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Community Development Department

To: Yi-An Huang, City Manager

From: Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager for Community Development

Date: March 21, 2024

Re: Response to POR 2024 \#25 regarding the data analysis included in the Economic Feasibility Analysis provided to EOHLC as part of Cambridge's MBTA Communities final compliance submission.

As requested by the City Council, attached is the final Economic Feasibility Analysis provided for Cambridge's MBTA Communities compliance submission. It includes a narrative report and tables with assumptions and modeling data in the format requested by the Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC). This analysis was conducted by Karl Seidman, the Community Development Department's real estate development economics consultant.

The report reviews Cambridge's housing stock and current levels of affordability, highlighting the importance of the inclusionary housing program to provide affordable housing opportunities for Cambridge residents.

The feasibility analysis concludes that as-of-right inclusionary condominium projects generally meet assumed financial return requirements in current market conditions. Regarding rental housing, the report concludes: "While multifamily rental projects do not meet assumed financial return requirements with Cambridge's inclusionary zoning requirements, this result reflects the current challenging financial market conditions rather than the City's inclusionary zoning requirements." The report shows that inclusionary rental housing projects would be more feasible under market conditions with somewhat lower interest rates and capital returns. It also shows that today's uniquely high interest rates and investment returns make it difficult to finance multifamily rental housing regardless of whether or not inclusionary housing is required.
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## I. Overview of Cambridge Housing Stock

Cambridge, Massachusetts boasts a diverse housing stock, with a total of 56,934 units housing 118,489 residents, according to the latest data from the American Community Survey (ACS). ${ }^{1}$ This housing stock is divided between rental and ownership units, with approximately $66 \%$ of occupied units being rental housing. ${ }^{2}$ The city's housing landscape is marked by significant rent and sales price variations, influenced by neighborhood, development type, and building age.

In the past five years, 3,099 units of multifamily rental housing have been developed, or $5.4 \%$ of the total stock. ${ }^{3}$ While this is a significant amount of units, the growing Cambridge population and construction cost means there is still immense pressure on the existing housing, and many families are rent-burdened or struggle to find housing within their income range.

## II. Rental Housing Market

The landscape of Cambridge's 33,751 occupied rental housing units is dynamic and multifaceted. ${ }^{4}$ Most of the new units being built in Cambridge are rentals, with 3,099 units of new multifamily housing since 2018. ${ }^{5}$ Despite the increase in units, Cambridge has a relatively low $4.4 \%$ vacancy rate across rentals,

[^1]indicating high demand compared to available inventory. ${ }^{6}$ Understanding the factors influencing the current market rents is critical for comprehending residents' affordability challenges and the impact of inclusionary zoning policy. This section delves into the variations in rents across neighborhoods, development types, and building ages.

## Current Market Rents

Citywide, the median rent for all housing types and unit sizes is $\$ 3,223$ per month, with 2-bedroom (2BR) units commanding a median market rent of $\$ 3,719$ per month. ${ }^{7}$ However, it is crucial to note that within $1 / 2$ mile from an MBTA station (Study Area), market rents significantly exceed these citywide medians. In this district, the median market rent for all housing types is $\$ 3,750$ per month, while 2BR units command a median of $\$ 4,646$ per month. ${ }^{8}$ Figure 1 shows a breakdown of median rent by unit size.

Figure 1 - Cambridge Market Median Asking Rent by Unit Size (July 2023)

| Unit Size | Cambridge | Study Area $^{9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Studio | $\$ 2,565$ | $\$ 2,659$ |
| 1 Bedroom | $\$ 2,929$ | $\$ 3,497$ |
| 2 Bedroom | $\$ 3,719$ | $\$ 4,646$ |
| 3 Bedroom | $\$ 4,653$ | $\$ 5,871$ |

Source: Costar

## Variation in Rents

Rents vary significantly across neighborhoods, development types, and building ages. For instance, Apartments in North Cambridge command the highest median rents ( $\$ 3,975$ for a $2 B R$ ) compared to other neighborhoods, and Strawberry Hill commands the lowest median rent (\$3,050 for a 2BR). See Figure $\mathbf{2}$ for a complete breakdown of median asking rent by neighborhood.

[^2]Figure 2 - Cambridge Median Rental Asking Price by Neighborhood (2023 Q2)


Source: Rental Listing Cost and Affordability Monitor - Metropolitan Area Planning Council

Additionally, larger buildings command higher rents. The current median market rent for a 2BR in a 50+ unit building is $\$ 3,789$, while a $2 B R$ unit in a building with less than ten units is $\$ 2,525$. This may reflect fewer amenities and older finishes in smaller buildings, because larger buildings are more likely to be newly built. Figure 3 shows the median market rent breakdown by unit size and building size.

Figure 3 - Cambridge Average Market Asking Rent by Unit Size and Building Size (July 2023)


Source: Costar
Note: Average market asking rent represents the dollar amount the lessor is advertising units for. Effective rent may differ.

Finally, new constructions tend to have higher rent than older buildings (built pre-2008). Figure 4 shows a breakdown of rents per unit by year built.

Figure 4 - Cambridge Median Market Rent per Unit by Year Built (July 2023)


Source: Costar

## Recent Trends in Rents

Rents in Cambridge across all unit types have generally increased for the past decade, with a slight slowdown during the COVID-19 pandemic. ${ }^{10}$ Data from the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) and Costar indicate an average annual increase of roughly $2.9 \%$ in Cambridge median rent between 2013 and 2023. Post-pandemic, from 2021 to the present, there has been an upward trend in rents, with a $9 \%$ annual increase in median rent. ${ }^{11}$ Cambridge is seeing a particularly high rent increase in Cambridge Highlands (50\% increase 2021 Q2-2023 Q2), near Fresh Pond and Alewife Station, where many new units have been built in the past decade. ${ }^{12}$

## Affordability of Units

The area median income (AMI) for Cambridge residents is $\$ 104,500$ for one-person households, $\$ 119,400$ for two-person households, and $\$ 134,400$ for three-person households. Just under half (49\%) of $2 B R$ units meet the affordability criteria (of rent no greater than $30 \%$ of income) for two-person households at the median income level, reflecting a moderate supply of affordable units at this income level. ${ }^{13}$ However, a household with income at $80 \%$ of the AMI aspiring to secure a $2 B R$ unit faces a narrow range of choices, with only $9.2 \%$ of units meeting this affordability criterion. ${ }^{14}$ Finally, only $1 \%$ of 2BR units meet the affordability criteria for households at 50\% of the Area Median Income (AMI), underscoring the pressing need for expanded housing supply targeted to very-low to low-income families. ${ }^{15}$

[^3]
## Rent-Burdened Households

According to ACS data, 50.5\% of households in Cambridge paid more than $30 \%$ of their income towards rent in 2022. This substantial proportion of rent-burdened households emphasizes the acute need to address housing affordability challenges in the city. ${ }^{16}$

In conclusion, this analysis of the rental housing market in Cambridge reaffirms the importance of addressing housing affordability and the need for strong inclusionary zoning requirements as part of the City's comprehensive, affordable housing strategy.

## III. Condo Housing Market

The condominium housing market is a key part of the city's housing supply. With 14,790 condominium units existing as of June 30, 2022, they help provide diverse housing options for residents. ${ }^{17}$ Most of these condo units were constructed before 2015, with an additional 217 units added in the past five years, representing a $1.5 \%$ increase in the condominium stock. This section delves into the intricacies of this market, starting with an exploration of current sales prices. ${ }^{18}$

## Current Median Sales Prices

From January 2021 through May 2023, 1,214 condo units across Cambridge were sold. The median sales price for all condominiums sold in Cambridge during this period was $\$ 870,000 .{ }^{19}$ The median sales price for $2 B R$ condos slightly exceeded the citywide median at $\$ 875,000 .{ }^{20}$ Figure 5 provides a breakdown of median sale price by unit size and sales year, underscoring that 1-bedroom units command a significant premium in the market.

Figure 5 - Cambridge Condo Median Sale Price by Unit Size and Sale Year, January 2021 to May 2023

|  | 1-Bedroom |  | 2-Bedroom |  | 3-Bedroom |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sale <br> Year | Number <br> of Sales | Median <br> Sales Price | Number <br> of Sales | Median <br> Sales Price | Number <br> of Sales | Median <br> Sales Price |
| 2023 | 61 | $\$ 1,150,000$ | 31 | $\$ 875,000$ | 31 | $\$ 880,000$ |
| 2022 | 263 | $\$ 1,150,000$ | 146 | $\$ 825,000$ | 93 | $\$ 810,000$ |
| 2021 | 153 | $\$ 975,000$ | 91 | $\$ 799,000$ | 66 | $\$ 800,000$ |

Source: Cambridge Assessor's Office Condo Sales Data, January 2021-May 2023

[^4]
## Variations in Sales Prices

Condo sales prices vary by neighborhood, with specific areas experiencing higher demand and, thus, higher prices. Wellington-Harrington has seen the highest median sales prices PSF ( $\$ 775$ ) between 20182022. Like the rent rates, Strawberry Hill has the lowest median sales price PSF (\$485) over that same period. ${ }^{21}$ See Figure 6 for a complete breakdown of median sales price PSF by neighborhood. ${ }^{22}$

Figure 6 - Cambridge Median Condo Sale Price PSF by Neighborhood (Sales 2018-2022 Q2)


Source: Cambridge Assessor's Office Condo Sales Data, 2018-2022

As with the rental market, newly built condo units sell at significantly higher prices than older units due to a higher level of amenities. The median sales price for units built in the last five years was $\$ 946$ PSF, while units older than 15 years have sold for $\$ 701$ PSF. ${ }^{23}$ Figure 7 provides a breakdown of median sales price PSF by year built.

Figure 7 - Cambridge Median Condo Sales Price PSF by Year Built
(Sales 2018-2022 Q2)


Source: Cambridge Assessor's Office Condo Sales Data, 2022

[^5]
## Recent Trends in Sales Prices

In the wake of the pandemic, a significant transformation has occurred in the Cambridge condominium market. From 2021 to the present, median condo prices have experienced a notable average annual increase of $5.8 \%{ }^{24}$ This recent growth rate follows a period of significant price growth from 2013 to 2018 and fairly stable prices from 2018 to 2020. Condo sales prices picked up again in 2020 before cooling off considerably in the first half of 2023. Figure 8 highlights the median condominium prices PSF from 2013 to 2023.


Source: Cambridge Assessor's Office Condo Sales Data, 2013-2023

## Affordability of Units

Unsurprisingly, the increasing sale price of condominiums comes with decreased affordability for many Cambridge residents. The income level needed to buy a median 2BR condo in Cambridge with a 3\% down payment through an FHA loan is $\$ 279,000$, which is equivalent to $208 \%$ of AMI for a 3-person household or $187 \%$ of AMI for a 4-person household. Households that pay a $20 \%$ down payment must make at least $\$ 225,000$ to afford a median 2BR condo, which is $167 \%$ of AMI for a 3-person household or $151 \%$ of AMI for a 4 -person household. These numbers indicate that only a small portion of the current Cambridge population can purchase condos anywhere in the City, requiring other households to seek rental housing or look outside Cambridge for ownership opportunities.

In conclusion, a multifaceted approach is essential in ensuring that Cambridge's condo market continues to thrive while creating units that are affordable to a diverse range of households. Even with varying down payment scenarios, the income thresholds required to access a median-price condo in Cambridge underscore the pressing need to address homeownership affordability, in part through the City's inclusionary zoning policy.

[^6]
## IV. Overview of Cambridge Inclusionary Zoning Policy

Cambridge's Inclusionary Housing Program was first established in 1998 through adoption of the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. In April 2017, the ordinance was amended to establish the current inclusionary zoning policy. These amendments were informed by an economic feasibility analysis, completed in 2016, which found that requiring $20 \%$ affordable units was financially viable under multiple development prototypes for household income levels consistent with Cambridge' policy ${ }^{25}$. The key requirements under this policy include ${ }^{26}$ :

- the policy applies to developments with 10 or more housing units or at least 10,000 square feet of residential gross floor area;
- these developments must dedicate $20 \%$ of their net residential floor area to low- and moderateincome tenants or moderate- and middle- income homebuyers (Affordable Dwelling Units);
- developments are encouraged to provide 3-BR units as part of the $20 \%$ inclusionary housing. Three-bedroom units are required for developments with over $30,000 \mathrm{SF}$, which must create one 3BR unit for every 6,000 of required Affordable Dwelling Unit floor area. The ratio of affordable 3BR units must be equal to or greater than the ratio of $3 B R$ units in the nonaffordable units;
- developers receive an as-of-right density bonus of up to $30 \%$ in total additional gross floor area and dwelling units in exchange for providing inclusionary housing units;
- household income levels for eligible tenants in affordable rental units are between $50 \%$ and $80 \%$ of Area Median Income (AMI); and
- household income levels for eligible homeowners in affordable ownership units cannot exceed $100 \%$ of AMI.

New multifamily housing development has occurred after adoption of the $20 \%$ inclusionary requirement. Three multifamily projects (two rental and one condominium) with 837 new housing units, of which 157 are affordable inclusionary units, have been permitted and built under the 2017 amended inclusionary zoning policy. Since its inception in 1998, Cambridge's Inclusionary Zoning Program has generated over 1,100 units of affordable rental and ownership housing, either completed or currently under construction in new developments the city ${ }^{27}$.

## V. Economic Feasibility Analysis Results

Five development scenarios were used for the economic feasibility analysis. These scenarios, presented in Figure 9, reflect the diversity of development sizes and types (rental or condominium) that have been recently built in the city and that are allowable by right under Cambridge zoning. The small and medium size projects include a $30 \%$ density bonus, as permitted under the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. No bonus was applied to the large rental project, as the bonus would bring the project above the $50,000 \mathrm{SF}$ threshold that requires a special permit, which no longer makes it an as-right project.

[^7]Figure 9. Development Scenarios Used for Economic Feasibility Analysis

| Project Type and Size |  |  |  | All Units |  |  |  | Affordable Units |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type | No of Units | Gross <br> Floor <br> Area <br> (GFA) | Dwelling unit Floor Area (DUFA) | Studio- <br> No. of <br> Units | 1 BR - <br> No. of <br> Units | 2 BR - <br> No. of <br> Units | 3 BRNo. of Units | Studio- <br> No. of <br> Units | 1 BR - <br> No. of Units | 2 BR - <br> No. of Units | 3 BR- <br> No. of Units |
| Small Project -Rental | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Small Project -Condo | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Medium Project-Rental | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Medium Project Condo | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Large Project -Rental | 49 | 50,000 | 40,000 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 |

Source: Karl F. Seidman Consulting Services and Karp Strategies
For rental projects, two financial return standards were used:

1. return on cost - the ratio of annual project net cash flow before debt service to total development costs with a threshold of $7 \%$ under current market and interest rate conditions. This financial return measure is commonly used by developers and is especially applicable to developers holding their property long-term.
2. internal rate of return - the discount rate at which the developer's cash outflows to develop the project equal the net cash proceeds received from the project's rental income and sale of the property. The IRR analysis assumes developers sell the property at the end of the third year after the development commences, once it is occupied with stabilized income. This return measure is most appropriate for developers that build projects with the expectation to sell the stabilized property to long-term investors.

For ownership projects, only the IRR measure was used since the developer's cash flow is from the sale of units to home -buyers after project completion and there is no on-going annual cash flow stream to compare to project development costs or developer equity.

Assumptions used in the financial analysis of the five scenarios are detailed in the accompanying Assumptions Checklist. A spreadsheet with the financial analysis for all five scenarios is also provided.

Figure 10. Estimated Financial Returns for Development Scenarios

| Scenario | Gross Floor <br> Area (SF) | Number of <br> Units | Return on <br> Cost | IRR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small Rental | 13,000 | 15 | $5.72 \%$ | $9.42 \%$ |
| Medium Rental | 43,550 | 42 | $5.84 \%$ | $11.60 \%$ |
| Large Rental | 50,000 | 49 | $5.56 \%$ | $6.55 \%$ |
| Small Condo | 13,000 | 15 | NA | $26.24 \%$ |
| Medium Condo | 43,550 | 42 | NA | $28.44 \%$ |
| Threshold Rate |  |  | $7.00 \%$ | $19.00 \%$ |

Source: Karl F. Seidman Consulting Services and Karp Strategies
Figure 10 presents the estimated financial return results for the five scenarios. The results show that the projected IRR returns for the small and medium condo projects exceed the $19 \%$ threshold by a healthy margin of 7.24 percentage points and 9.44 percentage points, respectively. These condo
projects are financially feasible with Cambridge's inclusionary zoning requirements under current market and financial conditions.

Estimated returns for all three rental scenarios are below projected return thresholds, for both return measures. The estimated return on cost ranges from $5.56 \%$ to $5.84 \%$, compared to the $7 \%$ threshold rate. Estimated IRRs are well below the $19 \%$ return threshold, with the margins ranging from 7.4 percentage points for the medium project to almost 12 percentage points for the large rental project.

The rapid rise in interest rates generated by Federal Reserve policy and uncertainly about future construction costs have increased the cost of capital for developers, which impacts developer's return thresholds. Consequently, the financial returns under current economic conditions may not represent long-term financial viability under a more stabilized market with lower interest-rates, more predictable inflation rates and reduced return requirements. In other words, the above financial feasibility results may reflect current development and financial market conditions and not be the result of Cambridge's inclusionary zoning requirements. To assess whether the economic feasibility results are driven by market conditions rather than Cambridge's inclusionary zoning policy, financial analysis for several alternative situations was conducted to be better understand the extent to which Cambridge's inclusionary zoning policy is the source of financial feasibility results for rental projects, or whether the results reflect particular assumptions in the model or current financial market conditions. These alternatives include:

1. a $10 \%$ increase in assumed rents to represent the potential (and possibly developer expectations) that rents will increase at about current levels during the project permitting and construction period;
2. a reduction in debt interest rates from $8.25 \%$ to $5.5 \%$ and cap rates from $5 \%$ to $4.5 \%$, reflecting pre-pandemic levels, and corresponding reductions in return on cost and IRR thresholds to 6\% and $16 \%$, respectively; and
3. rental projects with all market rate units without any affordable units and no density bonus.

A 10\% rent increase has a large impact on financial returns, making projects viable under the IRR threshold by raising the IRR above the $19 \%$ threshold for the small and medium projects and to just below $19 \%$ for the large rental project (see Figure 11). It also raises the return on cost by .70 basis points ${ }^{28}$-much closer to the $7 \%$ threshold but still below the level desired by developers planning to hold their property long-term.

[^8]Figure 11. Rental Project Financial Returns with 10\% Rent Increase

| Scenario | Gross Floor <br> Area (SF) | Number of <br> Units | Return on <br> Cost | IRR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Small Rental | 13,000 | 15 | $6.43 \%$ | $22.81 \%$ |
| Medium Rental | 43,500 | 42 | $6.54 \%$ | $24.86 \%$ |
| Large Rental | 50,000 | 49 | $6.22 \%$ | $18.76 \%$ |
| Threshold Rate |  |  | $7.00 \%$ | $19.00 \%$ |

Source: Karl F. Seidman Consulting Services and Karp Strategies

In a lower interest rate and investment return environment, all three rental projects exceed a 16\% IRR requirement and would be feasible for developers expecting to sell a completed and stabilized project to investors (see Figure 12). All three projects are within 45 basis points of a lower $6 \%$ return on cost standard, with the small and medium rental projects just below the threshold at $5.72 \%$ and $5.84 \%$, respectively. These returns are close enough for some developers to proceed with a project, especially in the strong Cambridge market, in which low vacancy rates and increases in market rents over time are likely.

Figure 12. Financial Analysis Results with Lower Interest Rates and Return Thresholds

| Scenario | Gross Floor <br> Area (SF) | Number of <br> Units | Return on <br> Cost | IRR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small Rental | 13,000 | 11 | $5.72 \%$ | $25.65 \%$ |
| Medium Rental | 43,500 | 32 | $5.84 \%$ | $28.95 \%$ |
| Large Rental | 50,000 | 49 | $5.56 \%$ | $17.09 \%$ |
| Small Condo | 13,000 | 15 | NA | $28.03 \%$ |
| Medium Condo | 43,550 | 42 | NA | $30.87 \%$ |
| Threshold Rate |  |  | $6.00 \%$ | $16.00 \%$ |

Source: Karl F. Seidman Consulting Services and Karp Strategies

Figure 13 shows results for rental scenarios with $100 \%$ market-rate units. Since these scenarios do not include the density bonus provided for under inclusionary zoning, the GFA and number of units for the small and medium projects are lower than in the prior scenarios. These scenarios are feasible based on the IRR criteria, but fall below the $7 \%$ return on cost threshold by 56 to 75 basis points. This result indicates that the current cost and financial market environment, rather than the city's inclusionary zoning policy, is making rental housing development in Cambridge challenging and infeasible under a 7\% return on cost threshold.

Figure 13. Estimated Financial Returns with All Market Rate Units

| Scenario | Gross Floor <br> Area (SF) | Number of <br> Units | Return on <br> Cost | IRR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small Rental | 10,000 | 11 | $6.25 \%$ | $19.23 \%$ |
| Medium Rental | 33,500 | 32 | $6.44 \%$ | $22.97 \%$ |
| Large Rental | 50,000 | 49 | $6.40 \%$ | $22.20 \%$ |
| Threshold Rate |  |  | $7.00 \%$ | $19.00 \%$ |

Source: Karl F. Seidman Consulting Services and Karp Strategies

## VI. Conclusions

Under current real estate and financial market conditions, multi-family condominium projects reflective of as-right zoning and site conditions exceed typical developer IRR thresholds and are financially feasible under Cambridge's inclusionary zoning policy. While multifamily rental projects do not meet assumed financial return requirements with Cambridge's inclusionary zoning requirements, this result reflects the current challenging financial market conditions rather than the City's inclusionary zoning requirements. The recent completion of several projects with the current inclusionary zoning requirements supports this conclusion along with financial analysis showing that under improved financial market conditions and modest increases in expected rents, many multi-family rental projects are financially feasible with Cambridge's inclusionary zoning requirements.

## Economic Feasibility Analysis - Assumption Checklist

The data and assumptions requested in this EFA form will allow DHCD to evaluate the potential impacts of any Inclusionary Zoning requirements in excess of what is allowed by the MBTA Communities Act. Please complete this form with all available information and provide source references for each data point as they relate to your MBTA 3A Compliant District(s).

| Revenue Sources | Input |  | Source | Notes/Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rents by Bed Count (per SQFT) |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Efficiency | \$ | 5.50 | Co-star, MLS, developer interviews | Reflects averages; new large project are higher |
| One Bedroom | \$ | 5.00 | Co-star, MLS, developer interviews | Reflects averages; new large project are higher |
| Two Bedroom | \$ | 4.35 | Co-star, MLS, developer interviews | Reflects averages; new large project are higher |
| Three Bedroom | \$ | 4.45 | Co-star, MLS, developer interviews | Reflects averages; new large project are higher |
| Sale Value (per SQFT) | \$ | 960.00 | Assessor Records-2021-2023 | Variation by unit size-2BR (\$900) 3BR (\$1000) |
| Sale Value (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |
| Other Income |  |  |  |  |
| Parking Revenue (per month per space) | \$ | - |  | Assume no on site parking for projects |
| On-Site Laundry (per month) | \$ | - |  | Laundry in units for virtually all projects |
| Other (please list) | \$ | - |  |  |
| Construction Costs | Input |  | Source | Notes/Comments |
| Land Acquisition (per unit) Land Acquisition (per SQFT) | \$ 87,000.00 |  |  | Based on 3 projects |
| Land Development Costs (per unit) Soft Costs (percentage of hard costs) Hard Costs (per SQFT) | \$ | - | Included in hard costs | Based on construction cost figures from developers |
|  |  | 20\% | Developer interviews |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | \$ | 350.00 | Developer \& Contractor interviews, BF | Podium + stick built for most projects; \$25 higher for condos reflecting higher quality finishes |
| Commercial Stick Built |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Podium |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Steel |  |  |  |  |
| Parking Assumptions | \$ - |  |  |  |
| Parking Ratio |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Parking Cost by Type |  |  |  |  |
| Surface (per space) |  |  |  | Not applicable |
| Structured (per space) |  |  |  | Not applicable |
| Underground (per space) |  |  |  | Not applicable |
| Operations \& Expenses | Input |  | Source | Notes/Comments |
| Vacancy (percentage) |  | 5\% | Developer interviews |  |
| Operating Expense (\% of EGI) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses (per unit) <br> Cost of Sale (percentage) |  | ,000.00 |  |  |
|  |  | 5\% |  | Brokerage fees for condos |
| Financial | Input |  | Source | Notes/Comments |
| Lending Rate (Percentage) Lending Term (Years) |  | 8.25\% | Developer interviews |  |
|  |  |  | Developer interviews | Amortization period |
| Debt Equity Ratio |  | 1.85 |  | (70/30 ratio); lower for rental projects per <br> 1.25 debt service coverage ratio |
| Cap Rate |  | 5\% | Costar, developer interviews |  |
| Return Expectations |  |  |  |  |
| Internal Rate of Return (IRR) |  | 19\% | Developer interviews |  |
| Return on Cost (ROC) |  | 7\% | Developer interviews |  |
| Cash on Cash (CoC) |  |  |  | Not applicable |


|  |  |  |  | All Units |  |  |  | Inclusionary Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | No of Units | GFA | Dwelling unit Floor Area (DUFA) | Studio- No. of Units | 1 BR-No. of Units | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { BR -No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \text { BR-No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | Studio- No. of Units | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BR -No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | 2 BR -No. of Units | 3 BR-No. of Units | Required Inclusionar y SF | Required <br> 3BR |
| Small Project-Rental | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Small Project -Condo | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Medium Project-Rental | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6968 | 1 |
| Medium Project Condo | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6968 | 1 |
| Large Project -Rental | 49 | 50,000 | 40,000 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8000 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Studio } \\ & \text { SF/unit } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $1 \mathrm{BR} \mathrm{SF} / \mathrm{unit}$ | $2 \mathrm{BR} \mathrm{SF} / \mathrm{unit}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 3BR } \\ \text { SF/unit } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Small \& medium projects |  |  |  | 500 | 700 | 900 | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Large Project |  |  |  | 500 | 700 | 900 | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |

Rental Income for Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Units

|  | Factor/ Parameter |  | SF/Units | Household Size/Unit |  | AMI | Income @ .65 AMI | $30 \%$ of Income/25\% for studios | Less Annual <br> Utility <br> Allowance* | Net <br> Annual <br> Rent/Unit | Total Annual Rent/Unit Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) |  | 10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dwelling Unit Floor Area (DUFA) |  | 7900 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required IZ DUFA @ . 20 |  | 1580 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required 3 BR Units |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of 3 BR Units |  | 0 | 1100 |  | 4 | \$149,300 | \$97,045 | \$29,113.50 | -3336 | \$25,778 | \$0 |
| Number of 2 BR Units |  | 1 | 900 |  | 3 | \$134,400 | \$87,360 | \$26,208.00 | -2388 | \$23,820 | \$23,820 |
| Number of 1 BR Units |  | 1 | 700 |  | 2 | \$119,400 | \$77,610 | \$23,283.00 | -1716 | \$21,567 | \$21,567 |
| Number of Studio Units |  | 1 | 500 |  | 1 | \$104,500 | \$67,925 | \$16,981.25 | -1236 | \$15,745 | \$15,745 |
| Total Affordable Units |  | 3 | 2100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Gross Rent Inclusionary Zoning Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$61,132 |
| Percent affordable DUFA |  | 20.39\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Rental Income for Market Rate Units |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |

Annual Cash Flow Statement

| Total Gross Rental Income | $\$ 544,072$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Parking Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| On-site Laundry Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| Other Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| Total Gross Annual Revenue | $\$ 544,072$ |
| Less Vacancy and Collection Loss | $-\$ 27,204$ |
| Less Operating Expenses | $-\$ 150,000$ |
| Net Cash Flow Before Debt | $\$ 366,869$ |
| Cash Flow for Debt Service @ 1.25 | $\$ 293,495$ |
| Annual Debt Service | $-\$ 293,493$ |
| Net Cash Flow After Debt Service | $\$ 73,376$ |
| Debt Principal | $(\$ 3,102,024)$ | round to 3,102,000


| Development Costs and Sources of Funds |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Building Floor Area | 13,000 |  |  |
| Construction Type Podium | tick built |  |  |
| Use of Funds | Cost/GFA SF | Cost/Unit | Amount |
| Land acquisition -based on 11 units before density bonus |  | 87000 | \$957,000 |
| Land development |  |  | \$0 |
| Building construction/hard costs | \$350 |  | \$4,550,000 |
| Parking construction Costs | \$0 |  | \$0 |
| Soft Costs | 20\% |  | \$910,000 |
| Total Development Cost |  |  | \$6,417,000 |
| Sources of Funds Percent |  |  | Amount |
| Developer/Investor Equity | 51.7\% |  | \$3,315,000 |
| Debt | 48.3\% |  | \$3,102,000 |
| Total Sources of Funds |  |  | \$6,417,000 |
| Debt Amortization Period |  |  | 300 |
| Debt Interest Rate |  |  | 8.25\% |
| Annual Debt Service |  |  | $(\$ 293,493)$ |

Financial Returns
Return on Cost Percentage*
*Net cash flow before debt/total development cost

| IRR Analysis with Building Sale in Year 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assumes constant rent and costs |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Equity investment | -\$1,105,000 | -\$1,105,000 | -\$1,105,000 |  |
| Net Cash Flow Before Debt Service |  |  |  | \$366,869 |
| Sale in Year 3-stablized net income |  |  |  | \$7,337,373 |
| Less sales cost (5\%) |  |  |  | -\$366,869 |
| Less debt payoff - principal + 1 years interest |  |  |  | -\$3,357,915 |
| Net Sales proceeds |  |  |  | \$3,612,589 |
| Net Cash Flow | -\$1,105,000 | -\$1,105,000 | -\$1,105,000 | \$3,979,458 |
| Cap rate | 5.00\% |  |  |  |
| IRR | 9.42\% |  |  |  |




Development Revenue

| Gross sales, IZ Units | \$1,098,202 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Gross sales, market units | \$7,710,000 |
| Total Gross Sales revenue | \$8,808,202 |
| Less Sales Cost (5\% of market gross sales) | \$ $\$ 440,410$ |
| Total Net Sales revenue | \$8,367,792 |
| Construction loan principal repayment | -\$4,764,900 |
| Construction loan interest during sales period | - $\$ 289,298$ |
| Net Sales Proceeds | \$3,313,594 |


| Development Costs and Sources of Funds |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Building Floor Area | 13,000 |  |  |
| Construction Type |  |  |  |
| Use of Funds | Cost/GFA SF | CostUnit | Amount |
| Land acquisition -based on 11 units before density bonus |  | 87000 | \$957,000 |
| Land development, included in construction costs |  |  |  |
| Building construction/hard costs | \$375 |  | \$4,875,000 |
| Parking construction c]osts | \$0 |  | \$0 |
| Soft costs | 20\% |  | \$975,000 |
| Total Development cost |  |  | \$6,807,000 |
| Sources of Funds | Percent |  | Amount |
| Developer/Investor Equity | 30\% |  | \$2,042,100 |
| Construction Debt | 70\% |  | \$4,764,900 |
| Total Sources of Funds |  |  | \$6,807,000 |
| Debt Interest Rate | 8.5\% |  |  |
| Construction loan period | 2 |  |  |

Financial Returns
Return on Cost Percentage

IRR Analysis with Condo Unit Sales in Year 3

|  | Year 0 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Equity investment (1/3 each year) | $-\$ 680,700$ | $-\$ 680,700$ | $-\$ 680,700$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Net sales proceeeds |  | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 3,313,594$ |
| Net Annual Cash Flow | $-\$ 680,700$ | $-\$ 680,700$ | $-\$ 680,700$ | $\$ 3,313,594$ |  |
| IRR | $26.24 \%$ |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  | All Units |  |  |  | Inclusionary Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | No of Units | GFA | Dwelling unit Floor Area (DUFA) | Studio- No. of Units | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BR -No. of } \\ \text { Units } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 BR-No. of Units | 3 BR-No. of Units | Studio- No. of Units | 1 BR - <br> No. of <br> Units | 2 BR - <br> No. of <br> Units | 3 BR-No. of Units | Required Inclusionar y SF | Required 3BR |
| Small Project-Rental | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Small Project -Condo | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Medium Project-Rental | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | , | 2 | 6968 | 1 |
| Medium Project Condo | 32 | 33,500 | 26,800 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5360 | 1 |
| Large Project-Rental | 49 | 50,000 | 40,000 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8000 | 1 |


|  | Project | Studio <br> SF/unit | 1 BR SF/unit | 2 BR SF/unit |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | 3 BR SF/unit 

Rental Income for Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Units


Annual Cash Flow Statement

| Total Gross Rental Income | $\$ 1,737,156$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Parking Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| On-site Laundry Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| Other Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| Total Gross Annual Revenue | $\$ 1,737,156$ |
| Less Vacancy and Collection Loss | $-\$ 86,858$ |
| Less Operating Expenses | $-\$ 420,000$ |
| Net Cash Flow Before Debt | $\$ 1,230,298$ |
| Cash Flow for Debt Service @ 1.25 | $\$ 984,239$ |
| Annual Debt Service | $-\$ 984,270$ |
| Net Cash Flow After Debt Service | $\$ \mathbf{2 4 6 0 , 0 2 9}$ |
| Debt Principal | $(\$ 10,402,672)$ | round to $10,403,000$


|  | Development Costs and Sources of Funds |
| :--- | :---: |
| Gross Building Floor Area <br> Construction Type | 43,550 |
|  | Podium \& Stick built |


| Use of Funds | Cost/GFA SF | Cost/Unit | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land acquisition - based on 32 units before density bonus |  | 87000 | \$2,784,000 |
| Land development costs, included in | uction |  | \$0 |
| Building construction/hard costs | 350 |  | \$15,242,500 |
| Parking construction costs | 0 |  | \$0 |
| Soft Costs | 0.2 |  | \$3,048,500 |
| Total Development Cost |  |  | \$21,075,000 |
| Sources of Funds | Percent |  | Amount |
| Developer/Investor Equity | 50.64\% |  | \$10,672,000 |
| Debt | 49.36\% |  | \$10,403,000 |
| Total Sources of Funds |  |  | \$21,075,000 |
| Debt Amortization Period |  |  | 300 |
| Debt Interest Rate |  |  | 0.0825 |
| Annual Debt Service |  |  | $(\$ 984,270)$ |

Return on Cost Percentage*
$*$

|  |  |  |  | All Units |  |  |  | Inclusionary Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | No of Units | GFA | Dwelling unit Floor Area (DUFA) | Studio- No. of <br> Units | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BR-No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{BR} \text {-No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | 3 BR -No. of <br> Unit | Studio- No. of Units | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BR-No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | 2 BR -No. of Units | 3 BR -No. of <br> Units | Required <br> Inclusionary <br> SF | Required 3BR |
| Small Project-Rental | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Small Project-Condo | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Medium Project-Rental | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6968 | 0 |
| Medium Project Condo | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6968 | 0 |
| Large Project-Rental | 49 | 50,000 | 40,000 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8000 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project |  |  |  | Studio SF/unit | 1 BR SF/unit | $2 \mathrm{BR} \mathrm{SF/unit}$ | 3 BR SF/unit |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Small \& medium projects |  |  |  | 500 | 700 | 900 | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Large Project |  |  |  | 500 | 700 | 900 | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |



| Market Rate Units | Percent of DUFA | Total DUFA | SF Per Unit | Number of Units | Total SF | Sales Price/SF | Total Sales Revenue | Gross Sales Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 BR SF |  |  | 1100 | 5 | 5500 | \$1,000 | \$5,500,000 | \$5,500,000 |
| 2 BR SF |  |  | 900 | 13 | 11700 | \$900 | \$10,530,000 | \$10,530,000 |
| 1 BRSF |  |  | 700 | 13 | 9100 | \$960 | \$8,736,000 | \$8,736,000 |
| Studio SF |  |  | 500 | 3 | 1500 | \$960 | \$1,440,000 | \$1,440,000 |
| Total Market Rate Units |  |  |  | 34 | 27800 |  |  |  |
| Total Gross Sales Revenue, Market Rate Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$26,206,000 |

Development Revenue

| Gross sales, IZ Units | $\$ 3,911,960$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Gross salas, market units | $\$ 26,206,000$ |
| Total Gross Sales revenue | $\$ 29,617,960$ |
| Less Sales Cost (5\% of market gross sales) | $-\$ 1,310,300$ |
| Total Net Sales revenue | $\$ 28,307,60$ |
| Construction loan principal repayment | $-\$ 15,667,050$ |
| Construction loan interest during sales period | $-\$ 1,331,699$ |
|  | $\$ 11,308,910$ |



| Total Sources of Funds |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Debt Interest Rate | $\$ 22,381,500$ |  |
| Construction loan period | $8.5 \%$ |  |
| Condo sales period | 2 |  |
|  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Return on Cost Percentage NA

IRR Analysis with Condo Unit Sales in Year 3

|  | Year 0 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Equity investment $(1 / 3$ each year) | $-\$ 2,238,150$ | $-\$ 2,238,150$ | $-\$ 2,238,150$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Net sales proceeeds | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 11,308,910$ |
| Net Annual Cash Flow | $-\$ 2,238,150$ | $-\$ 2,238,150$ | $-\$ 2,238,150$ | $\$ 11,308,910$ |
| IRR | $28.44 \%$ |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  | All Units |  |  |  | Inclusionary Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | No of Units | GFA | Dwelling unit <br> Floor Area (DUFA) | Studio- No. of Units | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BR -No. of } \\ \text { Units } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { BR -No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \text { BR-No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | Studio- No. of Units | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BR -No. of } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | 2 BR -No. of Units | 3 BR-No. of Units | Required Inclusionary SF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Required } \\ & 3 B R \end{aligned}$ |
| Small Project -Rental | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Small Project -Condo | 15 | 13,000 | 10,400 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2080 | 0 |
| Medium Project-Rental | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6968 | 1 |
| Medium Project Condo | 42 | 43,550 | 34,840 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6968 | 1 |
| Large Project -Rental | 49 | 50,000 | 40,000 | 5 | 17 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8000 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project |  |  |  | Studio SF/unit | $1 \mathrm{BR} \mathrm{SF} / \mathrm{unit}$ | $2 \mathrm{BR} \mathrm{SF} / \mathrm{unit}$ | $3 \mathrm{BR} \mathrm{SF} / \mathrm{unit}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Small \& medium projects |  |  |  | 500 | 700 | 900 | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Large Project |  |  |  | 500 | 700 | 900 | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Rental Income for Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor/ <br> Parameter | SF/Units | Household Size/Unit |  | AMI |  | Income @ .65 AMI | $30 \%$ of Income/25\% for studios | Less Annual Utility Allowance* | Net Annual Rent/Unit | Total Annual <br> Rent/Unit <br> Type |
| Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dwelling Unit Floor Area (DUFA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required IZ DUFA @ . 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required 3 BR Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of 3 BR Units |  | 1100 |  | 4 |  | \$149,300 | \$97,045 | \$29,114 | -3336 | \$25,778 | \$25,778 |
| Number of 2 BR Units |  | 900 |  | 3 |  | \$134,400 | \$87,360 | \$26,208 | -2388 | \$23,820 | \$95,280 |
| Number of 1 BR Units |  | 700 |  | 2 |  | \$119,400 | \$77,610 | \$23,283 | -1716 | \$21,567 | \$86,268 |
| Number of Studio Units |  | 500 |  | 1 |  | \$104,500 | \$67,925 | \$16,981 | -1236 | \$15,745 | \$15,745 |
| Total Gross Rent Inclusionary Zoning Units |  | 8000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$223,071 |


| Rental Income for Market Rate Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Units | SF Per Unit | Units | Total Unit SF | Rent/SF | Rent/Unit |
| 3 BR SF | 1100 | 5 | 5500 | \$4.45 | \$293,700 |
| 2 BR SF | 900 | 17 | 15300 | \$4.35 | \$798,660 |
| 1 BR SF | 700 | 13 | 9100 | \$5.00 | \$546,000 |
| Studio SF | 500 | 4 | 2000 | \$5.50 | \$132,000 |
| Total Market Rate Units |  | 39 | 31900 |  |  |
| Total Gross Rent Market Rate Units |  |  |  |  | \$1,770,360 |

## Annual Cash Flow Statements

| Total Gross Rental Income | $\$ 1,993,431$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Parking Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| On-site Laundry Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| Other Revenue | $\$ 0$ |
| Total Gross Annual Revenue | $\$ 1,993,431$ |
| Less Vacancy and Collection Loss | $-\$ 99,672$ |
| Less Operating Expenses | $-\$ 490,000$ |
| Net Cash Flow Before Debt | $\$ 1,403,759$ |
| Cash Flow for Debt Service @ 1.25 | $\$ 1,123,007$ |
| Annual Debt Service | $-\$ 1,123,008$ |
| Net Cash Flow After Debt Service | $\$ 280,751$ |
| Debt Principal | $\$ 11,869,365$ |


| ss Building Floor Area 50,000 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Type | Podium \& Stick built |  |  |
| Use of Funds | Cost/GFA SF | Cost/Unit | Amount |
| Land acquisition |  | 87000 | \$4,263,000 |
| Land development costs, included | uction |  | \$0 |
| Building construction/hard costs | 350 |  | \$17,500,000 |
| Parking construction costs | 0 |  | \$0 |
| Soft Costs | 0.2 |  | \$3,500,000 |
| Total Development Cost |  |  | \$25,263,000 |
| Sources of Funds | Percent |  | Amount |
| Developer/Investor Equity | 53.02\% |  | \$13,393,635 |
| Debt | 46.98\% |  | \$11,869,365 |
| Total Sources of Funds |  |  | \$25,263,000 |
| Debt Amortization Period |  |  | 300 |
| Debt Interest Rate |  |  | 0.0825 |
| Annual Debt Service |  |  | (\$1,123,008) |

Financial Returns
Return on Cost Percentage $5.56 \%$
*Net cash flow before debt/total development cost

IRR Analysis with Building Sale in Year 3

|  | Year 0 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Equity investment | -\$4,464,545 | -\$4,464,545 | -\$4,464,545 |  |
| Net Cash Flow Before Debt Service |  |  |  | \$1,403,759 |
| Sale in Year 3-stablized net income |  |  |  | \$28,075,184 |
| Less sales cost (5\%) |  |  |  | -\$1,403,759 |
| Less debt payoff - principal + 1 years interest |  |  |  | -\$12,848,588 |
| Net Sales proceeds |  |  |  | \$13,822,837 |
| Net Cash Flow | -\$4,464,545 | -\$4,464,545 | -\$4,464,545 | \$15,226,597 |
| Cap rate | 5.00\% |  |  |  |
| IRR | 6.55\% |  |  |  |
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