeastern Economic Development Corporation
Urban League Feasibility Study
Demographic Trends, 1990-1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1990-1994 % Change</th>
<th>Average Annual % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Area</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Mile Radius</td>
<td>112,986</td>
<td>116,580</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1,110,549</td>
<td>1,164,980</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Number of Households** |       |       |                     |                        |
| Trade Area               | 1,515 | 1,573 | 3.8%                | 1.0%                   |
| 2-Mile Radius            | 33,580 | 34,480 | 2.7%         | 0.7%                   |
| City of San Diego        | 406,316 | 424,379 | 4.4%         | 1.1%                   |

| **Median Household Income** |       |       |                     |                        |
| Trade Area                | $18,001 | $20,460 | 13.7%       | 3.4%                   |
| 2-Mile Radius             | $21,950 | $24,635 | 12.2%       | 3.1%                   |
| City of San Diego         | $33,686 | $40,558 | 20.4%       | 5.1%                   |

| **Average Household Income** |       |       |                     |                        |
| Trade Area                 | $23,408 | $27,150 | 16.0%       | 4.0%                   |
| 2-Mile Radius              | $26,740 | $30,722 | 14.9%       | 3.7%                   |
| City of San Diego          | $43,627 | $49,970 | 14.5%       | 3.6%                   |

| **Per Capita Income**     |       |       |                     |                        |
| Trade Area                | $6,024  | $6,935 | 15.1%       | 3.8%                   |
| 2-Mile Radius             | $8,054  | $9,227 | 14.6%       | 3.6%                   |
| City of San Diego         | $16,401 | $18,765 | 14.4%       | 3.6%                   |

Source: Strategic Mapping Demographics System
1990 US Census
Table E-4  
Southeastern Economic Development Corporation  
Urban League Feasibility Study  
Per Capita Retail Spending By Category, City of San Diego, 1990-1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population (1)</strong></td>
<td>1,102,859</td>
<td>1,131,383</td>
<td>1,150,565</td>
<td>1,170,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita Income (2)</strong></td>
<td>$16,401</td>
<td>$17,100</td>
<td>$17,784</td>
<td>$18,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Merchandise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aggregate Sales (3)</strong></td>
<td>$1,018,429,000</td>
<td>$985,516,000</td>
<td>$1,024,472,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Person</td>
<td>$923</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>$890</td>
<td>$892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of PCI</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aggregate Sales (3)</strong></td>
<td>$210,462,857</td>
<td>$234,347,143</td>
<td>$259,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Person</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of PCI</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food &amp; Liquor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aggregate Sales (3)</strong></td>
<td>$1,855,137,143</td>
<td>$2,022,212,857</td>
<td>$2,165,661,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Person</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$1,787</td>
<td>$1,882</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of PCI</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eating &amp; Drinking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aggregate Sales (3)</strong></td>
<td>$1,075,433,000</td>
<td>$1,094,517,000</td>
<td>$1,110,814,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Person</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$967</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>$956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of PCI</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>5.66%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
(1) State Department of Finance  
(2) 1990's estimated came from the 1990 US Census; 1993's estimate came from Strategic Mapping Demographic Services; and 1991 and 1992's PCI are KMA estimates.  
(3) State Board of Equalization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Expenditures as % of PCI</th>
<th>Expenditures per Person</th>
<th>Total Expenditures (000s)</th>
<th>Productivity ($/SF/Yr)</th>
<th>Convenience Retail Space Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$2,065</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Liquor</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>$624</td>
<td>$3,872</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$361</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,691</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or Say (Range)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000-40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mount Hope Trade Area 1994 Estimates**

Population (1) 6,204
PCI (2) $6,935

**Sources:**

(1) Strategic Mapping Demographic Services
(2) Strategic Mapping Demographic Services
(3) Based on Urban Land Institute, "Dollars & Cents of U.S. Shopping Centers 1995"
## Table E-6

Southeastern Economic Development Corporation  
**Urban League Feasibility Study**  
**Convenience Retail Space Supported by Retail Expenditure Potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Expenditures as % of PCI</th>
<th>Expenditures per Person</th>
<th>Total Expenditures (000s)</th>
<th>$/SF/Yr Productivity (3)</th>
<th>Convenience Retail Space Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>$443</td>
<td>$51,633</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$12,908</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>$830</td>
<td>$96,812</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating &amp; Drinking</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$55,936</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$217,288</td>
<td></td>
<td>943,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or Say (Range)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900,000-1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Two-Mile Radius 1994 Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (1)</td>
<td>116,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI (2)</td>
<td>$9,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

1. (1) Strategic Mapping Demographic Services  
2. (2) Strategic Mapping Demographic Services  
3. (3) Based on Urban Land Institute, "Dollars & Cents of U.S. Shopping Centers 1995"