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May 18, 2015
To: Ketil Freeman
From: Nora Lake-Brown
Subject: $\quad$ Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study Economic Impact Analysis for Low- and Mid-Rise Residential, MixedUse and Non-Residential Prototypes

This memorandum presents an analysis of the potential economic impact of alternative affordable housing nexus fees on the feasibility of ten low- and mid-rise residential, mixed-use and non-residential prototypes. It is based on the economic impact analysis of twelve other market rate residential and office prototypes contained in DRA's "Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis" for the City of Seattle, 2014. This memo applies the same economic impact analysis methodology and basic assumptions, with selected updates, to the analysis to the ten additional low- and mid-rise residential, mixed-use and non-residential prototypes analyzed in DRA's nexus study for the City of Seattle. The analysis looks at the impact of the following fees per net square foot for low, middle and high cost areas, applied consistently across all land uses, at "low" and "high" fee levels.

| Nexus Fee Level: | Low Fee <br> Per NSF | High Fee <br> Per NSF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Land/Price Areas: |  |  |
| Low Priced Areas | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 7$ |
| Middle Priced Areas | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 12$ |
| High Priced Areas | $\$ 16$ | $\$ 22$ |

## Summary of Findings from the Economic Impact Analysis

DRA evaluated the financial feasibility of the development prototypes at alternative levels of an affordable housing nexus fees using two methods of assessment: return on equity analysis and land residual analysis (see Methodology section below). Table 1 summarizes the results of both analyses for the ten prototypes. Table 2
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details the return on equity analysis for each of the prototypes. Table 3 details the land residual analysis calculations.

For the ROE analysis, feasibility threshold returns are estimated at $6 \%$ to $8 \%$ for the apartment prototypes and $10 \%$ to $12 \%$ for the non-residential prototypes. For the land residual analysis, feasibility is measured by residual land values that approach or exceed current market land sales prices.

Most of the prototypes are determined to be economically feasible under one or more of the three land cost/price scenarios. Exceptions include the rental flats, mixed-use grocery store and stand-alone retail prototypes. In most cases where the prototype is feasible without the fee, the addition of the fee does not make the prototype infeasible. This less likely to be the case for the high cost scenario and fee level.

## Development Prototypes

The economic impact analysis contained in this memo uses ten development prototypes that, in addition to the twelve original prototypes analyzed in the 2014 study, were analyzed in DRA's affordable housing nexus study for the City. These ten additional prototypes, detailed in Table 4, were developed by City staff based on a review of actual projects and other available data. They include the following:

- Single-Family Infill
- Owner Townhomes
- Owner Flats
- Renter Flats
- Mixed Use Residential with Grocery Store
- Mixed-Use Residential with Restaurant
- Mixed-Use Residential with Entertainment
- Single-Story Stand Alone Retail
- Research and Development
- Medical Office
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These prototypes were used to assess the potential economic impact of affordable housing nexus fees on the economic feasibility of new development.

## Methodology

DRA evaluated the financial feasibility of the development prototypes at alternative nexus fee levels fees using two methods of assessment: return on equity analysis and land residual analysis. The return on equity approach calculates the value of a development based on its stabilized income potential and subtracts the costs of development to yield the net value of the investment, representing developer/investor profit. The financial feasibility of the prototypes, under a certain set of economic assumptions, is measured by the rate of the return on equity the resulting net investment value (or profit) produces. Under this approach, land costs are held fixed at an estimated market sales price and the economic impact of the program is shown as a change in the dollar amount of the net value of investment in the prototype and as a change in the ROE.

Land residual analysis methodology calculates the value of a development based on its income potential and subtracts the costs of development and developer profit (excluding land) to yield the underlying value of the land. When evaluating alternative land uses, the alternative that generates the highest value to a site is considered its highest and best use. An alternative that generates a value to the land that is negative, or well below market land sales prices, is financially infeasible.

Both the ROE and RLV analyses calculate the value of rental prototypes (residential and commercial) at a point in time based on the estimated stabilized net operating income of the prototype. For the condominium housing prototypes, DRA estimated gross sales revenues and subtracted sales commissions/costs to yield net sales revenues.

The low- and mid-rise residential prototypes are analyzed under low, middle and high land cost and price assumptions, reflecting the range of market conditions in different locations within the City. The mixed-use and non-residential prototypes
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are analyzed under middle and high cost/price scenarios, representing areas where they are likely to be developed.

## Assumptions and Analysis

DRA used the same assumptions as in its 2014 Economic Analysis, Version B, Lower Cap Rates, with the following updates and additions:

- Hard construction costs for the prototypes were escalated by $5 \%$ over the 2104 costs based on the increase in the Turner Building Cost Index of $4.75 \%$ for urban areas from $1^{\text {st }}$ Quarter 2014 to $1^{\text {st }}$ Quarter 2015. Hard construction costs for the medical office building are increased $30 \%$ over comparable office construction for higher floor heights, greater HVAC requirements and higher tenant improvement costs.
- Apartment rents for the additional low- and mid-rise residential and mixeduse prototypes are based on the 2014 study escalated by 5\% to 2015. According to Apartment Insights Washington, average rents in King and Snohomish counties increased by $8 \%$ from $4^{\text {th }}$ Quarter 2013 to $4^{\text {th }}$ Quarter 2014. However, vacancy rates also increased and the influx of new apartments is expected to temper future rent increases.
- Apartment operating costs were escalated by $4 \%$ over 2014 assumptions for low, middle and high rent scenarios, based on the average annual increase in operating costs reported by Dupre + Scott from 2000 to 2013.
- Estimated rental income for the non-residential prototypes is based on a review of market data and interviews with local developers. Medical office lease rates are estimated to be $30 \%$ higher than comparable office lease rates, based on developer interviews.
- For the owner housing, the townhome sales price was based on the median sales price per square foot for new homes sold in Seattle during the $1^{\text {st }}$ Quarter 2015 of $\$ 340$ for an average-sized new unit of 1,300 square feet, according to Redfin. The estimated per square foot sales prices for single-
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family infill homes and owner flats are estimated at \$325 and \$350, respectively.

- Land costs for the single-story retail prototype are based on data provided by City staff on sales for comparable sites in lower cost areas. Single-story retail development will only be feasible in such areas.

The development cost assumptions used in this analysis are detailed in Table 5.
Table 6 presents the estimated prototype development cost budgets and total development cost, with and without land costs, for the ten prototypes, respectively.

The income and operating cost assumptions and projected net operating income for the prototypes with rental residential units are summarized in Table 7.

Assumptions on condominium sales prices and projected net sales income are shown in Table 8. Assumptions on lease rates, operating costs, and projected net operating income from the non-residential prototypes are shown in Table 9.
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Table 1
Summary of Return on Equity and Land Residual Analysis Results
Nexus Protototypes
Resid. Cap Rate: $\quad 4.25 \%$
Nexus Protototypes
Lower Cap Rates Version B
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

(1) Return on equity measured as net project value divided by the number of years equity investment divided by total equity investment.
(2) Land residual value per square foot site area.
(3) Low and High nexus fee scenarios for low, middle and high economic areas are as follows. Nexus fees are assumed to be applied per net square foot building area

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text { Low Nexus Fee } & \text { Low Cost Area } & \text { Middle Cost } & \text { High Cost Area } \\
& \$ 5 & \$ 10 & \$ 16
\end{array}
$$

Source: DRA.
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|  |  |  | Single-Family Infill | Owner Townhomes | Owner Flats | Rental Flats | MU Grocery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less: Affordable Housing Nexus Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$5 | Per NSF | \$11,000 | \$42,000 | \$46,500 | \$47,500 |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$10 | Per NSF | \$22,000 | \$84,000 | \$93,000 | \$95,000 | \$1,575,000 |
| High Scenario | \$16 | Per NSF | \$35,200 | \$134,400 | \$148,800 | \$152,000 | \$2,520,000 |
| 2. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: High |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$7 | Per NSF | \$15,400 | \$58,800 | \$65,100 | \$66,500 |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$12 | Per NSF | \$26,400 | \$100,800 | \$111,600 | \$114,000 | \$1,890,000 |
| High Scenario | \$22 | Per NSF | \$48,400 | \$184,800 | \$204,600 | \$209,000 | \$3,465,000 |
| Net Value of Investment After Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$41,033 | \$370,395 | (\$330,718) | \$1,774,508 |  |
| Return on Equity |  |  | 9\% | 21\% | -13\% | 89\% |  |
| Middle Scenario |  |  | \$39,784 | \$193,308 | (\$694,951) | \$2,066,455 | $(\$ 51,083)$ |
| Return on Equity |  |  | 8\% | 10\% | -24\% | 88\% | 0\% |
| High Scenario |  |  | \$31,835 | $(\$ 46,316)$ | (\$1,124,392) | \$2,018,479 | (\$4,198,506) |
| Return on Equity |  |  | 6\% | -2\% | -33\% | 73\% | -3\% |
| 2. Residential and | esidential Fe |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario |  |  | \$36,633 | \$311,595 | (\$395,818) | \$1,708,008 |  |
| Return on Equity |  |  | 8\% | 18\% | -15\% | 85\% |  |
| Middle Scenario |  |  | \$35,384 | \$176,508 | $(\$ 713,551)$ | \$2,047,455 | (\$366,083) |
| Return on Equity |  |  | 7\% | 9\% | -24\% | 88\% | 0\% |
| High Scenario |  |  | \$18,635 | $(\$ 96,716)$ | $(\$ 1,180,192)$ | \$1,961,479 | $(\$ 5,143,506)$ |
| Return on Equity |  |  | 4\% | -4\% | -34\% | 71\% | -4\% |
| Cash Flow Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt | 60\% |  | \$344,980 | \$1,309,923 | \$1,921,256 | \$1,502,794 |  |
| Equity | 40\% |  | \$229,987 | \$873,282 | \$1,280,837 | \$1,001,863 |  |
| Middle Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt | 60\% |  | \$370,480 | \$1,461,535 | \$2,216,521 | \$1,752,243 | \$47,226,897 |
| Equity | 40\% |  | \$246,986 | \$974,357 | \$1,477,681 | \$1,168,162 | \$31,484,598 |
| High Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt | 60\% |  | \$398,679 | \$1,670,829 | \$2,573,230 | \$2,060,081 | \$53,981,121 |
| Equity | 40\% |  | \$265,786 | \$1,113,886 | \$1,715,487 | \$1,373,387 | \$35,987,414 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Annual Debt Service } & 5 \% & 20 \text { Yrs } \\ \text { Low Scenario } & \\ \text { Middle Scenario } & & \\ \text { High Scenario } & & \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$27,321 | \$103,739 | \$152,153 | \$119,013 |  |
|  |  |  | \$29,340 | \$115,746 | \$175,537 | \$138,768 | \$3,740,119 |
|  |  |  | \$52,622 | \$220,535 | \$339,644 | \$271,912 | \$7,125,030 |
| Net Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario |  |  | $(\$ 27,321)$ | (\$103,739) | (\$152,153) | \$62,851 |  |
| Annual Return on Equity (2) |  |  | -11.9\% | -11.9\% | -11.9\% | 6.3\% |  |
| Middle Scenario |  |  | (\$29,340) | (\$115,746) | $(\$ 175,537)$ | \$77,211 | (\$712,614) |
| Annual Return on Equity (2) |  |  | -11.9\% | -11.9\% | -11.9\% | 6.6\% | -2.3\% |
| High Scenario |  |  | (\$52,622) | (\$220,535) | (\$339,644) | (\$33,745) | (\$3,850,829) |
| Annual Return on Equity (2) |  |  | -13.2\% | -13.2\% | -13.2\% | -1.6\% | -7.1\% |

(1) Return on equity measured as net project value divided by the number of years equity investment divided by total equity investment.
(2) Annual net cash flow (NOI less debt service) divided by total equity investment.

Source: DRA.
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(1) Return on equity measured as net project value divi
(2) Annual net cash flow (NOI less debt service) divide

Source: DRA.
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|  | Single-Family Infill | Owner Townhomes | Owner Flats | Rental Flats | MU Grocery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Area (SF) | 5,000 | 9,600 | 9,600 | 9,600 | 50,000 |
| Net SF R\&D Laboratory | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF General Office | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ner SF Medical Office | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF Retail | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF Grocery Store | - | - | - | - | 37,500 |
| Net SF Restaurant | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF Entertainment | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF Community Space | - | - | - | - | 7,500 |
| Total Net SF Non-Residential | - | - | - | - | 45,000 |
| Residential Net SF | 2,200 | 8,400 | 9,300 | 9,500 | 112,500 |
| Total Net SF | 2,200 | 8,400 | 9,300 | 9,500 | 157,500 |
| Residential Units | 1 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 173 |
| Approximate Building Stories | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Total Annual Net Operating Income, Apartments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario <br> NOI Per NSF |  |  |  | \$181,865 \$19.14 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario |  |  |  | \$215,979 | \$3,027,505 |
| NOI Per NSF |  |  |  | \$22.73 | \$19.22 |
| High Scenario |  |  |  | \$238,168 | \$3,274,201 |
| NOI Per NSF |  |  |  | \$25.07 | \$20.79 |
| Cap Rate |  |  |  | 4.25\% | 4.25\% |
| Capitalized Value, Apartments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario |  |  |  | \$4,279,165 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario |  |  |  | \$5,081,859 | \$71,235,412 |
| High Scenario |  |  |  | \$5,603,947 | \$77,040,029 |
| Net Home Sales Proceeds |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$627,000 | \$2,553,600 | \$2,871,375 |  |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$679,250 | \$2,713,200 | \$3,092,250 |  |  |
| High Scenario | \$731,500 | \$2,872,800 | \$3,313,125 |  |  |
| Total Annual NOI, Non-Residential Uses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Scenario |  |  |  |  | \$450,000 |
| NOI Per NSF |  |  |  |  | \$2.86 |
| High Scenario |  |  |  |  | \$562,500 |
| NOI Per NSF |  |  |  |  | \$3.57 |
| Cap Rate, Commercial |  |  |  |  | 5.00\% |
| Capitalized Value, Non-Resid Uses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Scenario |  |  |  |  | \$9,000,000 |
| High Scenario |  |  |  |  | \$11,250,000 |
| Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Rental; Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$627,000 | \$2,553,600 | \$2,871,375 | \$4,279,165 | N/A |
| Per NSF | \$285 | \$304 | \$309 | \$450 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$679,250 | \$2,713,200 | \$3,092,250 | \$5,081,859 | \$80,235,412 |
| Per NSF | \$309 | \$323 | \$333 | \$535 | \$509 |
| High Scenario | \$731,500 | \$2,872,800 | \$3,313,125 | \$5,603,947 | \$88,290,029 |
| Per NSF | \$333 | \$342 | \$356 | \$590 | \$561 |
| Less: Total Development Cost, Excluding Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$474,967 | \$1,883,205 | \$2,902,093 | \$2,204,657 | N/A |
| Per NSF | \$216 | \$224 | \$312 | \$232 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$492,466 | \$1,955,892 | \$3,214,201 | \$2,440,404 | \$69,911,495 |
| Per NSF | \$224 | \$233 | \$346 | \$257 | \$444 |
| High Scenario | \$514,465 | \$2,064,716 | \$3,568,717 | \$2,713,468 | \$76,768,535 |
| Per NSF | \$234 | \$246 | \$384 | \$286 | \$487 |
| Less: Assumed Return on Equity (See Below) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$55,197 | \$209,588 | \$307,401 | \$240,447 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$59,277 | \$233,846 | \$354,643 | \$280,359 | \$7,556,304 |
| High Scenario | \$63,789 | \$267,333 | \$411,717 | \$329,613 | \$8,636,979 |
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|  | Single-Family Infill | Owner Townhomes | Owner Flats | Rental Flats | MU Grocery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residual Land Value Before Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$96,836 | \$670,395 | (\$30,718) | \$2,074,508 | N/A |
| Per SF Site Area | \$19 | \$70 | (\$3) | \$216 | N/A |
| Per Dwelling Unit | \$96,836 | \$111,733 | $(\$ 3,413)$ | \$172,876 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$127,507 | \$757,308 | $(\$ 121,951)$ | \$2,641,455 | \$10,323,917 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$26 | \$79 | (\$13) | \$275 | \$206 |
| Per Dwelling Unit | \$127,507 | \$126,218 | $(\$ 13,550)$ | \$220,121 | \$59,676 |
| High Scenario | \$153,247 | \$808,084 | $(\$ 255,592)$ | \$2,890,479 | \$11,521,494 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$31 | \$84 | (\$27) | \$301 | \$230 |
| Per Dwelling Unit | \$153,247 | \$134,681 | $(\$ 28,399)$ | \$240,873 | \$66,598 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Equity Investment @ } \\ \text { Low Scenario } \end{array}$ | \$189,987 | \$753,282 | \$1,160,837 | \$881,863 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$196,986 | \$782,357 | \$1,285,681 | \$976,162 | \$27,964,598 |
| High Scenario | \$205,786 | \$825,886 | \$1,427,487 | \$1,085,387 | \$30,707,414 |
| Assumed Investment Period (Months) | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Less: Total Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: Low |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario $\quad \$ 5$ | \$11,000 | \$42,000 | \$46,500 | \$47,500 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario $\quad \$ 10$ Per NSF | \$22,000 | \$84,000 | \$93,000 | \$95,000 | \$1,575,000 |
| High Scenario $\quad \$ 16$ | \$35,200 | \$134,400 | \$148,800 | \$152,000 | \$2,520,000 |
| 2. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: High |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario $\quad \$ 7$ | \$15,400 | \$58,800 | \$65,100 | \$66,500 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario $\quad \$ 12$ | \$26,400 | \$100,800 | \$111,600 | \$114,000 | \$1,890,000 |
| High Scenario $\quad \$ 22$ | \$48,400 | \$184,800 | \$204,600 | \$209,000 | \$3,465,000 |
| Residual Land Value After Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: Low |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per SF Site Area | \$17 | \$65 | (\$8) |  | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$105,507 | \$673,308 | (\$214,951) | \$2,546,455 | \$8,748,917 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$21 | \$70 | (\$22) | \$265 | \$175 |
| High Scenario | \$118,047 | \$673,684 | (\$404,392) | \$2,738,479 | \$9,001,494 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$24 | \$70 | (\$42) | \$285 | \$180 |
| 2. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: High |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$81,436 | \$611,595 | (\$95,818) | \$2,008,008 | N/A |
| Per SF Site Area | \$16 | \$64 | (\$10) | \$209 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$101,107 | \$656,508 | $(\$ 233,551)$ | \$2,527,455 | \$8,433,917 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$20 | \$68 | (\$24) | \$263 | \$169 |
| High Scenario | \$104,847 | \$623,284 | $(\$ 460,192)$ | \$2,681,479 | \$8,056,494 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$21 | \$65 | (\$48) | \$279 | \$161 |
| Equity Investment @ ${ }^{\text {@ }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ \% of TDC |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assumed Investment Period (Years) | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Assumed Return on Equity (1) | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| Low Scenario | \$229,987 | \$873,282 | \$1,280,837 | \$1,001,863 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$246,986 | \$974,357 | \$1,477,681 | \$1,168,162 | \$31,484,598 |
| High Scenario | \$265,786 | \$1,113,886 | \$1,715,487 | \$1,373,387 | \$35,987,414 |

(1) Return on equity measured as net project value divided by the number of years equity investment divided by total equity investment.

Source: DRA.
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|  | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment | Stand Alone Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Area (SF) | 20,000 | 20,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Net SF R\&D Laboratory | - | - | - | 80,000 | - |
| Net SF General Office | - | - | - | 8,000 | - |
| Ner SF Medical Office | - | - | - | - | 69,600 |
| Net SF Retail | - | - | 20,000 | 1,600 | 2,400 |
| Net SF Grocery Store | - | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF Restaurant | 2,250 | - | - | - | - |
| Net SF Entertainment | - | 11,250 | - | - | - |
| Net SF Community Space | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Net SF Non-Residential | 2,250 | 11,250 | 20,000 | 89,600 | 72,000 |
| Residential Net SF | 46,800 | 57,200 | - | - | - |
| Total Net SF | 49,050 | 68,450 | 20,000 | 89,600 | 72,000 |
| Residential Units | 72 | 88 |  | - | - |
| Approximate Building Stories | 4 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| Total Annual Net Operating Income, Apartments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| NOI Per NSF | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$1,018,930 | \$1,398,358 |  |  |  |
| NOI Per NSF | \$20.77 | \$20.43 |  |  |  |
| High Scenario | \$1,121,539 | \$1,523,769 |  |  |  |
| NOI Per NSF | \$22.87 | \$22.26 |  |  |  |
| Cap Rate | 4.25\% | 4.25\% |  |  |  |
| Capitalized Value, Apartments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$23,974,814 | \$32,902,551 |  |  |  |
| High Scenario | \$26,389,144 | \$35,853,398 |  |  |  |
| Net Home Sales Proceeds |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low ScenarioMiddle Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual NOI, Non-Residential Uses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$21,600 | \$108,000 | \$288,000 | \$2,047,880 | \$2,102,064 |
| NOI Per NSF | \$0.44 | \$1.58 | \$14.40 | \$22.86 | \$29.20 |
| High Scenario | \$27,000 | \$135,000 | \$360,000 | \$2,559,850 | \$2,627,580 |
| NOI Per NSF | \$0.55 | \$1.97 | \$18.00 | \$28.57 | \$36.49 |
| Cap Rate, Commercial | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% |
| Capitalized Value, Non-Resid Uses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Scenario | \$432,000 | \$2,160,000 | \$5,760,000 | \$40,957,600 | \$42,041,280 |
| High Scenario | \$540,000 | \$2,700,000 | \$7,200,000 | \$51,197,000 | \$52,551,600 |
| Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Rental; Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per NSF | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$24,406,814 | \$35,062,551 | \$5,760,000 | \$40,957,600 | \$42,041,280 |
| Per NSF | \$498 | \$512 | \$288 | \$457 | \$584 |
| High Scenario | \$26,929,144 | \$38,553,398 | \$7,200,000 | \$51,197,000 | \$52,551,600 |
| Per NSF | \$549 | \$563 | \$360 | \$571 | \$730 |
| Less: Total Development Cost, Excluding Land |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per NSF | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$13,350,474 | \$22,512,393 | \$3,100,781 | \$22,966,655 | \$27,296,898 |
| Per NSF | \$272 | \$329 | \$155 | \$256 | \$379 |
| High Scenario | \$14,908,766 | \$24,748,101 | \$3,100,781 | \$24,879,989 | \$29,975,104 |
| Per NSF | \$304 | \$362 | \$155 | \$278 | \$416 |
| Less: Assumed Return on Equity (See Below) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$1,619,566 | \$2,499,110 | \$806,475 | \$2,972,799 | \$2,958,422 |
| High Scenario | \$1,938,122 | \$2,882,698 | \$806,475 | \$3,204,479 | \$3,384,490 |

Table 3
Land Residual Analysis
Nexus Protototypes
Lower Cap Rates Version B
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment | Stand Alone Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residual Land Value Before Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per SF Site Area | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per Dwelling Unit | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$11,056,340 | \$12,550,158 | \$2,659,219 | \$17,990,945 | \$14,744,382 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$553 | \$628 | \$53 | \$900 | \$737 |
| Per Dwelling Unit | \$153,560 | \$142,615 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| High Scenario | \$12,020,378 | \$13,805,297 | \$4,099,219 | \$26,317,011 | \$22,576,496 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$601 | \$690 | \$82 | \$1,316 | \$1,129 |
| Per Dwelling Unit | \$166,950 | \$156,878 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Equity Investment @ Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$5,340,190 | \$9,004,957 | \$1,240,313 | \$9,186,662 | \$10,918,759 |
| High Scenario | \$5,963,506 | \$9,899,240 | \$1,240,313 | \$9,951,996 | \$11,990,041 |
| Assumed Investment Period (Months) | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Less: Total Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: Low |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario Per NSF | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario Per NSF | \$490,500 | \$684,500 | \$200,000 | \$896,000 | \$720,000 |
| High Scenario Per NSF | \$784,800 | \$1,095,200 | \$320,000 | \$1,433,600 | \$1,152,000 |
| 2. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: High |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario Per NSF | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario P12 Per NSF | \$588,600 | \$821,400 | \$240,000 | \$1,075,200 | \$864,000 |
| High Scenario Per NSF | \$1,079,100 | \$1,505,900 | \$440,000 | \$1,971,200 | \$1,584,000 |
| Residual Land Value After Nexus Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: Low |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per SF Site Area | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$10,565,840 | \$11,865,658 | \$2,459,219 | \$17,094,945 | \$14,024,382 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$528 | \$593 | \$49 | \$855 | \$701 |
| High Scenario | \$11,235,578 | \$12,710,097 | \$3,779,219 | \$24,883,411 | \$21,424,496 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$562 | \$636 | \$76 | \$1,244 | \$1,071 |
| 2. Residential and Non-Residential Fee: High |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per SF Site Area | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$10,467,740 | \$11,728,758 | \$2,419,219 | \$16,915,745 | \$13,880,382 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$523 | \$586 | \$48 | \$846 | \$694 |
| High Scenario | \$10,941,278 | \$12,299,397 | \$3,659,219 | \$24,345,811 | \$20,992,496 |
| Per SF Site Area | \$547 | \$615 | \$73 | \$1,217 | \$1,050 |
| Equity Investment @ $\quad \mathbf{4 0 \%} \quad$ of TDC |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| Assumed Return on Equity (1) | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$6,748,190 | \$10,412,957 | \$3,360,313 | \$12,386,662 | \$12,326,759 |
| High Scenario | \$8,075,506 | \$12,011,240 | \$3,360,313 | \$13,351,996 | \$14,102,041 |

(1) Return on equity measured as net project value div

Source: DRA.

Table 4
Development Prototypes
Nexus Analysis
2015

|  | Single-Family Infill | Owner Townhomes | Owner Flats | Rental Flats | MU Grocery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoning | SF-5000 | LR2 | LR2 | LR2 | SM / C / NC-65 |
| Zip Code(s) | Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106 | Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106 | Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106 | Many including: 98107, 98103, 98122, 98144, 98106 | Multiple |
| Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea | Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge | Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge | Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge | Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill / Central Area, North Beacon Hill, Delridge | Multiple |
| Primary Land Use(s) | Residential | Residential | Residential | Res over Retail | Rental Apts. Grocery Store |
| Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner) | Owner | Owner | Owner | Renter | Renter |
| Total Site Area (Acre) | 0.11 Acres | 0.22 Acres | 0.22 Acres | 0.22 Acres | 1.15 Acres |
| Total Site Area (SF) | 5,000 | 9,600 | 9,600 | 9,600 | 50,000 |
| Construction Type | Type VB | Type VB | Type VB | Type VB | Type V over Type I |
| Parking Type | Above Grade Garage | Above Grade Garage | Subterranean | Subterranean | Subterranean |
| Approximate Building Stories | 2 Stories | 3 Stories | 3 Stories | 3 Stories | 6 Stories |
| Total Gross Building SF (Incl. Pkg) (1) | 2,600 | 10,800 | 15,225 | 11,500 | 300,000 |
| Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.) (1) | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 6.00 |
| Total Gross Building SF (Excluding All Parking) (2) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 200,000 SF |
| Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Excl. Pkg.) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4.00 |
| Total Gross Building SF Above Ground | N/A | N/A | 11,625 | 11,875 | 300,000 |
| Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking | N/A | N/A | 11,625 | 11,875 | 300,000 |
| Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking | N/A | N/A | 9,300 | 9,500 | 225,000 |
| Building Efficiency Ratio (\%) | 100\% | 100\% | 80\% | 80\% | 75\% |
| Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (\%) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 19\% |
| Levels Underground Parking | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Levels Structured Parking Above Grade | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stories of Ground Floor Retai//Lobby/Service Space | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stories of Non-Residential Space (2nd Story and Above) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stories of Residential Space | 2.0 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 31.4 |
| Total Stories Above Ground | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 31.4 |
| Net Rentable SF R\&D | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF General Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Medical Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Retail | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Grocery Store | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 37,500 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Restaurant | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Entertainment | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Residential | 2,200 SF | 8,400 SF | 9,300 SF | 9,500 SF | 112,500 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Total | 2,200 SF | 8,400 SF | 9,300 SF | 9,500 SF | 150,000 SF |
| Net SF Community Space | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 7,500 SF |
| Total Net Bldg. SF | 2,200 SF | 8,400 SF | 9,300 SF | 9,500 SF | 157,500 SF |
| Gross SF R\&D | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Medical Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Retail | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Grocery Store | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 50,000 SF |
| Gross SF Restaurant | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Entertainment | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Residential | 2,200 SF | 8,400 SF | 11,625 SF | 11,875 SF | 150,000 SF |
| Gross SF Community Space Total Gross Bldg. SF | 2,200 SF | 8,400 SF | 11,625 SF | $\stackrel{0}{0}{ }_{11,875}^{\text {SF }}$ | $10,000 \mathrm{SF}$ $210,000 \mathrm{SF}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Bedroom Count Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 25\% |
| One Bedroom | 0\% | 0\% | 67\% | 33\% | 50\% |
| Two Bedroom | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 17\% | 25\% |
| Three Bedroom | 100\% | 100\% | 33\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Units by BR Count |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 43 |
| One Bedroom | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 87 |
| Two Bedroom | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 43 |
| Three Bedroom | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Residential Units | 1 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 173 |
| Residential Density (Units per Acre) | $9 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{a}$ | 27 du/a | 41 du/a | $54 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{a}$ | 151 du/a |
| Unit Size (Net SF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 650 SF | 450 SF |
| One Bedroom | 0 SF | 0 SF | 800 SF | 800 SF | 650 SF |
| Two Bedroom | 0 SF | 1,400 SF | 1,500 SF | 1,200 SF | 850 SF |
| Three Bedroom | 2,200 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Average Unit Size | 2,200 SF | 1,400 SF | 1,033 SF | 793 SF | 650 SF |
| Parking Spaces Per Floor | N/A | 48 Spaces/Floor | N/A | N/A | 125 Spaces/Floor |
| No. of Underground Parking Spaces | 0 Spaces | 0 Spaces | 9 Spaces | 6 Spaces | 250 Spaces |
| No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces | 2 Spaces | 12 Spaces | 0 Spaces | 0 Spaces | 0 Spaces |
| Total Parking Spaces Provided | 2 Spaces | 12 Spaces | 9 Spaces | 6 Spaces | 250 Spaces |
| Gross SF/Parking Space (Incl. Circulation) | 200 SF | 200 SF | 400 SF | 400 SF | 400 SF |
| Total Parking SF | 400 SF | 2,400 SF | 3,600 SF | 2,000 SF | 100,000 SF |
| Total Underground Parking SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 3,600 SF | 2,000 SF | 100,000 SF |
| Total Parking SF Above Grade | 400 SF | 2,400 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |

(1) Includes below-grand and above-grade parking.

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

Table 4
Development Prototypes
Nexus Analysis
2015

|  | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment | Stand Alone Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoning | SM / C / NC-65 | SM/C / NC-65 | IG / IC / C | SM 85 | SM/NC/C-85 |
| Zip Code(s) | Multiple | Multiple | Multiple | 98104, 98109, 98105, 98122 | 98104, 98109, 98105, 98122 |
| Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea | Multiple | Multiple | Multiple | First Hill, South Lake Union, University District, Capitol Hill | First Hill, South Lake Union, University District, Capitol Hill |
| Primary Land Use(s) | Rental Apts. <br> Restaurant | Rental Apts. Entertainment | Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office Grnd. Floor Retail |
| Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner) | Renter | Renter | N/A | 0 | 0 |
| Total Site Area (Acre) | 0.46 Acres | 0.46 Acres | 1.15 Acres | 0.46 Acres | 0.46 Acres |
| Total Site Area (SF) | 20,000 | 20,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Construction Type | Type V | Type V over Type I | Type V over Type I | Type I | Type I |
| Parking Type | Surface | Subterranean | Subterranean | Subterranean | Subterranean |
| Approximate Building Stories | 4 Stories | 6 Stories | 1 Stories | 7 Stories | 6 Stories |
| Total Gross Building SF (Incl. Pkg) (1) | 65,000 | 95,000 | 25,000 | 112,000 | 90,000 |
| Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Incl. Pkg.) (1) | 3.25 | 4.75 | 0.50 | 5.60 | 4.50 |
| Total Gross Building SF (Excluding All Parking) (2) Floor Area Ratio (Gross Bldg SF, Excl. Pkg.) | $\begin{gathered} 49,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ 2.45 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61,800 \mathrm{SF} \\ 3.09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ 0.50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 112,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ 14.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ 14.00 \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Gross Building SF Above Ground | 65,000 | 95,000 | 25,000 | 112,000 | 90,000 |
| Total Gross Parking SF Above Ground | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Gross SF Above Ground Excluding Parking | 65,000 | 95,000 | 25,000 | 112,000 | 90,000 |
| Total Net Building SF Excluding Parking | 49,000 | 71,000 | 20,000 | 90,000 | 72,000 |
| Building Efficiency Ratio (\%) | 75\% | 75\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (\%) | 100\% | 36\% | 19\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Levels Underground Parking | 0.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Levels Structured Parking Above Grade | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stories of Ground Floor Retail/Lobby/Service Space | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Stories of Non-Residential Space (2nd Story and Above) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 |
| Stories of Residential Space | 3.3 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Stories Above Ground | 3.3 | 13.2 | 1.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 |
| Net Rentable SF R\&D | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 80,000 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF General Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 8,000 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Medical Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 69,600 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Retail | 0 SF | 0 SF | 20,000 SF | 1,600 SF | 2,400 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Grocery Store | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Restaurant | 2,250 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Entertainment | 0 SF | 11,250 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Residential | 46,800 SF | 57,200 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Net Rentable SF Total | 49,050 SF | 68,450 SF | 20,000 SF | 89,600 SF | 72,000 SF |
| Net SF Community Space | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |  |  |
| Total Net Bldg. SF | 49,050 SF | 68,450 SF | 20,000 SF | 89,600 SF | 72,000 SF |
| Gross SF R\&D | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 100,000 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 10,000 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Medical Office | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 87,000 SF |
| Gross SF Retail | 0 SF | 0 SF | 25,000 SF | 2,000 SF | 3,000 SF |
| Gross SF Grocery Store | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Restaurant | 3,000 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Entertainment | 0 SF | 15,000 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Residential | $62,400 \mathrm{SF}$ | 76,267 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Gross SF Community Space | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |  |  |
| Total Gross Bldg. SF | 65,400 SF | $91,267 \mathrm{SF}$ | 25,000 SF | 112,000 SF | 90,000 SF |
| Unit Bedroom Count Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 25\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0 | 0 |
| One Bedroom | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 0 | 0 |
| Two Bedroom | 25\% | 25\% | 40\% | 0 | 0 |
| Three Bedroom | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0 | 0 |
| Units by BR Count |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 18 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One Bedroom | 36 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two Bedroom | 18 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Three Bedroom | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Residential Units | 72 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential Density (Units per Acre) | 157 du/a | 192 du/a | $0 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{a}$ | 0 du/a | $0 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Unit Size ( Net SF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 450 SF | 450 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| One Bedroom | 650 SF | 650 SF | 700 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Two Bedroom | 850 SF | 850 SF | 900 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Three Bedroom | 0 SF | 0 SF | 1,100 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Average Unit Size | 650 SF | 650 SF | 820 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |
| Parking Spaces Per Floor | 53 Spaces/Floor | 50 Spaces/Floor | N/A | 52 Spaces/Floor | 50 Spaces/Floor |
| No. of Underground Parking Spaces | 43 Spaces | 83 Spaces | 0 Spaces | 147 Spaces | 180 Spaces |
| No. of Above-Ground Parking Spaces | 0 Spaces | 0 Spaces | 105 Spaces | 0 Spaces | 0 Spaces |
| Total Parking Spaces Provided | 43 Spaces | 83 Spaces | 105 Spaces | 147 Spaces | 180 Spaces |
| Gross SF/Parking Space (Incl. Circulation) | 380 SF | 400 SF | 0 SF | 388 SF | 400 SF |
| Total Parking SF | 16,000 SF | 33,200 SF | 0 SF | 57,000 SF | 72,000 SF |
| Total Underground Parking SF | 16,000 SF | 33,200 SF | 0 SF | 57,000 SF | 72,000 SF |
| Total Parking SF Above Grade | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF | 0 SF |

(1) Includes below-grand and above-grade parking.

Source: City of Seattle Department of Planning and Deve

Table 5
Development and Financing Cost Assumptions
Nexus Prototypes
Version B
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | Single-Family Infill | Owner Townhomes | Owner Flats | Rental Flats | MU Grocery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail/Restaurant/Grocery Store/Entertainment Net SF | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37,500 |
| Office/R\&D/Medical Office Net SF | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential Net SF | 2,200 | 8,400 | 9,300 | 9,500 | 112,500 |
| Total Net SF | 2,200 | 8,400 | 9,300 | 9,500 | 157,500 |
| Total Gross SF Building Area (Including Str. Parking) | 2,600 | 10,800 | 15,225 | 11,500 | 300,000 |
| Total Residential Units |  | 6 | 9 | 12 | 173 |
| Site Area (SF) | 5,000 | 9,600 | 9,600 | 9,600 | 50,000 |
| Approximate Building Stories |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Zoning | SF-5000 | LR2 | LR2 | LR2 | SM / C / NC-65 |
| Hard Cost Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Price |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario Per Hsg. Unit | \$100,000 | \$50,000 | \$33,333 | \$25,000 | N/A |
| Per Site SF | \$20 | \$31 | \$31 | \$31 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario Per Hsg. Unit | \$125,000 | \$80,000 | \$53,333 | \$40,000 | \$50,867 |
| Per Site SF | \$25 | \$50 | \$50 | \$50 | \$176 |
| High Scenario Per Hsg. Unit | \$150,000 | \$120,000 | \$80,000 | \$60,000 | \$76,301 |
| Per Site SF | \$30 | \$75 | \$75 | \$75 | \$264 |
| Building Demolition Costs | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Hard Construction Cost (Per Gross SF Incl. Str. Pkg.) (1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$115 | \$120 | \$130 | \$130 | \$150 |
| Middle Scenario | \$120 | \$125 | \$145 | \$145 | \$165 |
| High Scenario | \$125 | \$130 | \$160 | \$160 | \$180 |
| 2015 Assumpt w/ \% incr: 5\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$121 | \$126 | \$137 | \$137 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$126 | \$131 | \$152 | \$152 | \$173 |
| High Scenario | \$131 | \$137 | \$168 | \$168 | \$189 |
| Hard Cost Contingency (\% of Hard Costs) | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| WA State Sales Tax (\% of Hard Costs Plus Conting.) | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% |
| Soft Cost Assumptions (\% of Hard Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architecture/Engineering/Consultants | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% |
| Financing Costs | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Other Soft Costs (2) | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Residential Condo Addit. Insur./Expenses | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal--Soft Cost \% | 16.0\% | 16.0\% | 18.0\% | 18.0\% | 16.0\% |
| Developer Overhead (\% TDC Less Land \& Sales Tax) | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |

(1) Hard costs are escalated 5\% over 2014 DRA assumptions for prototypes of comparable construction based on increase in Turner Building Cost Index of $4.75 \%$ fo Hard costs for construction of medical office building are increased $30 \%$ over comparable office construction for higher floor heights, greater HVAC requirement: (2) Includes insurance, legal, accounting, marketing, lease-up, permits and fees.

## Source: DRA

Table 5
Development and Financing Cost Assumptions
Nexus Prototypes
Version B
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment | Stand Alone Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail/Restaurant/Grocery Store/Entertainment Net SF | 2,250 | 11,250 | 20,000 | 1,600 | 2,400 |
| Office/R\&D/Medical Office Net SF |  |  | 0 | 88,000 | 69,600 |
| Residential Net SF | 46,800 | 57,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Net SF | 49,050 | 68,450 | 20,000 | 89,600 | 72,000 |
| Total Gross SF Building Area (Including Str. Parking) | 65,000 | 95,000 | 25,000 | 112,000 | 90,000 |
| Total Residential Units | 72 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Area (SF) | 20,000 | 20,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Approximate Building Stories |  |  |  | 7 | 6 |
| Zoning | SM / C / NC-65 | SM / C / NC-65 | IG / IC / C | SM 85 | SM/NC/C-85 |
| Hard Cost Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Price |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario Per Hsg. Unit | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per Site SF | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario Per Hsg. Unit | \$48,889 | \$40,000 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per Site SF | \$176 | \$176 | \$106 | \$400 | \$176 |
| High Scenario Per Hsg. Unit | \$73,333 | \$60,000 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Per Site SF | \$264 | \$264 | \$106 | \$425 | \$264 |
| Building Demolition Costs | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Hard Construction Cost (Per Gross SF Incl. Str. Pkg.) (1 2014 Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$130 | \$150 | N/A | \$135 | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$145 | \$165 | N/A | \$145 | N/A |
| High Scenario | \$160 | \$180 | N/A | \$155 | N/A |
| 2015 Assumpt w/ \% incr: 5\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | N/A | N/A | \$105 | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Scenario | \$152 | \$173 | \$105 | \$152 | \$225 |
| High Scenario | \$168 | \$189 | \$105 | \$163 | \$246 |
| Hard Cost Contingency (\% of Hard Costs) | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| WA State Sales Tax (\% of Hard Costs Plus Conting.) | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% |
| Soft Cost Assumptions (\% of Hard Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architecture/Engineering/Consultants | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% |
| Financing Costs | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Other Soft Costs (2) | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Residential Condo Addit. Insur./Expenses | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal--Soft Cost \% | 16.0\% | 18.0\% | 18.0\% | 16.0\% | 16.0\% |
| Developer Overhead (\% TDC Less Land \& Sales Tax) | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |

(1) Hard costs are escalated 5\% over 2014 DRA assumr urban areas from First Quarter 2014 to First Quarter 2015.

Hard costs for construction of medical office buildis and higher tenant improvement costs.
(2) Includes insurance, legal, accounting, marketing, If

Source: DRA
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[^1]Table 7
Estimated Net Operating Income from Apartments
Nexus Rental Housing Prototypes
Version B
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | Rental Flats | MU Grocery | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Rentable SF of Apartment Space | 9,500 | 112,500 | 46,800 | 57,200 |
| Net Rentable SF of Retail Space | 0 | 37,500 | 2,250 | 11,250 |
| Approximate Building Stories | 3 | G | 4 | 6 |
| Number of Apartment Units |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 6 | 43 | 18 | 22 |
| One Bedroom | 4 | 87 | 36 | 44 |
| Two Bedroom | 2 | 43 | 18 | 22 |
| Three Bedroom | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 12 | 173 | 72 | 88 |
| Unit Size (Square Feet) |  |  |  |  |
| Studio | 650 | 450 | 450 | 450 |
| One Bedroom | 800 | 650 | 650 | 650 |
| Two Bedroom | 1,200 | 850 | 850 | 850 |
| Three Bedroom | - | - | - | - |
| Average | 793 | 650 | 650 | 650 |
| Average Monthly Rent Per Square Foot (1) |  |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$2.42 | \$2.42 | \$2.42 | \$2.42 |
| Middle Scenario | \$2.73 | \$2.73 | \$2.73 | \$2.73 |
| High Scenario | \$2.99 | \$2.99 | \$2.99 | \$2.99 |
| Miscellaneous Income (\$/Unit/Year) | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 |
| Rental Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Rental Operating Cost/Unit (2) |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 Assumptions |  |  |  |  |
| Low and Middle Scenarios | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 |
| High Scenario | \$7,000 | \$7,000 | \$7,000 | \$7,000 |
| 2015 Assumptions 4\% |  |  |  |  |
| Low and Middle Scenarios | \$6,760 | \$6,760 | \$6,760 | \$6,760 |
| High Scenario | \$7,280 | \$7,280 | \$7,280 | \$7,280 |
| Retail Income (\$/NSF/Year) | \$20.00 | \$20.00 | \$20.00 | \$20.00 |
| Retail Vacancy Rate (\% Gross Retail Income) | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Retail Operating Cost (\% of Gross Retail Income) | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% |
| LOW SCENARIO |  |  |  |  |
| Total Monthly Gross Income | \$22,943 | \$271,688 | \$113,022 | \$138,138 |
| Annual Gross Income | \$275,310 | \$3,260,250 | \$1,356,264 | \$1,657,656 |
| Less: Vacancy | (\$13,766) | $(\$ 163,013)$ | $(\$ 67,813)$ | $(\$ 82,883)$ |
| Plus: Misc. Income | \$1,440 | \$249,120 | \$103,680 | \$126,720 |
| Plus: Retail Income | \$0 | \$750,000 | \$45,000 | \$225,000 |
| Adjusted Annual Gross Income | \$262,985 | \$4,096,358 | \$1,437,131 | \$1,926,493 |
| Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Apartment Operating Costs | (\$81,120) | (\$1,169,480) | (\$486,720) | (\$594,880) |
| Retail Operating Costs | \$0 | (\$75,000) | (\$4,500) | (\$22,500) |
| Net Operating Income | \$181,865 | \$2,851,878 | \$945,911 | \$1,309,113 |
| MIDDLE SCENARIO |  |  |  |  |
| Total Monthly Gross Income | \$25,935 | \$307,125 | \$127,764 | \$156,156 |
| Annual Gross Income | \$311,220 | \$3,685,500 | \$1,533,168 | \$1,873,872 |
| Less: Vacancy | (\$15,561) | (\$184,275) | $(\$ 76,658)$ | (\$93,694) |
| Plus: Misc. Income | \$1,440 | \$20,760 | \$8,640 | \$10,560 |
| Plus: Retail Income | \$0 | \$750,000 | \$45,000 | \$225,000 |
| Adjusted Annual Gross Income | \$297,099 | \$4,271,985 | \$1,510,150 | \$2,015,738 |
| Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Apartment Operating Costs | (\$81,120) | (\$1,169,480) | (\$486,720) | (\$594,880) |
| Retail Operating Costs | \$0 | (\$75,000) | (\$4,500) | (\$22,500) |
| Net Operating Income | \$215,979 | \$3,027,505 | \$1,018,930 | \$1,398,358 |
| HIGH SCENARIO |  |  |  |  |
| Total Monthly Gross Income | \$28,429 | \$336,656 | \$140,049 | \$171,171 |
| Annual Gross Income | \$341,145 | \$4,039,875 | \$1,680,588 | \$2,054,052 |
| Less: Vacancy | (\$17,057) | $(\$ 201,994)$ | (\$84,029) | (\$102,703) |
| Plus: Misc. Income | \$1,440 | \$20,760 | \$8,640 | \$10,560 |
| Plus: Retail Income | \$0 | \$750,000 | \$45,000 | \$225,000 |
| Adjusted Annual Gross Income | \$325,528 | \$4,608,641 | \$1,650,199 | \$2,186,909 |
| Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Apartment Operating Costs | $(\$ 87,360)$ | (\$1,259,440) | (\$524,160) | (\$640,640) |
| Retail Operating Costs | \$0 | (\$75,000) | (\$4,500) | (\$22,500) |
| Net Operating Income | \$238,168 | \$3,274,201 | \$1,121,539 | \$1,523,769 |

[^2]Table 8
Estimated Net Sales Income from Owner Housing
Nexus Owner Prototypes
Version B
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | Single-Family Infill | Owner Townhomes | Owner Flats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Saleable SF of Living Area | 2,200 | 8,400 | 9,300 |
| Number of Owner Hsg. Units |  |  |  |
| Studio | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One Bedroom | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Two Bedroom | 0 | 6 | 3 |
| Three Bedroom | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| Unit Size (Square Feet) |  |  |  |
| Studio | - | - | - |
| One Bedroom | - | - | 800 |
| Two Bedroom | - | 1,400 | 1,500 |
| Three Bedroom | 2,200 | - | - |
| Average | 2,200 | 1,400 | 1,033 |
| Average Sales Price Per Square Foot |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$300.00 | \$320.00 | \$325.00 |
| Middle Scenario | \$325.00 | \$340.00 | \$350.00 |
| High Scenario | \$350.00 | \$360.00 | \$375.00 |
| Average Sales Price Per Unit |  |  |  |
| Low Scenario | \$660,000 | \$448,000 | \$335,833 |
| Middle Scenario | \$715,000 | \$476,000 | \$361,667 |
| High Scenario | \$770,000 | \$504,000 | \$387,500 |
| Sales Costs (\% of Gross Sales Income) | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| LOW SCENARIO |  |  |  |
| Total Gross Sales Income | \$660,000 | \$2,688,000 | \$3,022,500 |
| Less: Sales Costs | (\$33,000) | $(\$ 134,400)$ | $(\$ 151,125)$ |
| Net Sales Income | \$627,000 | \$2,553,600 | \$2,871,375 |
| Net Sales Income Per Net Saleable SF | \$285 | \$304 | \$309 |
| MIDDLE SCENARIO |  |  |  |
| Total Gross Sales Income | \$715,000 | \$2,856,000 | \$3,255,000 |
| Less: Sales Costs | (\$35,750) | $(\$ 142,800)$ | $(\$ 162,750)$ |
| Net Sales Income | \$679,250 | \$2,713,200 | \$3,092,250 |
| Net Sales Income Per Net Saleable SF | \$309 | \$323 | \$333 |
| HIGH SCENARIO |  |  |  |
| Total Gross Sales Income | \$770,000 | \$3,024,000 | \$3,487,500 |
| Less: Sales Costs | $(\$ 38,500)$ | $(\$ 151,200)$ | (\$174,375) |
| Net Sales Income | \$731,500 | \$2,872,800 | \$3,313,125 |
| Net Sales Income Per Net Saleable SF | \$333 | \$342 | \$356 |

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

Source: Dataquick Information System; DRA

Table 9
Estimated Net Operating Income from Non-Residential Uses
Version B, Middle Scenario
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | MU Grocery | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment | Stand Alone Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net SF R\&D Laboratory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 0 |
| Net SF General Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,000 | 0 |
| Ner SF Medical Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69,600 |
| Net SF Retail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 1,600 | 2,400 |
| Net SF Grocery Store | 37,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net SF Restaurant | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net SF Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 11,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Net SF Non-Residential | 37,500 | 2,250 | 11,250 | 20,000 | 89,600 | 72,000 |
| Parking Spaces--Office | - | - | - | - | 147 | 180 |
| Approximate Building Stories | 6 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| R\&D Laboratory Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monthly Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  |  | \$2.67 |  |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  |  | \$32.00 |  |
| Vacancy Rate |  |  |  |  | 10.0\% |  |
| Operating Expenses Per NSF |  |  |  |  | \$10 |  |
| Office Income/Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monthly Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  |  | \$2.67 |  |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  |  | \$32.00 |  |
| Vacancy Rate |  |  |  |  | 10.0\% |  |
| Operating Expenses Per NSF |  |  |  |  | \$10 |  |
| Medical Office Income/Oper. Assumptions (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monthly Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  |  |  | \$3.47 |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  |  |  | \$41.60 |
| Vacancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  | 10.0\% |
| Operating Expenses Per NSF |  |  |  |  |  | \$13 |
| Retail Income/Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monthly Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  | \$2.50 | \$2.50 | \$1.67 |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  |  | \$30.00 | \$30.00 | \$20.00 |
| Vacancy Rate |  |  |  | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Operating Expenses Per NSF |  |  |  | 42\% | 42\% | 42\% |
| Grocery Store Income/Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monthly Rent Per NSF (NNN) | \$2.08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) | \$25.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Rate | 10.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses (\% of Gross Income) | 42\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant Income/Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  | \$20.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 10.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses (\% of Gross Income) |  | 42\% |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment Income/Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN) |  |  | \$20.00 |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Rate |  |  | 10.0\% |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses (\% of Gross Income) |  |  | 42\% |  |  |  |
| Parking Income/Operating Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parking Income (\$/Space/Month) |  |  |  |  | \$350.00 | \$350.00 |
| Parking Vacancy Rate |  |  |  |  | 20.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Parking Operating Expense (\% of Gross Income) |  |  |  |  | 20\% | 20\% |

Table 9
Estimated Net Operating Income from Non-Residential Uses
Version B, Middle Scenario
Seattle Nexus and Economic Impact Analysis
2015

|  | MU Grocery | MU Restaurant | MU Entertainment | Stand Alone Retail | R\&D Laboratory | Medical Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net SF R\&D Laboratory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 0 |
| Net SF General Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,000 | 0 |
| Ner SF Medical Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69,600 |
| Net SF Retail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 1,600 | 2,400 |
| Net SF Grocery Store | 37,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net SF Restaurant | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net SF Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 11,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Net SF Non-Residential | 37,500 | 2,250 | 11,250 | 20,000 | 89,600 | 72,000 |
| Parking Spaces--Office | - | - | - | - | 147 | 180 |
| Approximate Building Stories | 6 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| Stabilized Net Operating Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Gross R\&D Rental Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,560,000 | \$0 |
| Annual Gross Office Rental Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$256,000 | \$0 |
| Annual Gross Medical Office Rental Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,895,360 |
| Annual Gross Retail Rental Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$600,000 | \$48,000 | \$48,000 |
| Annual Gross Grocery Store Rental Income | \$937,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Annual Gross Restaurant Rental Income | \$0 | \$45,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Annual Gross Entertainment Rental Incom | \$0 | \$0 | \$225,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Annual Gross Parking Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$617,400 | \$756,000 |
| Annual Gross Non-Residential Rental Income | \$937,500 | \$45,000 | \$225,000 | \$600,000 | \$3,481,400 | \$3,699,360 |
| Less: R\&D Vacancy | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$256,000) | \$0 |
| Less: Office Vacancy | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 25,600)$ | \$0 |
| Less: Medical Office Vacancy | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 289,536)$ |
| Less: Retail Vacancy | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$60,000) | $(\$ 4,800)$ | $(\$ 4,800)$ |
| Less: Grocery Store Vacancy | $(\$ 93,750)$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Less: Restaurant Vacancy | \$0 | $(\$ 4,500)$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Less: Entertainment Vacancy | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 22,500)$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Less: Parking Vacancy | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 123,480)$ | $(\$ 226,800)$ |
| Adjusted Annual Gross Income | \$843,750 | \$40,500 | \$202,500 | \$540,000 | \$3,071,520 | \$3,178,224 |
| Less: R\&D Operating Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 800,000)$ | \$0 |
| Less: Office Operating Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$80,000) | \$0 |
| Less: Medical Operating Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 904,800)$ |
| Less: Retail Operating Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$252,000) | $(\$ 20,160)$ | $(\$ 20,160)$ |
| Less: Grocery Store Operating Expenses | (\$393,750) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Less: Restaurant Operating Expenses | \$0 | $(\$ 18,900)$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Less: Entertainment Operating Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 94,500)$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Less: Parking Operating Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 123,480)$ | (\$151,200) |
| Annual Total Net Operating Income | \$450,000 | \$21,600 | \$108,000 | \$288,000 | \$2,047,880 | \$2,102,064 |
| Net Operating Income Per NSF | \$12.00 | \$9.60 | \$9.60 | \$14.40 | \$22.86 | \$29.20 |

(1) Medical office lease rates are estimated to be $30 \%$ higher than comparable office lease rates, based on developer interviews.

Source: CBRE; Reis Reports; Downtown Seattle Association; Realty Rates; DRA.


[^0]:    Source: DRA

[^1]:    Source: DRA

[^2]:    (1) Apartment rents escalated 5\% over 2014 DRA assumptions on low, middle and high rent scenarios. According to Apartment Insights Washington, average rents in King and Snohomish counties increased by 8\% from 4th Quarter 2013 to 4th Quarter 2014, while in some neighborhoods rents increased more rapidly (for example Ballard saw a $14 \%$ increase.) However, vacancy rates also increased and the influx is new apartments is expected to temper future rent increases.
    (2) Apartment operating costs escalated 4\% over 2014 DRA assumptions on low, middle and high rent scenarios, based on average annua increase in operating costs reported by Dupre+Scott from 2000 to 2013.

