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Allen \& Associates Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 79196

Charlotte, North Carolina 28271
Phone: 704-905-2276 | Fax: 704-220-0470
E-mail: jcarroll@allenadvisors.com

March 6, 2022
Mr. Donald Nuzzio
TM Associates
1375 Piccard Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850
Re: Birch Island Apartments Phase 1
Dear Mr. Donald Nuzzio:
The subject property, known as Birch Island Apartments Phase 1, is an existing affordable multifamily development located at 10322 Penny Lane in Wakefield, Sussex County, Virginia (Parcel Number 61-4-ABC). The subject property consists of 48 revenue-producing units originally constructed in 1984 and renovated in 2000. The sponsor has proposed to renovate the property with an allocation of tax credits. The subject property is an open age community.

The subject property is proposed to consist of 48 revenue-producing units including 1, 2 and 3-bedroom garden apartments. A total of 5 units are proposed to be income restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 19 units are proposed to be income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI; a total of 24 units are proposed to be income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI; no units are proposed to be set aside as market rate units; a total of 35 units are proposed to benefit from project-based rental assistance; no units are proposed to benefit from HOME financing.

The sponsor has proposed to reamortize the existing USDA-RD loan for 50 years; the rent and income restrictions associated with this loan will remain in place until it is repaid. The rent and income restrictions associated with the proposed allocation of tax credits will run for the next 30 years.

The scope of this assignment consists of a comprehensive market analysis for the subject property. The market study was completed in accordance with VHDA, National Council for Housing Market Analyst (NCHMA) guidelines and the Uniform Standards of Professional Practice (USPAP). The completion of this report involved a site visit, interviews with local property managers, and the collection of market data through discussions with persons knowledgeable of the local real estate market.

The purpose, intended use, and function of the report is to assess the marketability of the subject property for tax credit application purposes. This report should not be used for any other purposes without the express written permission of Allen \& Associates Consulting.

The report has been generated for the benefit of our client TM Associates. VHDA is named as an additional user of the report. No other person or entity may use the report for any reason whatsoever without our express written permission.

A summary of our findings and conclusions is found in the following pages. The conclusions reported are based on the conditions that exist as of the effective date of this report. These factors are subject to change and may alter, or otherwise affect the findings and conclusions presented in this report.

To the best of our knowledge, this report presents an accurate evaluation of market conditions for the subject property as of the effective date of this report. While the analysis that follows is based upon information obtained from sources believed to be reliable, no guarantee is made of its accuracy.

Feel free to contact us with any questions or comments.
Respectfully submitted:
ALLEN \& ASSOCIATES CONSULTING

Jeff Carroll

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following is a summary of our key findings and conclusions with respect to the subject property:

## Project Description

The subject property, known as Birch Island Apartments Phase 1, is an existing affordable multifamily development located at 10322 Penny Lane in Wakefield, Sussex County, Virginia (Parcel Number 61-4-ABC). The subject property consists of 48 revenue-producing units originally constructed in 1984 and renovated in 2000. The sponsor has proposed to renovate the property with an allocation of tax credits. The subject property is an open age community.

## Proposed Unit Mix

The subject property is proposed to consist of 48 revenue-producing units including 1,2 and 3-bedroom garden apartments. A total of 5 units are proposed to be income restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI; a total of 19 units are proposed to be income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI; a total of 24 units are proposed to be income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI; no units are proposed to be set aside as market rate units; a total of 35 units are proposed to benefit from project-based rental assistance; no units are proposed to benefit from HOME financing.

The sponsor has proposed to reamortize the existing USDA-RD loan for 50 years; the rent and income restrictions associated with this loan will remain in place until it is repaid. The rent and income restrictions associated with the proposed allocation of tax credits will run for the next 30 years.

| Proposed Unit Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Gross Rent | UA | Net Rent |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$739 | \$138 | \$601 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$739 | \$138 | \$601 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$739 | \$138 | \$601 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$739 | \$138 | \$601 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$816 | \$167 | \$649 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$816 | \$167 | \$649 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$816 | \$167 | \$649 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$816 | \$167 | \$649 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$978 | \$224 | \$754 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$978 | \$224 | \$754 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$978 | \$224 | \$754 |
| Total/Average |  |  | 48 | \$817 | \$167 | \$651 |

## Site Description

The subject property includes an irregular-shaped parcel consisting of approximately 3.045 acres and approximately 300 feet of road frontage.

A total of 62 parking spaces are planned for this development ( 58 regular / 4 accessible / 1.29 spaces per unit). Privatelyowned parking areas are planned for the subject property. We normally see 1.5 to 2.0 spaces per unit for projects like the subject. Public transportation is not found in the area. In our opinion, the current parking appears light for the subject property.

Additional Considerations:
Zoning
Environmental
Topography
Flood
DDA Status
QCT Status
Access
Visibility

A1. Legal, non-conforming use. 1984 construction. No suspected environmental conditions. No issues detected.
Zone X. Outside the 100-year flood zone.
Sussex, Virginia. Not designated as a Difficult to Develop Area.
Tract 8704.00. Designated as a Qualified Census Tract.
Good. Located near a moderately-traveled road.
Good. Moderate drive-traffic and frontage.

In our opinion, the site is suitable for development.
Neighborhood Description
In our opinion, the subject property has a good location relative to competing properties with respect to neighborhood characteristics.

In our opinion, the subject property has a fair location relative to competing properties with respect to area amenities.

Additional Considerations:

```
Crime Lower crime rates than market average.
Schools Lower graduation rates than market average.
Average Commute Shorter commutes than market average.
```

In our opinion, the neighborhood is suitable for development.

## Primary Market Area

We defined the primary market area by generating a 30-minute drive time zone around the subject property. We also considered existing concentrations of multifamily properties and the nearest census tract boundaries in our analysis.

The primary market area includes a population of 43,623 persons and covers a total of 989.5 square miles, making it 35.5 miles across on average.

We estimate that up to 20 percent of demand will come from areas outside of the primary market area.

## Demogaphic Characteristics

We anticipate moderate population and household growth for the market area. Renter households are anticipated to increase modestly as well. Finally, we anticipate that rents will grow with CPI over the next few years. Additional details follow:

| Population | Market area population currently stands at 43,623 and is projected to <br> grow 0.5 percent this year. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Households | Market area households currently stand at 15,463 and is projected to <br> grow 0.2 percent this year. |
| Renter Households | Market area renter households currently stand at 3,654 and is projected <br> to grow 0.1 percent this year. |
| Renter Tenure | Market area renter tenure currently stands at 23.6 percent. |
| Rent Growth | Market area rents have grown $2.28 \%$ annually since 2010. |

## Regional Economic Outlook

We anticipate moderate economic growth for the region. Additional details follow:

| Est Employment | Regional establishment employment currently stands at 36,351 and is projected to grow 1.0 percent this year. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Civ Employment | Regional civilian employment currently stands at 38,881 and is projected to grow 0.3 percent this year. |
| Empl by Industry | Regional establishment employment currently stands at 36,351. The data suggests that State and Local Government is the largest employment category accounting for $15.2 \%$ of total regional employment. Manufacturing is the second largest category accounting for $10.5 \%$ of total employment. Health Care and Social Assistance is the third largest category accounting for $9.6 \%$ of total employment. Retail Trade is the fourth largest category accounting for $9.4 \%$ of total employment. Other Services is the fifth largest category accounting for $7.3 \%$ of total employment. |


| Top Employers | The top employers include: (1) Smithfield Foods (2200 employees); (2) <br> Smithfield Foods (2000 employees) and; (3) International Paper Co |
| :--- | :--- |
| Layoffs/Expansions | (1800 employees). <br> Major employers are currently hiring; none reported any pending <br> layoffs. |

## Supply Analysis

Our analysis includes a total of 19 confirmed market area properties consisting of 845 units. The occupancy rate for these units currently stands at 96 percent. This rate reflects the occupancy for all confirmed market area units, regardless of project status (stabilized, under construction, proposed, etc.).

The following tables summarize our findings for this market area:

| Grand Total |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 2 | 102 | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| Restricted | 11 | 234 | 12 | $95 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 6 | 509 | 24 | $95 \%$ |
| Total | 19 | 845 | 36 | $96 \%$ |


| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family | Vacant | Occupancy |  |  |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| Market Rate | 2 | 102 | 12 | $95 \%$ |
| Restricted | 10 | 233 | 24 | $94 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 3 | 398 | 36 | $95 \%$ |


| Elderly |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Restricted | 1 | 1 | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 3 | 111 | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | 112 | 0 | $100 \%$ |


| Pipeline |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Family |  |  |  |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Restricted | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |


| Elderly |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Restricted | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |

## Most Comparable Properties

An overview of the market rate comparables selected for purposes of our analysis follows. The properties we consider to be the best comparables are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Key | Property | Units | Occupancy | Built | Renovated | Rents | Type | Miles to Sub |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | 128 | $96 \%$ | 1975 | 2016 | Market Rate | Family | 26.38 |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 144 | $99 \%$ | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | 24.95 |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | 97 | $100 \%$ | 1991 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | 16.87 |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartm | 87 | $100 \%$ | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | 20.67 |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | 109 | $100 \%$ | 1989 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | 24.28 |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | 111 | $95 \%$ | 1987 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | 26.26 |

An overview of the restricted rent comparables selected for purposes of our analysis follows. The properties we consider to be the best comparables are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Key | Property | Units | Occupancy | Built | Renovated | Rents | Type | Miles to Sub |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 24 | $96 \%$ | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | 26.38 |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1\&2 | 120 | $99 \%$ | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family |  |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | 120 | $100 \%$ | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family |  |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | 48 | $100 \%$ | 2016 | na | Restricted | Family |  |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 60 | $88 \%$ | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | 27.53 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Achievable Rents

In the following table we present our concluded achievable rents and rent advantage for the subject property:

| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Achievable | Proposed | Advantage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$625 | \$601 | 3.8\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$750 | \$649 | 13.5\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$800 | \$754 | 5.8\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$912 | \$651 | 28.7\% |

Our analysis suggests an average achievable rent of $\$ 912$ for the subject property. This is compared with an average proposed rent of $\$ 651$, yielding an achievable rent advantage of 28.7 percent. Overall, the subject property appears to be priced at or below achievable rents for the area.

## NCHMA Demand Analysis

In the following tables we present our concluded demand, capture rate, penetration rate and absorption period estimates for the subject property using the NCHMA demand methodology:

| Unit Type / <br> Rent Type / Income Limit | Vac Units at Market Entry | Gross <br> Demand | Vacant \& Pipeline Units | Capture Rate Gross | Capture Rate Net | Penetration Rate | Absorption Pd (Mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Bedroom / Subsidized / 60\% of AMI | 6 | 1,327 | 6 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 8.7\% | 2 |
| 1-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI | 2 | 384 | 1 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 4.4\% | 2 |
| 2-Bedroom / Subsidized / 60\% of AMI | 9 | 1,841 | 13 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 14.4\% | 2 |
| 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI | 3 | 503 | 5 | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 17.7\% | 2 |
| 3-Bedroom / Subsidized / 50\% of AMI | 2 | 1,676 | 5 | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 2.0\% | <1 |
| 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI | 2 | 347 | 3 | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 15.6\% | 2 |


| Project-Wide Gross Capture Rate | $1.2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Project-Wide Net Capture Rate | $1.2 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Penetration Rate | $28.3 \%$ |
| Stabilized Occupancy | $95 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period | 2 mos |

In our opinion, the estimated project-level capture rate suggests an appropriate number of units for the subject property. The unit level capture rates suggest an appropriate mix of units for the subject property.

In our opinion, the estimated project-level penetration rate suggest an appropriate number of units for the subject property. The unit-level penetration rates suggest an appropriate mix of units for the subject property.

Our analysis suggests that the subject property will stabilize at 95 percent occupancy. We estimate 2 months of absorption and an average absorption rate of 10.7 units per month for this project. In our opinion, the absorption period suggests an appropriate number and mix of units for the subject property.

It is important to note that this analysis does not account for pent-up demand, pre-leasing efforts or rent concessions. In our opinion, an effective pre-leasing effort could result in a month-for-month reduction in the estimated absorption period for this project. In addition, any concessions or rent subsidies not accounted for already in this analysis could cut capture rates and absorption periods significantly.

## VHDA Demand Analysis

In the following table we present our concluded capture rate and absorption period estimates for the subject property using the VHDA demand methodology:

| Project-Wide Capture Rate - LIHTC Units | $4.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - Market Units | $0.0 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - All Units | $4.5 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period (Months) | 2 mos |

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the subject property appears to be feasible from a market standpoint. Because of the demonstrated depth of demand in this area and the current occupied status of the subject property, we do not believe the renovation of this property will have an adverse impact on existing projects in the market area. The units appear to be priced appropriately and we anticipate a rapid lease-up after renovation.

Birch Island Apartments Phase 1
10322 Penny Lane
Wakefield, Virginia 23888
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## PROJECT OVERVIEW

## Project Description

The subject property, known as Birch Island Apartments Phase 1, is an existing affordable multifamily development located at 10322 Penny Lane in Wakefield, Sussex County, Virginia (Parcel Number 61-4-ABC). The subject property consists of 48 revenue-producing units originally constructed in 1984 and renovated in 2000. The sponsor has proposed to renovate the property with an allocation of tax credits. The subject property is an open age community.

Select project details are summarized below:
Project Description

| Property Name | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Street Number | 10322 |
| Street Name | Penny |
| Street Type | Lane |
| City | Wakefield |
| County | Sussex County |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23888 |
| Units | 48 |
| Project Rent | Restricted |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Prop Rehab |
| Financing Type | Tax Credit |
| Latitude | 36.9737 |
| Longitude | -76.9748 |

## Scope of Renovation

The subject property is currently in fair condition. The sponsor has proposed to rehabilitate the subject property to bring it up to "like new" condition using tax credit financing. The contemplated rehabilitation scope includes roof, parking lot, landscape, appliance, cabinet, HVAC and tile repairs and/or replacement. Tenants will be temporarily displaced as renovation progresses for this property.

## Construction and Lease-Up Schedule

We anticipate a 12-month construction period for this project. Assuming a December 1, 2022 closing, this yields a date of completion of December 1, 2023. Our demand analysis (found later in this report) suggests a 2-month absorption period. This yields a date of stabilization of February 1, 2024.

## Unit Configuration

The subject property currently consists of 48 revenue-producing units including 1, 2 and 3 -bedroom garden apartments. A total of 38 units are currently income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI; a total of 10 units are currently income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI; no units are currently set aside as market rate units; a total of 35 units currently benefit from project-based rental assistance. The subject property currently stands at $94 \%$ occupancy. The current rent and income restrictions will remain in place for the next 28 years or until the outstanding USDA-RD debt is repaid, whichever is earlier.

| Current Unit Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SF | Unit | Income | Rent | HOME | Subs | Total | Gross <br> Rent | Net <br> Rent |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 8 | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | No | 2 | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | No | 3 | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 5 | $\$ 776$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 13 | $\$ 776$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | No | 1 | $\$ 776$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | No | 5 | $\$ 776$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 2 | $\$ 927$ | $\$ 754$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 4 | $\$ 927$ | $\$ 754$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | No | 2 | $\$ 927$ | $\$ 754$ |
| Total/Average | 707 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | $\$ 776$ | $\$ 651$ |

The subject property is proposed to consist of 48 revenue-producing units including 1,2 and 3-bedroom garden apartments. A total of 5 units are proposed to be income restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 19 units are proposed to be income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI; a total of 24 units are proposed to be income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI; no units are proposed to be set aside as market rate units; a total of 35 units are proposed to benefit from project-based rental assistance; no units are proposed to benefit from HOME financing.

The sponsor has proposed to reamortize the existing USDA-RD loan for 50 years; the rent and income restrictions associated with this loan will remain in place until it is repaid. The rent and income restrictions associated with the proposed allocation of tax credits will run for the next 30 years.

| Proposed Unit Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BR | BA | SF | Unit <br> Type | Income <br> Limit | Rent <br> Limit | HOME <br> Units | Subs <br> Units | Total <br> Units | Gross <br> Rent | Net <br> Rent |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | No | Yes | 2 | $\$ 739$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 6 | $\$ 739$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | Yes | 4 | $\$ 739$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | No | 4 | $\$ 739$ | $\$ 601$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | No | Yes | 2 | $\$ 816$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 10 | $\$ 816$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | Yes | 7 | $\$ 816$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | No | 5 | $\$ 816$ | $\$ 649$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | No | Yes | 1 | $\$ 978$ | $\$ 754$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 978$ | $\$ 754$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | No | No | 4 | $\$ 978$ | $\$ 754$ |
| Total/Average | 707 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | $\$ 817$ | $\$ 651$ |

Income \& Rent Limits
The subject property is operated subject to certain income restrictions. The following table gives the applicable income limits for this area:

| Income Limits |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Size | $30 \%$ of AMI | $40 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of $A M I$ | $60 \%$ of AMI | $70 \%$ of AMI | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| 1.0 Person | $\$ 18,900$ | $\$ 25,200$ | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 44,100$ | $\$ 50,400$ |
| 2.0 Person | $\$ 21,600$ | $\$ 28,800$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 50,400$ | $\$ 57,600$ |
| 3.0 Person | $\$ 24,300$ | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 56,700$ | $\$ 64,800$ |
| 4.0 Person | $\$ 27,000$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 63,000$ | $\$ 72,000$ |
| 5.0 Person | $\$ 29,160$ | $\$ 38,880$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 68,040$ | $\$ 77,760$ |
| 6.0 Person | $\$ 31,320$ | $\$ 41,760$ | $\$ 52,200$ | $\$ 62,640$ | $\$ 73,080$ | $\$ 83,520$ |
| 7.0 Person | $\$ 33,480$ | $\$ 44,640$ | $\$ 55,800$ | $\$ 66,960$ | $\$ 78,120$ | $\$ 89,280$ |
| 8.0 Person | $\$ 35,640$ | $\$ 47,520$ | $\$ 59,400$ | $\$ 71,280$ | $\$ 83,160$ | $\$ 95,040$ |

Source: HUD; State Housing Finance Agency
The income limits found above were based (in part) on HUD's published median household income for the area. The table below shows how this statistic has increased/decreased over the past several years:

| Historical Median Income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\$$ | Change |
| 2010 | $\$ 73,900$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 74,600$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 75,600$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 73,900$ | $-2.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 72,900$ | $-1.4 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 74,200$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 72,400$ | $-2.4 \%$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 78,700$ | $8.7 \%$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 83,200$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 86,400$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 89,400$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 90,000$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Source: HUD |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The subject property is operated subject to certain rent restrictions. The following table gives the maximum housing expense (net rent limit + tenant-paid utilities) for this area:

Maximum Housing Expense

| Unit Type | $30 \%$ of AMI | $40 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | $60 \%$ of AMI | $70 \%$ of AMI | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 Bedroom | $\$ 472$ | $\$ 630$ | $\$ 787$ | $\$ 945$ | $\$ 1,102$ | $\$ 1,260$ |
| 1 Bedroom | $\$ 506$ | $\$ 675$ | $\$ 843$ | $\$ 1,012$ | $\$ 1,181$ | $\$ 1,350$ |
| 2 Bedroom | $\$ 607$ | $\$ 810$ | $\$ 1,012$ | $\$ 1,215$ | $\$ 1,417$ | $\$ 1,620$ |
| 3 Bedroom | $\$ 702$ | $\$ 936$ | $\$ 1,170$ | $\$ 1,404$ | $\$ 1,638$ | $\$ 1,872$ |
| 4 Bedroom | $\$ 783$ | $\$ 1,044$ | $\$ 1,305$ | $\$ 1,566$ | $\$ 1,827$ | $\$ 2,088$ |
| Source: HUD |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The following table sets forth the gross fair market rents (net fair market rents + tenant-paid utilities) that would apply to any Section 8 voucher recipients or any units benefiting from HOME financing at the subject property:

| Fair Market Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Gross Rent |
| 0 Bedroom | $\$ 1,022$ |
| 1 Bedroom | $\$ 1,044$ |
| 2 Bedroom | $\$ 1,189$ |
| 3 Bedroom | $\$ 1,556$ |
| 4 Bedroom |  |
| Source: HUD |  |
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## IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION \& ANALYSIS

Our improvement analysis includes an evaluation of the following factors with respect to the subject property: (1) Building Features; (2) Unit Features; (3) Project Amenities, (4) Utility Configuration; and (5) Useful Life Analysis.

## Building Features

The subject property currently consists of 48 revenue-producing units in 6 residential buildings and 1 non-residential building. The development currently includes approximately 33,912 square feet of net rentable area and 38,999 square feet of gross building area.

The subject property is proposed to consist of 48 revenue-producing units in 6 residential buildings and 1 nonresidential building. The development is proposed to include approximately 33,912 square feet of net rentable area and 38,999 square feet of gross building area.

Additional information regarding the subject property's major building systems is found below.
Foundation - Concrete Slab, Basements, Crawl Spaces, etc.
The subject property includes slab on grade foundations.
Structural Frame - Floor, Wall, Roof Structural Systems, etc.
The subject property is constructed with wood frame surfaced with plywood. Floor/ceiling assemblies consist of wood joists \& plywood or concrete subfloors. Roof assmeblies consist of wood trusses \& plywood sheathing.

Exterior Wall - Exterior Finishes, Doors, Windows, Exterior Stairs, etc.
The subject currently includes vinyl siding, horizontal sliding \& double hung aluminum double pane windows, and steel clad insulated six-panel unit entry doors with glass. The sponsor proposes to replace the siding, windows and exterior doors as part of the planned renovation. Vinyl windows are proposed after renovation.

## Roof - Sheathing, Coverings, Warranties, Gutters \& Downspouts, Soffit \& Fascia, etc.

The subject includes gabled asphalt shingle roofs. The sponsor proposes to replace the roofs as part of the planned renovation.

## Vertical Transportation - Elevator, Interior Stair Systems

The subject property includes 2-story walk up buildings with no elevators.
Plumbing - Sanitary, Storm, Sewer, Fixtures, Domestic Hot Water
Domestic water piping is constructed of CPVC pipe and fittings. Wastewater lines consist of PVC pipe and fittings. Potable hot water is supplied via individual electric hot water heaters. The sponsor proposes to replace the water heaters as part of the planned renovation.

## HVAC - Heating, Air Conditioning, Ventilation

The subject property currently includes individual interior-mounted electric heat, individual exterior-mounted a/c compressors with interior-mounted air handlers. New HVAC systems are proposed as part of the planned renovation.

Electrical and Communications - Distribution, Aluminum Wiring, etc.
Buildings receive electrical power from exterior pad-mounted transformers. Electrical service to units consists of 120/240V AC with 100 amps available for each panel. Electrical wiring is made of copper. Properly grounded, threeprong outlets are found in each dwelling unit. The outlets located in the wet areas are Ground Fault Circuit Interrupter (GFCI) outlets. Surface-mounted flourescent \& LED fixtures are proposed after renovation.

## Fire Suppression

The subject property is not currently equipped with an NFPA-13 fully automatic fire suppression (sprinkler) system. However, hard-wired smoke detectors with battery backup are found in each bedroom area. The sponsor proposes to replace the smoke detectors as part of the planned renovation.

## Unit Features

The subject property currently contains 48 revenue-producing units including 45 regular units and 3 accessible units including 88 bedrooms, 48 full bathrooms and 0 half bathrooms.

The subject property is proposed to contain 48 revenue-producing units including 43 regular units and 5 accessible units, including 88 bedrooms, 48 full bathrooms and 0 half bathrooms.

Additional information regarding the subject property's unit features is found below.

## Walls / Ceilings / Interior Doors

Subject property units include 8 foot ceilings, painted gypsum wallboard \& ceilings, wood hollow-core flat panel interior doors and wood hollow-core flat panel closet doors. The sponsor proposes to replace the interior doors as part of the planned renovation. Wood solid-core flat panel doors are planned post renovation.

## Floor Covering

Floor covering currently consists of vinyl sheeting in the entryways, bathrooms, kitchens, living areas \& bedrooms. The sponsor proposes to replace the flooring as part of the planned renovation. Luxury vinyl plank is proposed for the entryways, bathrooms, kitchens \& living areas. Wall-to-wall carpeting is planned for the bedrooms.

## Kitchens

Kitchens currently include electric four-top ranges, range hoods, frost-free refrigerators, wood cabinets, laminated countertops and stainless steel sinks. The sponsor proposes to replace the appliances, cabinets and countertops as part of the planned renovation. Dishwashers are planned after renovation.

## Bathrooms

Bathrooms currently include porcelain sinks \& toilets along with fiberglass tubs \& surrounds. The bathrooms also include exhaust fans and other accessories. The sponsor proposes to replace these components as part of the planned renovation.

## Project Amenities

A discussion of the development's project amenities is found below.

## Site \& Common Area Amenities

A playground is currently found at the subject property. A community center is planned post renovation.

## Parking

Open parking is found at the subject property.

## Laundry

Central laundry facilities are currently found at the subject property.

## Security

No security amenities are currently found at the subject property. Call buttons are proposed for select units post renovation.

## Services

No additional services are currently found at the subject property.
Tables comparing the subject property's amenities to that of the most comparable properties are found at the end of this section.

## Utility Configuration

The subject property currently includes electric heat, electric cooking and electric hot water. All utilities - with the exception of cold water, sewer and trash - are currently paid by the resident.

The sponsor has proposed a utility configuration change as part of the planned renovation. All utilities - with the
exception of trash - are proposed to be paid by the resident.

In the table that follows we compare the subject's proposed utility allowances (also known as tenant paid utilities) to the estimated allowances using the HUD Utility Schedule Model:

| Utility Allowances |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BR | BA | SF | Unit Type | Inc Lmt | Rnt Lmt | HOME | Subs | Units | UA | HUD UA |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | 40\% of AMI | 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$138 | \$108 |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$138 | \$108 |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | 60\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$138 | \$108 |
| 1 | 1.0 | 550 | Garden/Flat | 60\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$138 | \$108 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | 40\% of AMI | 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$167 | \$131 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$167 | \$131 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | 60\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$167 | \$131 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 724 | Garden/Flat | 60\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$167 | \$131 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | 40\% of AMI | 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$224 | \$176 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$224 | \$176 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 967 | Garden/Flat | 60\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$224 | \$176 |
| Total/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | \$167 | \$131 |

The HUD utility allowances are a good measure of the energy costs for a given property. Our analysis suggests that the proposed utility allowances are higher than those established using the HUD model.

Tables comparing the subject property's utility configuration to that of the most comparable properties are found at the end of this section. Outputs from the HUD Utility Schedule Model are also found there.

## Useful Life Analysis

The subject property was originally constructed in 1984 and is currently in fair condition. In our opinion, the subject has a remaining useful life \& remaining economic life of 20 years in its current condition. Assuming the scope of work described above, we anticipate a remaining useful life \& remaining economic life of 50 years after renovation. Finally, we estimate a post-renovation effective age of 10 years for this project.

In the course of completing this study, we rated the condition of the subject property and the most comparable properties on a 1-5 scale ( 1 being the worst and 5 being the best). We also evaluated the actual and effective ages of the subject and select comparables. A table summarizing our findings is found below:

| Actual Age \| Effective Age | Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rating |  |  |  |  | Rank |  |  |
| $\underset{\underset{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}}{ }$ |  | $$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 긍 든 } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { 응 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2012 | 2.50 | 10 | 2 | 11 |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | 1975 | 2010 | 3.75 | 12 | 3 | 5 |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 1998 | 2005 | 3.50 | 3 | 7 | 7 |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2005 | 4.00 | 4 | 7 | 2 |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2005 | 2010 | 4.50 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | 1992 | 2010 | 4.00 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | 1991 | 2005 | 3.50 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2005 | 3.75 | 8 | 7 | 5 |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | 2016 | 2016 | 4.00 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | 1989 | 2000 | 3.25 | 7 | 11 | 9 |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | 1987 | 2010 | 3.25 | 9 | 3 | 9 |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1990 | 2.50 | 10 | 12 | 11 |

Source: Allen \& Associates; Sponsor

| Amenities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \＆Com | mon Area | Amen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\otimes} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \frac{0}{\pi} \end{array}$ | $\text { 言 } \frac{\partial}{\mathbb{Q}}$ | Ơ ※ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O. } \\ & \vdots \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { 흠 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ®̃ }}{\text { む̃ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त్ㄲ } \\ & \frac{0}{3} \end{aligned}$ |  | 은 |  | চ্চ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 尔 } \\ & \text { స゙ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \text { Nō } \\ & \text { in O } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Sub Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 001 Autumn Ridge 1 | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 003 Autumn Ridge 2－LC2 | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \＆ 2 | no | yes | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 047 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 053 King＇s Landing Apartments | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no |
| 060 Meadowridge Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 075 October Station Apartments | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes |
| 084 Sadler Pond Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no |
| 090 Suffolk Station Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |


|  |  | Unit Amenities |  |  |  |  |  | Kitchen Amenities |  |  |  |  | Air Conditioning |  |  |  | Heat |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { n }}{\text { ch }} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{0} \\ & \text { © } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & i=2 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 厄్刃 } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { In } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ $\frac{0}{0}$ $\sum_{i}^{0}$ 0.0 |  |  | $\frac{\bar{\pi}}{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{3}{0} \text { n } \\ & \frac{0}{c}{ }_{5}^{5} 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \text { ¿̃ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\frac{\bar{\omega}}{3}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | yes | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 －LC2 | yes | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \＆ 2 | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 053 | King＇s Landing Apartments | yes | some | yes | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | yes | yes | yes | no | some | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |


|  |  | Parking |  |  |  |  | Laundry |  |  | Secuirty |  |  |  |  |  | Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ®}}{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \text { ¿̃ } \end{aligned}$ | © © U | $\frac{0}{3}$ | $\frac{\text { 呴 }}{3}$ | 치을 |  |  |  |  |  | 产㐫亮 | 8 0. 0.0 0 0 | : 춘 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{\widetilde{\#}} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | some | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 －LC2 | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \＆ 2 | no | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 053 | King＇s Landing Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | some | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |

Utilities

| Util |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tenant－Paid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Owner－Paid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ®ิ }}{\text { ® }}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { 흥 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $$ | $\overline{3 x}^{3}$ | 定恶 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 으N } \\ & \text { 흥 } \\ & \hline 0 \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 을.. } \\ & \text { 흘 } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 录先 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\stackrel{\pi}{n}}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\grave{0}}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{\pi / \pi} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{i n} \end{aligned}$ |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 －LC2 | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \＆ 2 | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 053 | King＇s Landing Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | yes | no | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |

Source：Allen \＆Associates；Sponsor

HUD Utility Schedule Model Output

| HUD Utility Schedule Model Output |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 Bedroom | 1 Bedroom | 2 Bedroom | 3 Bedroom | 4 Bedroom |  |
| Heat－Gas | 9 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 14 |  |
| Heat－Elec | 9 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 14 |  |
| Cooking－Gas | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |  |
| Cooking－Elec | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |  |
| Other Electric | 13 | 16 | 22 | 28 | 34 |  |
| Air Conditioning | 6 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 13 |  |
| Hot Water－Gas | 8 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 18 |  |
| Hot Water－Elec | 8 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 18 |  |
| Water | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 17 |  |
| Sewer | 46 | 46 | 53 | 84 | 116 |  |
| Trash | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Source：Local Utility Providers；HUD |  |  |  |  |  |

## SITE DESCRIPTION \& ANALYSIS

Our assessment of the site included an evaluation of the following factors with respect to the subject property: (1) Survey; (2) Site Plan; (3) Nuisances, Hazards, Detrimental Influences \& Environmental; (4) Topography; (5) Flood Zone; (6) Difficult to Develop Area Status; (7) Qualified Census Tract Status; and (8) Traffic Patterns, Access \& Visibility.

## Survey

A survey for the subject property was not provided to the analyst for review. Current surveys should be evaluated to ascertain whether there are any easements encumbering the subject property.

## Site Plan

A site plan for the subject property was provided to the analyst for review. Site plans are necessary to analyze the site improvements, parking configuration, internal traffic flow, location of building improvements and landscaping improvements for the subject property. Our review did not identify any problem areas with respect to the subject property. A summary of the development's site features is found below.

## Acres / Lot Shape / Frontage

The subject property includes an irregular-shaped parcel consisting of approximately 3.045 acres and approximately 300 feet of road frontage.

## Zoning

According to the local zoning administrator, the subject property is currently zoned A-1. It is our understanding that the current zoning for the subject is a legal, nonconforming use. According to the local zoning administrator, the subject property was constructed prior to zoning being adopted in the area. It is our understanding that if the subject property were destroyed by fire or some other hazard, it would be approved for rebuild.

## Parking / Streets / Curbs / Sidewalks

A total of 62 parking spaces are planned for this development (58 regular / 4 accessible / 1.29 spaces per unit). Privately-owned parking areas are planned for the subject property. We normally see 1.5 to 2.0 spaces per unit for projects like the subject. Public transportation is not found in the area. In our opinion, the current parking appears light for the subject property.

## Dumpsters / Dumpster Enclosures

The subject includes 2 publicly-owned dumpsters along with 2 privately-owned wood enclosures.

## Landscaping / Perimeter Fence / Retaining Walls / Entry Sign

Trees, shrubs \& lawns are found at the subject property. A perimeter fence is not found at the subject property. Retaining walls are not found at this property. One unlighted entry sign is found at this property.

## Stormwater Management / Site Lighting / Water Service / Wastewater Service

Stormwater management consists of catch basins and concrete pipe connecting to a public system. Site lighting consists of publicly-owned HID poles. Domestic water service to buildings consists of ductile iron pipe connecting to a public system. Wastewater service to buildings consists of PVC pipe connecting to a public system.

## Nuisances, Hazards, Detrimental Influences \& Environmental

We did not observe any nuisances, hazards, detrimental influences or recognized environmental conditions on our inspection of the subject property. The subject property was originally constructed in 1984, after the 1978 ban on lead and asbestos containing construction materials. Nevertheless, we recommend that the sponsor obtain a comprehensive environmental assessment from a qualified professional.

## Topography

The USGS map showing the topography of the subject property and surrounding area is found below:


The topographic map shows that the site is flat and drains to adjacent properties to the south. In our opinion, there do not appear to be any topographic issues with respect to the subject property.

Flood Zone
The map showing the location of the subject property relative to nearby areas prone to flooding (identified in purple) is found below:


RiskMeter

LATITUDE: 36.973716, LONGITUDE: -76.974832
LOCATION ACCURACY: User demhed iocation LATITUDE: 36.973716 LONGITUDE: -76.974832 MATCH CODE: SOURCE: CENSUS BLOCK ID: 511838704001051
Flood Zone Determination Report
Flood Zone Determination: OUT

| SFHA (FLOOD ZONE) | OUT | WITHIN 250 FEET OF FLOODZONE | NO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FLOOD ZONE | X | COMMUNITY | 510192 |
| COMMUNITYNAME | SUSSEX COUNTY | PANEL | 0280D |
| PANEL DATE | July 07, 2009 | COBRA | OUT |
| PARTICIPATION STATUS | R | ORIGIN FIRM DATE | March 02, 1983 |
| MAPNUMBER | 51183C0280D | FIPS CODE | 51183 |


© 2022 CoreLogic. Inc. All rights reserved. CORELOGIC, RISKMETER, PXPOINT and the Corelogic logo are trademarks of CoreLogic, Inc. and/or its subsidiaries. All other trademarks are the property of their respective holders
Report generated Mar 2.2022 by jcarrolleallenadvisors.com

According to FEMA map number 51183C0280D dated July 07, 2009, the subject property is located in Zone $X$. This is an area that is identified as being located outside the 100-year flood zone.

## Difficult to Develop Area Status

The subject proprterty is located in Wakefield, Virginia - an area that is not designated as a Difficult to Develop Area. Consequently, the subject property does not appear to qualify for special DDA funding under state and federal programs.

## Qualified Census Tract Status

The federal government has identified census tracts throughout the United States that include high concentrations of low-income households and substandard housing units. These areas, known as Qualified Census Tracts, qualify for special funding under various state and federal programs. A QCT map showing the location of the subject property is found below:


The subject property is located in Census Tract 8704.00 - an area that is designated as a Qualified Census Tract. Consequently, the subject property does appear to qualify for special QCT funding under state and federal programs.

## Traffic Patterns, Access \& Visibility

A traffic map identifying the subject property is found below:


Access
The subject property is located on the west side of Birch Island Road, approximately 2 blocks north of Rocky Hock Road in Wakefield, Virginia. Birch Island Road is a moderately-traveled north-south road carrying approximately 2,500 vehicles per day. Rocky Hock Road is a moderately-traveled east-west road carrying approximately 1,000 vehicles per day. We did not observe any road or infrastructure improvements taking place in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. In our opinion, therefore, accessibility is good by virtue of the location of the subject property relative to existing streets and thoroughfares.

## Visibility

The subject property is visible from Birch Island Road with +/- 300 feet of froantage and a moderate volume of driveby traffic. Consequently, in our opinion visibility is good by virtue of the exposure of the subject property to existing drive-by traffic volumes.

In the course of completing this study, we rated the access and visibility for the subject property and the most comparable properties on a 1-5 scale (1 being the worst and 5 being the best). A table summarizing our findings is found below:

| Rating |  |  |  | Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ |  | $$ | 2 $\frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{2}{5}$ | $$ | 긍 $\vdots$ $\vdots$ |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 3.50 | 3.00 | 2 | 4 |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 10 | 10 |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 12 | 12 |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 2 | 8 |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 3.00 | 3.00 | 6 | 4 |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | 3.25 | 3.25 | 5 | 2 |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | 3.00 | 2.75 | 6 | 6 |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 3.00 | 2.75 | 6 | 6 |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | 2.50 | 2.50 | 9 | 8 |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | 2.25 | 2.25 | 10 | 10 |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | 3.50 | 3.25 | 2 | 2 |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 4.00 | 4.00 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Allen \& Associates

## NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION \& ANALYSIS

## Neighborhood

Our assessment of the neighborhood includes an evaluation of the following factors with respect to the subject property: (1) Life Cycle; (2) Surrounding Properties; (3) Economic Characteristics; (4) Crime Rates; (5) Educational Attainment; and (6) Commuting Patterns.

## Life Cycle

Neighborhoods are sometimes thought to evolve through four distinct stages:

- Growth - A period during which the area gains public favor and acceptance.
- Stability - A period of equilibrium without marked gains or loses.
- Decline - A period of diminishing demand.
- Revitalization - A period of renewal, redevelopment, modernization, and increasing demand.

Based on our evaluation of the neighborhood, the subject property is located in an area that appears to be in the stability stage of its life cycle. Modest population growth is anticipated for the next several years.

## Surrounding Properties

The subject property is located in Wakefield, Virginia. The immediate area consists of a mix of land uses.

Single family in good condition is located to the north and east of the subject property; commercial in good condition is located to the south; vacant land is located to the west of the subject property. Neighboring land uses appear to be complimentary to the use of the subject property. The condition of the neighboring properties appears to be complimentary as well.

Surrounding property uses are summarized in the table found below:

| Surrounding Properties |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Direction | Use | Condition |
| North | Single Family | Good |
| South | Commercial | Good |
| East | Single Family | Good |
| West | Vacant Land | - |

Source: Allen \& Associates

## Economic Characteristics

The subject property is located in an area with average household incomes of \$31,250 (in 2015 dollars); this is compared with $\$ 46,094$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with median cash rents of \$548 (in 2015 dollars); this is compared with $\$ 793$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

Finally, the subject property is located in an area with median single family home values of \$126,100 (in 2015 dollars); this is compared with $\$ 199,458$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

## Crime Rates

The subject property is located in an area with personal crime rates of $3.4 \%$. Personal crime includes offenses such as rape, murder, robbery and assault. Our research suggests that the average personal crime rate for the most comparable properties stands at 6.9\%.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with property crime rates of $2.4 \%$. Property crimes include offenses such as burglary, larceny and theft. Our research suggests that the average property crime rate for the most
comparable properties stands at 4.8\%.
Please note: The crime statistics included in this analysis are historical area-wide figures. These statistics make no consideration for changing demographics or the implementation of an affirmative crime prevention program at the subject property.

## Educational Attainment

The subject property is located in an area with high school graduation rates of $74.0 \%$; this is compared with $78.7 \%$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with college graduation rates of $10.2 \%$; this is compared with $18.2 \%$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

## Commuting Patterns

The subject property is located in an area with an average drive to work of 24.4 minutes; this is compared with 29.5 minutes for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with an average of 1.49 vehicles per household; this is compared with 1.53 vehicles per household for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

## Conclusion

In our opinion, the subject property has a good location relative to competing properties with respect to neighborhood characteristics.

## Proximity to Area Amenities

Our assessment included an evaluation of the proximity of various amenities to the subject and the most comparable properties. We looked at the following amenities in our analysis: (1) Banks; (2) Grocery; (3) Emergency Clinics; (4) Pharmacies; and (5) Discount Stores.

A listing of some of the area amenities is found below. An amenity map is found in the following pages:

| Amenity | Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bank | Name | Miles |  |
| Grocery | Truist | 0.9 mi SW |  |
| Emergency Clinic | Wakefield Great Valu | 0.9 mi W |  |
| Pharmacy | Sentara Obici Hospital | 26.0 mi SE |  |
| Discount Store | CVs | 17.0 mi SE |  |
| Elementary School | Ivor Elementary School | 0.6 mi SW |  |
| Middle School | Luther P. Jackson Middle School | 6.2 mi SE |  |
| High School | Surry County High School | 8.4 mi NE |  |
| Bus Stop | Source: Google Maps | 8.4 mi NE |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Truist, Great Valu, and Dollar General are all located less than 1.0 miles away from the subject property. Sentara Obici Hospital and CVS Pharmacy are located less than 26.0 miles away.

## Number of Area Amenities

We utilized Microsoft Streets \& Trips to evaluate the subject and the most comparable properties with respect to the number of amenities in the immediate area.

- Microsoft Streets \& Trips identified 2 banks within 2.0 miles of the subject property. The subject is ranked 12 out of the 12 properties included in this analysis.
- A total of 1 grocery store is in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 14 for the area.
- A total of 0 hospital are in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 5 for the area.
- A total of 1 pharmacy is in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 11 for the area.
- A total of 2 shopping centers are in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 12 for the area.


## Nearest Area Amenities

We utilized Microsoft Streets \& Trips to evaluate the subject and the most comparable properties with respect to the nearest area amenities.

- According to Microsoft Streets \& Trips, the nearest bank is 0.9 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 8 out of the 12 properties included in this analysis.
- The nearest grocery store is 0.9 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 11 for the area.
- The nearest hospital is 19.63 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 14 for the area.
- The nearest pharmacy is 0.89 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 7 for the area.
- The nearest shopping center is 0.49 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 8 for the area.

Conclusion
In our opinion, the subject property has a fair location relative to competing properties with respect to area amenities.

Tables comparing the subject property's proximity to area amenities to that of the most comparable properties is found on the next page. Maps showing the proximity of the subject property to area amenities and area employers is also found in the following pages.

In the course of completing this study, we rated the neighborhood and the proximity to area amenities for the subject property and the most comparable properties on a 1-5 scale ( 1 being the worst and 5 being the best). The tables on the following pages give these ratings.

| Neighborhood Ratings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rating |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rank (1 = Property with Highest Rating) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Surrounding Area |  |  | Crime Rates |  | Education |  | Commute | Surrounding Area |  |  | Crime Rates |  | Education |  |  |  |
| 入े |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 응 } \\ & \omega \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { 등 } \\ & \text { 포 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | \$31,250 | \$548 | \$126,100 | 3.4\% | 2.4\% | 74.0\% | 10.2\% | 24.41 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 2.90 |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | \$15,417 | \$333 | \$172,500 | 13.2\% | 1.9\% | 46.6\% | 4.5\% | 27.61 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 2.20 |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | \$15,417 | \$333 | \$172,500 | 13.2\% | 1.9\% | 46.6\% | 4.5\% | 27.61 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 2.20 |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | \$88,141 | \$329 | \$290,600 | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 98.9\% | 38.2\% | 33.09 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.30 |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | \$77,045 | \$1,113 | \$275,200 | 7.3\% | 3.6\% | 94.2\% | 38.8\% | 26.26 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | \$70,801 | \$1,178 | \$205,900 | 2.8\% | 1.3\% | 93.1\% | 28.5\% | 41.13 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 4.20 |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | \$36,902 | \$883 | \$160,400 | 6.3\% | 10.6\% | 83.4\% | 16.8\% | 30.14 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 2.50 |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | \$89,625 | \$1,365 | \$259,800 | 4.7\% | 8.4\% | 93.0\% | 35.2\% | 33.37 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 4.10 |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | \$26,731 | \$929 | \$166,500 | 17.9\% | 10.7\% | 74.7\% | 8.2\% | 28.22 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 2.00 |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | \$36,603 | \$948 | \$217,200 | 4.5\% | 2.2\% | 72.8\% | 13.5\% | 31.17 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 3.40 |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | \$29,483 | \$925 | \$151,500 | 2.7\% | 4.1\% | 84.3\% | 2.1\% | 25.96 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 2.90 |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | \$35,714 | \$628 | \$195,300 | 4.6\% | 8.2\% | 82.5\% | 18.0\% | 25.58 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 3.30 |

Proximity to Area Amenities

| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rating |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rank (1 = Property with Highest Rating) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number within 2.0 miles of Property |  |  |  |  | Nearest to Property, Miles |  |  | Number within 2.0 miles of Property |  |  |  |  | Nearest to Property, Miles |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Z 0} \\ & \dot{U} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { چ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 흉 } \\ & \text { 오 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 응 <br> 은 <br> ㅇ | 응 응 ㅇ ज | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 정 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{T 0} \\ & \text { "뮤 } \\ & \text { 우 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { چ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 흉 } \\ & \text { 오 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 음 } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 흥 } \\ & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { 믐 } \\ & \text { 오 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Sub | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 19.6 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 2.00 |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 3.60 |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 3.60 |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 9.5 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 3.50 |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3.50 |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4.00 |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | 7 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 4.00 |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 8 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 3.90 |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | 11 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 31 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 3.1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 3.40 |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | 9 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 3.50 |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | 12 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 35 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.50 |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 10.6 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 2.20 |

Source: US Census; Claritas; Google Maps

Proximity to Area Amenities


Proximity to Area Employers


## SUBJECT PROPERTY PHOTOS

Photos of the subject property and the surrounding area are found below:


Subject Property


Looking North from Entrance


Looking East from Entrance


Looking South from Entrance


Looking West from Entrance


Typical Family Room


Typical Bedroom


Typical Bathroom


Typical Kitchen


Typical Closet


Utility Room


Laundry Room


## MARKET AREA

## Overview

Market areas are influenced by a variety of interrelated factors. These factors include site location, economic, and demographic characteristics (tenure, income, rent levels, etc.), local transportation patterns, physical boundaries (rivers, streams, topography, etc.), census geographies, and the location of comparable and/or potentially competing communities.

In areas where the county seat is the largest city, centrally located, and draws from the entire county, the county may be the market area. In the case where there are potentially competing communities in one county, the market area may be part of the county. In fact, the market area could include portions of adjacent counties. In this case, a combination of county subdivisions may be used to define the market area. In urban or suburban areas, the market area will be adjacent to the site extending to all locations of similar character with residents or potential residents likely to be interested in the project. In this case, county subdivisions, townships, or a combination of census tracts may be used to define the market area.

Allen \& Associates recently conducted a series of property management interviews to better understand market areas and resident moving patterns for multifamily properties. Our study suggested that markets may be classified into the following general categories: urban, suburban and rural. Renters in urban markets are typically willing to move 5 to 10 minutes when looking for a new apartment. Our research also shows that renters in suburban markets are normally willing to move 10 to 15 minutes when looking for a new place to live. Renters in rural markets are typically willing to move 15 to 20 minutes when looking for a new apartment. We considered these general guidelines in our evaluation of the subject property.

Our study suggested that secondary market areas were generally a function of whether the proposed development was family or elderly. Our research suggested that secondary market demand for family properties ranged from 10 to 30 percent. Secondary market demand for elderly properties ranged from 10 to 50 percent. Although seniors move less frequently than younger renters, they are often willing to move longer distances when looking for housing. We considered these general secondary market guidelines in our evaluation of the subject property.

Our primary and secondary market area definitions are found below.

## Primary Market Area

We defined the primary market area by generating a 30-minute drive time zone around the subject property. We also considered existing concentrations of multifamily properties and the nearest census tract boundaries in our analysis.

Primary market area, drive time and existing multifamily maps are found in the following pages. The primary market area included all or part of the following census tracts:

| Census Tract | County | State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51093280101 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51093280104 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51093280105 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51093280106 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51093280200 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51093280300 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51093280400 | Isle of Wight County | Virginia |
| 51175200100 | Southampton County | Virginia |
| 51175200200 | Southampton County | Virginia |
| 51175200400 | Southampton County | Virginia |
| 51181860100 | Surry County | Virginia |
| 51181860200 | Surry County | Virginia |
| 51183870100 | Sussex County | Virginia |
| 51183870201 | Sussex County | Virginia |


| 51183870202 | Sussex County | Virginia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 51183870300 | Sussex County | Virginia |
| 51183870400 | Sussex County | Virginia |

The primary market area includes a population of 43,623 persons and covers a total of 989.5 square miles, making it 35.5 miles across on average.

## Secondary Market Area

We estimate that up to 20 percent of demand will come from areas outside of the primary market area.

Market Area



Existing Multifamily


## ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

In this section we conduct an analysis of the regional economy. For purposes of our analysis, we define the region as Isle of Wight, Franklin City, Southampton, Surry, and Sussex, Virginia. A map depicting the Region is found below.


## Employment by Industry

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) tracks establishment employment by major industry. In the table below we present the current breakdown and percent distribution. The data set comes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) via Woods \& Pool Economics.

| Establishment Employment |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry | Region | Reg \% | US \% |
| Farm Employment | 1,002 | $2.8 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Forestry, Fishing, Related Activities And Other Employment | 506 | $1.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Mining Employment | 181 | $0.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Utilities Employment | 68 | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Construction Employment | 1,506 | $4.1 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Manufacturing Employment | 3,816 | $10.5 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| Wholesale Trade Employment | 806 | $2.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Retail Trade Employment | 3,434 | $9.4 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| Transportation And Warehousing Employment | 1,728 | $4.8 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Information Employment | 134 | $0.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Finance And Insurance Employment | 1,241 | $3.4 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Real Estate And Rental And Lease Employment | 1,871 | $5.1 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| Professional And Technical Services Employment | 1,575 | $4.3 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |
| Management Of Companies And Enterprises Employment | 481 | $1.3 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Administrative And Waste Services Employment | 2,276 | $6.3 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Educational Services Employment | 579 | $1.6 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Health Care And Social Assistance Employment | 3,483 | $9.6 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ |
| Arts, Entertainment, And Recreation Employment | 539 | $1.5 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Accommodation And Food Services Employment | 2,513 | $6.9 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| Other Services, Except Public Administration Employment | 2,647 | $7.3 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Federal Civilian Government Employment | 214 | $0.6 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Federal Miliary Employment | 240 | $0.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| State And Local Government Employment | 5,511 | $15.2 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |
| Establishment Employment | 36,351 | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Regional establishment employment currently stands at 36,351 . The data suggests that State and Local Government is the largest employment category accounting for $15.2 \%$ of total regional employment. Manufacturing is the second largest category accounting for $10.5 \%$ of total employment. Health Care and Social Assistance is the third largest category accounting for $9.6 \%$ of total employment. Retail Trade is the fourth largest category accounting for $9.4 \%$ of total employment. Other Services is the fifth largest category accounting for $7.3 \%$ of total employment.

Economists generally classify employment two ways: basic and non-basic. Basic employment, which is considered to be the engine of a local economy, includes industries that rely on external factors to fuel demand. For instance, mining, logging and manufacturers are frequently considered basic employers. Goods for these industries are shipped outside the location where they are produced. Non-basic employers depend largely on local demand and usually employ local workers. For example, grocery stores and restaurants are sometimes considered non-basic employers.

The Location Quotient (LQ) technique is the most common method of identifying basic industries for a given economy. The LQ technique compares the share of workers in each industry of a given economy with that of a larger reference economy. If the number of workers in the given economy is greater than that of the reference economy, these are considered to be basic industries because they fill needs beyond those of the reference community.

In the table above we highlight the basic industries for the region. The distribution of employment in these industries exceeds that for the United States. These basic industries represent about 19,838 employees or about $54.6 \%$ of total regional employment. These are the industries that drive the regional economy.

## Earnings by Industry

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) tracks average earnings by major industry. In the table below we present the current breakdown and rank. The data set comes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) via Woods \& Pool Economics.

| Average Earnings (2012 \$) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Industry | Earnings | Rank |
| Farm Employment | $\$ 27,037$ | 20 |
| Forestry, Fishing, Related Activities And Other Employment | $\$ 47,198$ | 9 |
| Mining Employment | $\$ 33,497$ | 14 |
| Utilities Employment | $\$ 219,338$ | 1 |
| Construction Employment | $\$ 44,855$ | 10 |
| Manufacturing Employment | $\$ 56,362$ | 4 |
| Wholesale Trade Employment | $\$ 56,269$ | 5 |
| Retail Trade Employment | $\$ 22,038$ | 22 |
| Transportation And Warehousing Employment | $\$ 53,034$ | 7 |
| Information Employment | $\$ 29,828$ | 18 |
| Finance And Insurance Employment | $\$ 33,378$ | 15 |
| Real Estate And Rental And Lease Employment | $\$ 11,083$ | 23 |
| Professional And Technical Services Employment | $\$ 48,464$ | 8 |
| Management Of Companies And Enterprises Employment | $\$ 196,644$ | 2 |
| Administrative And Waste Services Employment | $\$ 41,855$ | 11 |
| Educational Services Employment | $\$ 27,967$ | 19 |
| Health Care And Social Assistance Employment | $\$ 39,842$ | 12 |
| Arts, Entertainment, And Recreation Employment | $\$ 32,824$ | 16 |
| Accommodation And Food Services Employment | $\$ 32,425$ | 17 |
| Other Services, Except Public Administration Employment | $\$ 26,729$ | 21 |
| Federal Civilian Government Employment | $\$ 85,748$ | 3 |
| Federal Military Employment | $\$ 34,142$ | 13 |
| State And Local Government Employment | $\$ 55,154$ | 6 |
| Establishment Employment | $\$ 42,777$ |  |

The data suggests that Utilities is the highest paid industry averaging $\$ 219,338$ per employee. Management of Companies is the second highest paid industry averaging $\$ 196,644$ per employee. Federal Civilian Government is the third highest paid profession averaging $\$ 85,748$ per employee. Manufacturing is the fourth highest paid industry averaging $\$ 56,362$ per employee. Wholesale trade is the fifth highest paid category averaging $\$ 56,269$ per employee. These figures are compared with regional Average Earnings of $\$ 42,777$ per employee.

The highlighted industries represent basic industries for the region. Average earnings for these basic industries comes to $\$ 57,233$ or $33.8 \%$ higher than average for the region.

## Top Employers

The table below gives a listing of the region's top employers. The data comes from InfoUSA and includes a primary industry description for each employer.

| Top Employers |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name | Employees | SIC Code | Industry Description | Location Type |
| Smithfield Foods | 2,200 | $2011-04$ | Meat Products (Mfrs) | - |
| Smithfield Foods | 2,000 | $2011-04$ | Meat Products (Mfrs) | Branch |
| International Paper Co | 1,800 | $9224-04$ | Fire Departments | Branch |
| Smithfield North Facility | 1,000 | $2011-01$ | Meat Packers (Mfrs) | - |
| Surry Power Station | 900 | $4911-04$ | Power Plants | - |
| Cost Plus World Mkt-VA Dstrbtn | 475 | $5099-98$ | Distribution Centers (Whls) | - |
| Southampton Correctional Cmplx | 370 | $9121-02$ | Government Offices-State | - |
| Sussex II State Prison | 300 | $9121-02$ | Government Offices-State | - |
| Walmart Supercenter | 259 | $5311-02$ | Department Stores | Branch |
| Sentara St Luke's | 258 | $8062-02$ |  | - |

The top employers include: (1) Smithfield Foods (2200 employees); (2) Smithfield Foods (2000 employees) and; (3) International Paper Co (1800 employees).

## Population

In this section we present population data for the region. The table and graph below show historic data since 2010. The historic data comes from the US Census; the forecast comes from Woods \& Pool Economics.

| Population Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pop | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 81,590 |  |
| 2011 | 81,386 | $-0.3 \%$ |
| 2012 | 81,095 | $-0.4 \%$ |
| 2013 | 80,944 | $-0.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | 80,983 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2015 | 80,989 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | 80,575 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 80,439 | $-0.2 \%$ |
| 2018 | 80,478 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2019 | 80,288 | $-0.2 \%$ |
| 2020 | 80,520 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2021 | 80,753 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2022 | 80,989 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2023 | 81,226 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2024 | 81,466 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Source: US Census; W\&P Economics |  |  |



Population decreased from 81,590 in 2010 to 80,520 in 2020 and is anticipated to increase to 81,466 in 2024.

## Establishment Employment

In this section we present establishment employment data for the region. The table and graph below show historic data since 2010. The historic data comes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS); the forecast comes from Woods \& Pool Economics.

| Establishment Employment Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Est Emp | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 32,932 |  |
| 2011 | 32,471 | $-1.4 \%$ |
| 2012 | 33,003 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 33,474 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2014 | 34,183 | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | 35,298 | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2016 | 35,138 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 35,024 | $-0.3 \%$ |
| 2018 | 35,192 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2019 | 35,252 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2020 | 33,650 | $-4.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | 35,984 | $6.9 \%$ |
| 2022 | 36,351 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2023 | 36,706 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2024 | 37,075 | $1.0 \%$ |



Source: BLS; W\&P Economics

Establishment employment increased from 32,932 in 2010 to 33,650 in 2020 and is anticipated to increase to 37,075 in 2024.

## Civilian Employment

In this section we present civilian employment data for the region. The table and graph below show historic data since 2010. The historic data comes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS); the forecast utilizes data from Woods \& Pool Economics.

| Civilian Employment Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Civ Emp | Growth $\%$ |
| 2010 | 40,072 |  |
| 2011 | 39,890 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 39,613 | $-0.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 39,616 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2014 | 39,550 | $-0.2 \%$ |
| 2015 | 39,156 | $-1.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | 39,441 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2017 | 39,658 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | 39,990 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2019 | 39,170 | $-2.1 \%$ |
| 2020 | 38,656 | $-1.3 \%$ |
| 2021 | 38,768 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2022 | 38,881 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2023 | 38,995 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2024 | 39,110 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Source |  |  |



Source: BLS; W\&P Economics

Civilian employment decreased from 40,072 in 2010 to 38,656 in 2020 and is anticipated to increase to 39,110 in 2024.

## Labor Force and Unemployment

In this section we take a look at the labor force and unemployment. The table below shows civilian employment, unemployment and labor force statistics for the region since 2010. The data set comes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) via the Texas A\&M Real Estate Center.

| Labor Force \& Unemployment |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Civ Emp | Unemp | Lab Force | Unemp Rate |
| 2010 | 40,072 | 3,217 | 36,855 | $8.0 \%$ |
| 2011 | 39,890 | 2,803 | 37,087 | $7.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 39,613 | 2,536 | 37,077 | $6.4 \%$ |
| 2013 | 39,616 | 2,240 | 37,376 | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 39,550 | 1,916 | 37,634 | $4.8 \%$ |
| 2015 | 39,156 | 1,798 | 37,358 | $4.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 39,441 | 1,630 | 37,811 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 2017 | 39,658 | 1,284 | 38,374 | $3.2 \%$ |
| 2018 | 39,990 | 1,190 | 38,800 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2019 | 39,170 | 2,263 | 36,907 | $5.8 \%$ |
| 2020 | 38,656 | 1,610 | 37,046 | $4.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Unemployment decreased from 3,217 in 2010 to 1,610 in 2020. The unemployment rate decreased from $8.0 \%$ in 2010 to $4.2 \%$ in 2020 .

The table and graph below show the unemployment rate for the region for the past 12 months.

| Unemployment Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Month | Unemp Rate |
| Dec-20 | $5.7 \%$ |
| Jan-21 | $5.7 \%$ |
| Feb-21 | $5.6 \%$ |
| Mar-21 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Apr-21 | $4.1 \%$ |
| May-21 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Jun-21 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Jul-21 | $4.2 \%$ |
| Aug-21 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Sep-21 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Oct-21 | $3.1 \%$ |
| Nov-21 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Dec-21 | $3.2 \%$ |



The Unemployment Rate for the Region came in at 5.7\% in December 2020 and 3.2\% in December 2021.

## Building Permits

In this section we look at building permits. The table and graph below show historical data for the region since 2000. The data set comes from the US Census.

| Building Permits |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 1 Family | 2-4 Family | 5+ Family | Total |
| 2000 | 392 | 5 | 0 | 397 |
| 2001 | 418 | 32 | 0 | 450 |
| 2002 | 435 | 13 | 0 | 448 |
| 2003 | 516 | 12 | 0 | 528 |
| 2004 | 580 | 16 | 0 | 596 |
| 2005 | 812 | 4 | 0 | 816 |
| 2006 | 708 | 4 | 60 | 772 |
| 2007 | 533 | 2 | 0 | 535 |
| 2008 | 328 | 4 | 0 | 332 |
| 2009 | 262 | 4 | 0 | 266 |
| 2010 | 204 | 4 | 144 | 352 |
| 2011 | 172 | 4 | 0 | 176 |
| 2012 | 165 | 2 | 0 | 167 |
| 2013 | 199 | 2 | 0 | 201 |
| 2014 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 207 |
| 2015 | 192 | 0 | 208 | 400 |
| 2016 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 262 |
| 2017 | 299 | 0 | 13 | 312 |
| 2018 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 286 |
| 2019 | 328 | 0 | 0 | 328 |
| 2020 | 387 | 0 | 28 | 415 |

Building permits for the region increased from 397 in 2000 to 816 in 2005, before decreasing to 167 in 2012 and increasing to 415 in 2020.

## Conclusion

We anticipate moderate economic growth accompanied by modest population growth for the region over the next several years.

## Population

In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Caliper Corporation population projection for the Market Area.

| Population Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 40,814 | - |
| 2011 | 40,798 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 41,095 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 41,392 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 41,688 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | 41,985 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2016 | 42,218 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2017 | 42,452 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2018 | 42,685 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2019 | 42,919 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2020 | 43,152 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | 43,387 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2022 | 43,623 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2023 | 43,860 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2024 | 44,098 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Source: Caliper; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Caliper Corporation 55+ population projection for the Market Area.

| $55+$ Population Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 11,823 | - |
| 2011 | 12,129 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2012 | 12,442 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 12,764 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2014 | 13,094 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 13,424 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2016 | 13,754 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 14,084 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2018 | 14,414 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2019 | 14,744 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2020 | 14,963 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | 15,182 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2022 | 15,401 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2023 | 15,621 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2024 | 15,840 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Source: Caliper; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Caliper Corporation 65+ population projection for the Market Area.

| 65+ Population Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 6,059 | - |
| 2011 | 6,313 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 6,578 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2013 | 6,855 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | 7,143 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2015 | 7,431 | $4.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | 7,719 | $3.9 \%$ |
| 2017 | 8,007 | $3.7 \%$ |
| 2018 | 8,295 | $3.6 \%$ |
| 2019 | 8,583 | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2020 | 8,789 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2021 | 8,996 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2022 | 9,202 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2023 | 9,408 | $2.2 \%$ |
| 2024 | 9,615 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Source: Caliper; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



## Households

In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Claritas household projection for the Market Area.

| Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth $\%$ |
| 2010 | 14,601 | - |
| 2011 | 14,685 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2012 | 14,770 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 14,855 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2014 | 14,941 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 15,027 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 15,113 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2017 | 15,198 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2018 | 15,284 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2019 | 15,370 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2020 | 15,401 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2021 | 15,432 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2022 | 15,463 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2023 | 15,494 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2024 | 15,525 | $0.2 \%$ |



In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Claritas 55+ household projection for the Market Area.

| $55+$ Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth $\%$ |
| 2010 | 6,961 | - |
| 2011 | 7,141 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2012 | 7,325 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 7,515 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2014 | 7,709 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 7,903 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2016 | 8,098 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 8,292 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2018 | 8,486 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2019 | 8,681 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2020 | 8,810 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | 8,939 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2022 | 9,068 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2023 | 9,197 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2024 | 9,326 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Source: Claritas; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Claritas 65+ household projection for the Market Area.

| $65+$ Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth $\%$ |
| 2010 | 3,517 | - |
| 2011 | 3,665 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 3,819 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2013 | 3,979 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | 4,146 | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2015 | 4,314 | $4.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | 4,481 | $3.9 \%$ |
| 2017 | 4,648 | $3.7 \%$ |
| 2018 | 4,815 | $3.6 \%$ |
| 2019 | 4,983 | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2020 | 5,102 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2021 | 5,222 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2022 | 5,342 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2023 | 5,462 | $2.2 \%$ |
| 2024 | 5,581 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Source: Claritas; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



## Renter Households

In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Claritas renter household projection for the Market Area.

| Renter Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth $\%$ |
| 2010 | 3,451 | - |
| 2011 | 3,472 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2012 | 3,493 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | 3,514 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2014 | 3,535 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 3,556 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 3,577 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2017 | 3,598 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2018 | 3,619 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2019 | 3,640 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2020 | 3,645 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 2021 | 3,649 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 2022 | 3,654 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 2023 | 3,658 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 2024 | 3,663 | $0.1 \%$ |



In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Claritas 55+ renter household projection for the Market Area.

| $55+$ Renter Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 1,274 | - |
| 2011 | 1,312 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 1,351 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2013 | 1,390 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2014 | 1,432 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2015 | 1,473 | $2.9 \%$ |
| 2016 | 1,514 | $2.8 \%$ |
| 2017 | 1,555 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2018 | 1,596 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2019 | 1,637 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2020 | 1,666 | $1.7 \%$ |
| 2021 | 1,694 | $1.7 \%$ |
| 2022 | 1,722 | $1.7 \%$ |
| 2023 | 1,750 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2024 | 1,779 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Source: Claritas; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



In the table below we give the 2010-2024 Claritas 65+ renter household projection for the Market Area.

| $65+$ Renter Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 607 | - |
| 2011 | 639 | $5.1 \%$ |
| 2012 | 671 | $5.1 \%$ |
| 2013 | 706 | $5.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | 742 | $5.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | 778 | $4.9 \%$ |
| 2016 | 814 | $4.7 \%$ |
| 2017 | 851 | $4.4 \%$ |
| 2018 | 887 | $4.3 \%$ |
| 2019 | 923 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 2020 | 952 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2021 | 981 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2022 | 1,010 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2023 | 1,039 | $2.9 \%$ |
| 2024 | 1,068 | $2.8 \%$ |
| Source: Claritas; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



## Household Income

The following table shows the current distribution of household incomes for the Market Area. The data set comes from Claritas and Ribbon Demographics.

Households, by Income, by Size

| $2022 \$$ |  |  | 2022 Households |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person | Total |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 9,999$ | 559 | 192 | 135 | 103 | 29 | 16 | 1,034 |
| $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 19,999$ | 787 | 437 | 200 | 66 | 43 | 19 | 1,553 |
| $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 29,999$ | 641 | 388 | 170 | 160 | 36 | 16 | 1,411 |
| $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 39,999$ | 335 | 563 | 184 | 84 | 73 | 35 | 1,274 |
| $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 49,999$ | 385 | 549 | 187 | 100 | 64 | 30 | 1,316 |
| $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 59,999$ | 305 | 515 | 104 | 88 | 61 | 31 | 1,103 |
| $\$ 60,000$ | $\$ 74,999$ | 229 | 746 | 347 | 215 | 67 | 31 | 1,635 |
| $\$ 75,000$ | $\$ 99,999$ | 202 | 789 | 530 | 392 | 85 | 45 | 2,042 |
| $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 124,999$ | 107 | 517 | 335 | 441 | 147 | 75 | 1,623 |
| $\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 149,999$ | 141 | 433 | 258 | 119 | 89 | 48 | 1,088 |
| $\$ 150,000$ | $\$ 199,999$ | 54 | 275 | 186 | 185 | 91 | 38 | 829 |
| $\$ 200,000$ | more | 59 | 229 | 92 | 72 | 71 | 32 |  |
| Total |  | 3,804 | 5,633 | 2,729 | 2,025 | 856 | 415 | 15,463 |

The following table shows the current distribution of 55+ household incomes for the Market Area.

| 55+ Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 \$ |  | 2022 Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 + Person | Total |
| \$0 | \$9,999 | 464 | 124 | 40 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 646 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 686 | 266 | 58 | 11 | 27 | 8 | 1,057 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 524 | 309 | 83 | 16 | 12 | 3 | 947 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 276 | 397 | 93 | 21 | 29 | 13 | 830 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 277 | 476 | 88 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 901 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 174 | 398 | 60 | 19 | 10 | 5 | 665 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 168 | 527 | 149 | 57 | 24 | 12 | 937 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 154 | 524 | 235 | 62 | 47 | 24 | 1,046 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 85 | 391 | 156 | 28 | 38 | 16 | 714 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 84 | 338 | 90 | 15 | 29 | 15 | 571 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 41 | 221 | 86 | 28 | 38 | 17 | 430 |
| \$200,000 | more | 59 | 158 | 40 | 11 | 41 | 16 | 325 |
|  |  | 2,991 | 4,130 | 1,179 | 298 | 328 | 142 | 9,068 |

The following table shows the current distribution of 65+ household incomes for the Market Area.

| 65+ Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 \$ |  | 2022 Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 + Person | Total |
| \$0 | \$9,999 | 313 | 66 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 406 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 529 | 159 | 27 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 730 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 399 | 198 | 67 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 671 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 219 | 319 | 41 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 601 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 186 | 348 | 60 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 612 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 106 | 258 | 33 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 416 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 96 | 322 | 27 | 44 | 9 | 5 | 504 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 99 | 274 | 97 | 28 | 26 | 14 | 538 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 48 | 164 | 67 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 293 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 39 | 170 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 240 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 28 | 95 | 26 | 3 | 21 | 9 | 180 |
| \$200,000 | more | 32 | 82 | 26 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 151 |
|  |  | 2,095 | 2,455 | 498 | 144 | 109 | 40 | 5,342 |

Source: Claritas \& Ribbon Demographics

## Renter Household Income

The following table shows the current distribution of renter household incomes for the Market Area. The data set comes from Claritas and Ribbon Demographics.

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

| 2022 \$ |  | 2022 Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 + Person | Total |
| \$0 | \$9,999 | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 | 560 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 369 | 204 | 112 | 36 | 33 | 17 | 771 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 221 | 111 | 80 | 91 | 26 | 12 | 541 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 97 | 125 | 55 | 15 | 45 | 19 | 356 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 152 | 66 | 38 | 51 | 24 | 11 | 342 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 36 | 81 | 13 | 18 | 23 | 8 | 180 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 34 | 97 | 23 | 45 | 8 | 3 | 210 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 57 | 145 | 72 | 57 | 10 | 4 | 345 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 19 | 28 | 15 | 58 | 8 | 0 | 127 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 37 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 11 | 4 | 117 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 15 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 42 |
| \$200,000 | more | 17 | 25 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 63 |
|  |  | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 | 3,654 |

The following table shows the current distribution of 55+ renter household incomes for the Market Area.

| 2022 \$ |  | 2022 Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 + Person | Total |
| \$0 | \$9,999 | 236 | 61 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 316 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 292 | 47 | 13 | 5 | 17 | 6 | 380 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 143 | 58 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 234 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 79 | 40 | 19 | 4 | 25 | 12 | 178 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 93 | 36 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 165 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 23 | 39 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 71 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 20 | 34 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 71 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 36 | 42 | 42 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 128 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 16 | 24 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 55 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 21 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 59 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| \$200,000 | more | 16 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 37 |
| Total |  | 989 | 407 | 164 | 48 | 88 | 26 | 1,722 |

The following table shows the current distribution of $65+$ renter household incomes for the Market Area.

| 2022 \$ |  | 2022 Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 + Person | Total |
| \$0 | \$9,999 | 135 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 156 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 212 | 28 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 250 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 99 | 33 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 148 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 68 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 125 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 54 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 70 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 19 | 31 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 57 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 29 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 17 | 37 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 84 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 8 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 35 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 18 |
| \$200,000 | more | 10 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| Total |  | 655 | 219 | 62 | 29 | 37 | 8 | 1,010 |

Source: Claritas \& Ribbon Demographics

## Overburdened Renter Households

The following tables give overburdened renter household data for the Market Area. The data set comes from the U.S. Census Bureau.

| Overburdened Renter Households |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $<20 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $\%$ of Total |
| $20-24 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $38.9 \%$ |
| $25-29 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $8.2 \%$ |
| $30-34 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $7.3 \%$ |
| $>35 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $33.2 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 33.2 percent of the renter households in this market area are overburdened, paying more than 35 percent of their income towards housing-related costs. Our research also suggests that 40.5 percent of the renter households are overburdened to 30 percent of income.

| $55+$ Overburdened Renter Households |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $<20 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | \% of Total |
| $20-24 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $23.9 \%$ |
| $25-29 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $13.9 \%$ |
| $30-34 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $12.9 \%$ |
| $>35 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $41.6 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 41.6 percent of the $55+$ renter households in this market area are overburdened, paying more than 35 percent of their income towards housing-related costs. Our research also suggests that 54.5 percent of the 55+ renter households are overburdened to 30 percent of income.

| $65+$ Overburdened Renter Households |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\%$ of Total |
| $<20 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $22.6 \%$ |
| $20-24 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $8.2 \%$ |
| $25-29 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $16.2 \%$ |
| $30-34 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $13.6 \%$ |
| $>35 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $39.5 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 39.5 percent of the 65+ renter households in this market area are overburdened, paying more than 35 percent of their income towards housing-related costs. Our research also suggests that 53.1 percent of the 65+ renter households are overburdened to 30 percent of income.

## Owner Substandard Units

The U.S. Census Bureau defines substandard housing units as follows: (1) Units without complete plumbing; or (2) Units with 1.00 or more persons per room.

The following tables give owner substandard housing unit data for occupied housing units in the nation, state, region and market area. The data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau:

| Owner Substandard Units |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  |  |
| 1.00 persons per room or less | $97.6 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $1.3 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.3 \%$ |
| Complete Plumbing | $99.2 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 1.00 persons per room or less | $0.8 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $0.0 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.0 \%$ |
| Lacking Complete Plumbing | $0.8 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Standard | $97.6 \%$ |
| Substandard | $2.4 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 2.4 percent of occupied owner housing units in the market area are substandard.

## Renter Substandard Units

The following tables give renter substandard housing unit data for occupied housing units in the nation, state, region and market area. The data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau:

| Renter Substandard Units |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $\%$ of Total |
| 1.00 persons per room or less | $92.7 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $2.3 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.7 \%$ |
| Complete Plumbing | $95.7 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 1.00 persons per room or less | $4.2 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $0.1 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.0 \%$ |
| Lacking Complete Plumbing | $4.3 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Standard | $92.7 \%$ |
| Substandard | $7.3 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 7.3 percent of renter owner housing units in the market area are substandard.

## Owner Movership

The following tables give owner household movership data for the market area with an estimated breakout by household size. The data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau and the American Housing Survey:

| Owner Movership, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 Person | 7+ Person |
| Owner to Owner | $2.4 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| Owner to Renter | $2.2 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| Owner Movership Rate | $4.6 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census, American Housing Survey; Allen \& Associates
Our research suggests an owner movership rate of 6.8 percent.

Elderly Owner Movership, by Size

|  | AHS Survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 Person | 7+ Person |
| Owner to Owner | $2.0 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| Owner to Renter | $1.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Owner Movership Rate | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census, American Housing Survey; Allen \& Associates
Our research suggests an elderly owner movership rate of 3.7 percent.

## Renter Movership

The following tables give renter household movership data for the market area with an estimated breakout by household size. The data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau and the American Housing Survey:

| Renter Movership, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 Person | 7+ Person |
| Renter to Renter | $8.5 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ | $32.1 \%$ | $32.4 \%$ | $35.1 \%$ | $54.2 \%$ |
| Renter to Owner | $2.1 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
| Renter Movership Rate | $10.5 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ | $34.5 \%$ | $42.1 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ | $43.6 \%$ | $64.2 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census, American Housing Survey; Allen \& Associates

Our research suggests a renter movership rate of 25.2 percent.

| Elderly Renter Movership, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 Person | 7+ Person |
| Renter to Renter | $7.4 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Renter to Owner | $0.6 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| Renter Movership Rate | $8.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census, American Housing Survey; Allen \& Associates
Our research suggests an elderly renter movership rate of 8.0 percent.

## SUPPLY ANALYSIS

In conducting our analysis, we began by attempting to compile a list of every multifamily property with 10 or more units in the market area. We included conventionally-financed multifamily communities as well as properties financed by the local housing authority and the state housing finance agency in our listing. We even included properties financed by and/or subsidized by USDA and/or HUD. Finally, we included properties that are either proposed or currently under construction. The result was a listing of projects with 10 or more units whether existing, under construction, or proposed - for this area. Our rental property inventory listing is found in the pages that follow.

A map showing the location of the properties included in the rental property inventory is found in the pages that follow. Properties identified with red pushpins have 100 percent market rate units (market rate properties), properties identified with yellow pushpins have a mixture of market rate / restricted / subsidized units (restricted properties), and properties identified with blue pushpins have 100 percent project-based rental assistance (subsidized properties).

After accounting for any unconfirmed properties and any properties that are located outside the defined market area, we arrived at a list of confirmed market area properties. This was the listing of properties upon which our analysis is based. In our opinion, the properties included on this list give a credible picture of market conditions as of the effective date of this report. This listing is found in the pages that follow.

Our next step was to compile a master list of unrestricted market rate rent comparables from the listing of confirmed properties. We eliminated any properties which were either under construction, being renovated, in lease up, or which were unstabilized for one reason or another. We identified market rate properties of similar age and condition to the subject property. If we were unable to identify a sufficient number of market rate comparables in the market area, we included market rate properties from outside the market area. If we were still unable to identify a sufficient number of market rate comparables, we included rent restricted properties provided, however, that the rents charged at these properties were below statuatory limits and similar to the rents charged at the market rate properties in the market area (suggesting that these rent restricted properties were de facto market rate properties).

Finally, we compiled a master list of restricted rent comparables from the listing of confirmed properties. We used the same approach described above for unrestricted market rate properties.

The resulting master lists of rent comparables and accompanying locator maps are found in this section as well. Detailed write-ups for the properties included on these lists are found in the Appendix. We include writeups for all of the rent comparables identified on our master lists, regardless of whether they ended up being selected as one of the best rent comparables. We did this for two reasons: (1) To be transparent; and (2) To provide the reader with context regarding our selection process.

The balance of this section includes a breakdown of confirmed market area properties by rent type, project status, year built, and financing source. We also include a rent, unit mix, and amenity summary for confirmed market area properties. Finally, we provide summary of vouchers, concessions, and waiting lists for the properties included in this report.

Rental Property Inventory

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1975 | 2016 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 128 | 5 | 96.1\% |
| 002 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC1 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 004 | Barrett House Apartments | 36.7231 | -76.6002 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 4 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 005 | Beamon's Mills Townhomes | 36.7536 | -76.5368 | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 55 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 006 | Berkley Court | 36.6758 | -76.9304 | 1972 | 2015 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 75 | 3 | 96.0\% |
| 007 | Bettie S Davis Village Apartments | 36.7125 | -76.5908 | 1983 | 2014 | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Bond | 60 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 008 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1984 | 2022 | Restricted | Family | Prop Rehab | Tax Credit | 48 | 3 | 93.8\% |
| 009 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 3 | 93.8\% |
| 010 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 16 | 1 | 93.8\% |
| 011 | Bradford Mews Apartments Phase 1 | 36.9594 | -76.6012 | 1994 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 012 | Bradford Mews Apartments Phase 2 | 36.9594 | -76.6012 | 1997 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 36.9594 | -76.6012 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 120 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 014 | Breeden Co Inc | 36.9556 | -76.5313 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 015 | C J's Place | 36.7283 | -76.5835 | 2012 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 016 | CAM | 36.7270 | -76.5822 | 1920 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 16 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 017 | Cedar Street Apartments | 36.9785 | -76.6353 | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 018 | Center 800 Apartments Phase 1 | 36.7306 | -76.5965 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 11 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 019 | Center 800 Apartments Phase 2 | 36.7306 | -76.5965 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 13 | 13 | 0.0\% |
| 020 | Center 801 Apartments | 36.7306 | -76.5965 | 2010 | na | Restricted | Family | Non-Inventory | Tax Credit | 34 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 021 | Chorey Park Apartments | 36.7319 | -76.5970 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | PHA | 100 | 5 | 95.0\% |
| 022 | Chuckatuck Village Apartments | 36.8553 | -76.5856 | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 42 | 3 | 92.9\% |
| 023 | Church Manor Apartments | 36.9785 | -76.6383 | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 50 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 024 | Colander Bishop Meadows | 36.7211 | -76.6012 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | PHA | 80 | 4 | 95.0\% |
| 025 | Commons at Centerbrooke Village | 36.7710 | -76.5898 | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Stabilized | Conventional | 132 | 8 | 93.9\% |
| 026 | Constance Manor Apartments | 36.7331 | -76.5966 | na | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 027 | Covenant Place Apartments | 36.9707 | -76.6301 | 1993 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 40 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 028 | Covington Court Apartments | 37.0398 | -77.0826 | 1991 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 029 | Crestline Realty Corp | 36.6774 | -76.9441 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 030 | Cross Management Corp | 36.7307 | -76.5861 | 2011 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 031 | Cypress Manor Apartments | 36.7191 | -76.5600 | 1992 | 2020 | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | Bond | 113 | 6 | 94.7\% |
| 032 | Dick Kelly Apartments | 36.7275 | -76.5806 | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 5 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 033 | Dorchester Square Apartments | 36.6619 | -76.9309 | 1972 | 2003 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 125 | 7 | 94.4\% |
| 034 | Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 1 | 36.9556 | -76.5313 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 240 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 035 | Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 2 | 36.9556 | -76.5313 | 2011 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 144 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 036 | Eagle Harbor West | 36.9515 | -76.5344 | 2017 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 240 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 037 | Epps Senior Village | 36.7861 | -76.5954 | na | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 120 | 120 | 0.0\% |
| 038 | Finney Avenue Residences | 36.7310 | -76.5768 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 12 | 1 | 91.7\% |
| 039 | Forest Pine Apartments | 36.6845 | -76.9379 | 1992 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 244 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 040 | Franklin South | 36.6690 | -76.9287 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 041 | Franklin Redevelopment Housing | 36.6633 | -76.9296 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Other | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 042 | Franklin Redevelopment Housing Elderly | 36.6695 | -76.9256 | na | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Non-Inventory | Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 043 | Galloway Terrace Apartments Phase 1 | 36.6715 | -76.9272 | 1985 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 12 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 044 | Galloway Terrace Apartments Phase 2 | 36.6732 | -76.9285 | 1985 | na | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | RD | 3 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 045 | Galloway Terrace Apartments Phase 3 | 36.6692 | -76.9383 | 1985 | na | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | RD | 3 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 046 | Heritage Acres X Apartments | 36.7464 | -76.5405 | 1992 | 2019 | Subsidized | Family | Rehabilitation | Bond | 76 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 36.7816 | -76.5783 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 144 | 1 | 99.3\% |
| 048 | Hoffler Apartments | 36.7330 | -76.5577 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | PHA | 80 | 4 | 95.0\% |
| 049 | Holland Trace Senior Apartments | 36.6659 | -76.9359 | 2000 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 050 | Jay's Place Group Home | 36.7291 | -76.5501 | 1985 | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 4 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 051 | Jefferson Manor Apartments | 36.7268 | -76.5876 | 1945 | 1985 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 39 | 8 | 79.5\% |
| 052 | Jersey Park Apartments | 36.9749 | -76.6461 | 1986 | 2006 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 80 | 3 | 96.3\% |

Rental Property Inventory

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | 36.7778 | -76.5885 | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 120 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 054 | Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1431 | -76.8418 | 1989 | 2006 | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 055 | Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 2 | 37.1431 | -76.8418 | 1993 | 2012 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 056 | Lofts at East Pointe | 36.7270 | -76.5783 | 1920 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 34 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 057 | Lynnhill Commons Phase 1 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 058 | Lynnhill Commons Phase 2 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 059 | Magnolia Gardens Apartments | 36.7474 | -76.5464 | 2003 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 67 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | 36.6774 | -76.9441 | 1991 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 97 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 061 | Meridian Obici | 36.7548 | -76.5831 | 2016 | na | Market Rate | Family | Lease Up | Conventional | 224 | 101 | 54.9\% |
| 062 | Montgomery Lofts On Main | 36.7291 | -76.5832 | 1912 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 12 | 1 | 91.7\% |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 36.9765 | -76.6099 | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 87 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 064 | Nansemond Square Apartments | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1975 | 2012 | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Bond | 128 | 26 | 79.7\% |
| 065 | Neighbors Place Apartments | 36.8312 | -76.8342 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 12 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 066 | Neighbors Place Apartments | 36.8312 | -76.8342 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | HUD | 12 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 067 | Nest (The) on 17 | 36.9561 | -76.5278 | 2017 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 240 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 068 | New Bold Apartments | 36.8357 | -76.8351 | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 069 | New Bold Apartments | 36.8357 | -76.8351 | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | HUD | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 070 | New Surry Village | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 3 | 90.6\% |
| 071 | Newport Village | 36.6635 | -76.9202 | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 2 | 95.8\% |
| 072 | Noah At Beamon's Mill | 36.7536 | -76.5368 | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 55 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 073 | Oak Terrace | 36.7473 | -76.5434 | 2022 | na | Restricted | Family | Construction | Bond | 120 | 5 | 95.8\% |
| 074 | October at Fair Downs | 36.7294 | -76.5597 | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Condominiums | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | 36.7299 | -76.5569 | 2016 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 076 | Oldtown Terrace | 36.6716 | -76.9274 | 1985 | na | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | Other | 35 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 077 | Parker Riddick Village | 36.7191 | -76.5600 | 1992 | 2020 | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | Bond | 113 | 6 | 94.7\% |
| 078 | Patriots Landing Apartments | 36.9783 | -76.6357 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 15 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 079 | Preserve (The) | 36.7305 | -76.5963 | 2012 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 080 | Preserve At Lake Meade | 36.7343 | -76.5976 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 081 | Pretlow-Old Town Apartments | 36.6651 | -76.9209 | 1983 | 2015 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 75 | 75 | 0.0\% |
| 082 | Reggie's Place Apartments | 36.7240 | -76.5581 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 4 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 083 | Residences at October (The) | 36.7301 | -76.5593 | 2013 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 72 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | 36.7669 | -76.5993 | 1989 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 109 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 085 | Seventy-Five Place lofts | 36.7270 | -76.5822 | 1920 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 16 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 086 | Springdale Apartments Phase 1 | 36.6859 | -76.9077 | 1994 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 40 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 087 | Springdale Apartments Phase 2 | 36.6859 | -76.9077 | 1997 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 40 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 088 | Stillwater Provisions | 36.9620 | -76.6060 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Non-Inventory | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 089 | Suburban Gardens | 36.6622 | -76.9294 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | emolished/Burr | Other | 75 | 75 | 0.0\% |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | 36.7185 | -76.5878 | 1987 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 111 | 6 | 94.6\% |
| 091 | Suffolk Towers Apartments | 36.7297 | -76.5826 | 1925 | na | Market Rate | Family | emolished/Burr | Conventional | 59 | 3 | 94.9\% |
| 092 | Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 47 | 3 | 93.6\% |
| 093 | Surry Village Apartments Phase 2 | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 32 | 2 | 93.8\% |
| 094 | Surry Village Apartments Phase 3 | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 8 | 1 | 87.5\% |
| 095 | Sussex Trace Apartments | 37.0221 | -77.1210 | 1982 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 50 | 8 | 84.0\% |
| 096 | Terrace (The) | 36.6715 | -76.9272 | 1985 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 12 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 097 | Tidewater Fair Downs | 36.7294 | -76.5597 | na | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 098 | Villas at October | 36.7301 | -76.5593 | 2019 | na | Restricted | Family | Unconfirmed | Bond | 39 | 2 | 94.9\% |
| 099 | Villas at Reid Landing (The) | 36.7641 | -76.5883 | 2020 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 51 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 100 | Waverly Elderly | 37.0398 | -77.0826 | 1991 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 101 | Waverly Village Apartments | 36.9740 | -76.9745 | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 40 | 4 | 90.0\% |
| 102 | Wellons Street Project | 36.7252 | -76.5907 | 1988 | na | Restricted | Family | Unconfirmed | Tax Credit | 6 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 103 | White Marsh Pointe at Eagle Landing | 36.7191 | -76.5594 | 2022 | na | Subsidized | Family | Construction | Bond | 206 | 206 | 0.0\% |
| 104 | Wilkens Group Home | 36.7285 | -76.5883 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 4 | 0 | 100.0\% |

Rental Property Inventory

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 105 | Williamtown Commons Apartments | 36.7331 | -76.5966 | 1990 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 16 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 106 | Wilson Pines Apartments | 36.7373 | -76.5527 | 1981 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 104 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 107 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 36.8240 | -76.7456 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 40 | 2 | 95.0\% |
| 108 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 36.8237 | -76.7466 | 1990 | 2022 | Subsidized | Family | Prop Rehab | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 109 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 36.8237 | -76.7466 | 1990 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 36.9748 | -76.6453 | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 7 | 88.3\% |
| 111 | Woods Edge Apartments | 36.9748 | -76.6453 | 1984 | 2017 | Restricted | Family | Non-Inventory | Tax Credit | 60 | 1 | 98.3\% |
| 112 | Port 58 at Hillpoint | 36.7831 | -76.5856 | 2022 | na | Market Rate | Family | Lease Up | Conventional | 230 | 10 | 95.7\% |



Rental Property Inventory, Unconfirmed

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 021 | Chorey Park Apartments | 36.7319 | -76.5970 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | PHA | 100 | 5 | 95.0\% |
| 024 | Colander Bishop Meadows | 36.7211 | -76.6012 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | PHA | 80 | 4 | 95.0\% |
| 048 | Hoffler Apartments | 36.7330 | -76.5577 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | PHA | 80 | 4 | 95.0\% |
| 056 | Lofts at East Pointe | 36.7270 | -76.5783 | 1920 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 34 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 062 | Montgomery Lofts On Main | 36.7291 | -76.5832 | 1912 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 12 | 1 | 91.7\% |
| 085 | Seventy-Five Place lofts | 36.7270 | -76.5822 | 1920 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 16 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 098 | Villas at October | 36.7301 | -76.5593 | 2019 | na | Restricted | Family | Unconfirmed | Bond | 39 | 2 | 94.9\% |
| 102 | Wellons Street Project | 36.7252 | -76.5907 | 1988 | na | Restricted | Family | Unconfirmed | Tax Credit | 6 | 0 | 100.0\% |

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 009 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 3 | 93.8\% |
| 010 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 16 | 1 | 93.8\% |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 36.9594 | -76.6012 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 120 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 017 | Cedar Street Apartments | 36.9785 | -76.6353 | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 023 | Church Manor Apartments | 36.9785 | -76.6383 | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 50 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 027 | Covenant Place Apartments | 36.9707 | -76.6301 | 1993 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 40 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 028 | Covington Court Apartments | 37.0398 | -77.0826 | 1991 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 052 | Jersey Park Apartments | 36.9749 | -76.6461 | 1986 | 2006 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 80 | 3 | 96.3\% |
| 054 | Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1431 | -76.8418 | 1989 | 2006 | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 055 | Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 2 | 37.1431 | -76.8418 | 1993 | 2012 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 36.9765 | -76.6099 | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 87 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 070 | New Surry Village | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 3 | 90.6\% |
| 078 | Patriots Landing Apartments | 36.9783 | -76.6357 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 15 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 092 | Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 47 | 3 | 93.6\% |
| 095 | Sussex Trace Apartments | 37.0221 | -77.1210 | 1982 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 50 | 8 | 84.0\% |
| 101 | Waverly Village Apartments | 36.9740 | -76.9745 | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 40 | 4 | 90.0\% |
| 107 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 36.8240 | -76.7456 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 40 | 2 | 95.0\% |
| 109 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 36.8237 | -76.7466 | 1990 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 36.9748 | -76.6453 | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 7 | 88.3\% |

Master List of Market Rate Comparables

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 001 | Autumn Ridge 1 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1975 | 2016 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 128 | 5 | 96.1\% |
| 047 | Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 36.7816 | -76.5783 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 144 | 1 | 99.3\% |
| 060 | Meadowridge Apartments | 36.6774 | -76.9441 | 1991 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 97 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 36.9765 | -76.6099 | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 87 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 084 | Sadler Pond Apartments | 36.7669 | -76.5993 | 1989 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 109 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 090 | Suffolk Station Apartments | 36.7185 | -76.5878 | 1987 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 111 | 6 | 94.6\% |



Master List of Restricted Rent Comparables

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 36.7121 | -76.5894 | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 36.9594 | -76.6012 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 120 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 053 | King's Landing Apartments | 36.7778 | -76.5885 | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 120 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 075 | October Station Apartments | 36.7299 | -76.5569 | 2016 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 36.9748 | -76.6453 | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 7 | 88.3\% |



## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, by Rent Type

The following tables and graphs provide a summary of the confirmed market area properties included in this analysis broken out by rent type:

| Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Market Rate |  | 2 | 2 |
| Restricted | 1 | 10 | 11 |
| Subsidized | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Total | 4 | 15 | 19 |


| Total Units |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Market Rate |  | 102 | 102 |
| Restricted | 1 | 233 | 234 |
| Subsidized | 111 | 398 | 509 |
| Total | 112 | 733 | 845 |

Vacant Units

|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Rate |  |  |  |
| Restricted |  | 12 | 12 |
| Subsidized |  | 24 | 24 |
| Total |  | 36 | 36 |

Occupancy Rate

|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Rate |  | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Restricted | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Subsidized | $100 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $96 \%$ |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our analysis includes a total of 19 confirmed market area properties consisting of 845 units. The occupancy rate for these units currently stands at 96 percent. This rate reflects the occupancy for all confirmed market area units, regardless of project status (stabilized, under construction, proposed, etc.).

Confirmed market area properties break down by rent type and tenure as shown in the tables above.

## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, by Project Status

The following tables and graphs provide a summary of the confirmed market area properties included in this analysis broken out by project status:

| Rental Property Inventory |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elderly |  |  |  |  |
| Total Properties |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |


| Family |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 3 | 10 | 2 | 15 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation <br> Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 111 | 1 |  | 112 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction <br> Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab <br> Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 111 | 1 |  | 112 |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 398 | 233 | 102 | 733 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction <br> Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab <br> Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 398 | 233 | 102 | 733 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stabilized | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 24 | 12 |  | 36 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 24 | 12 |  | 36 |

Source: Allen \& Associates
Our survey includes a total of 19 stabilized market area properties consisting of 845 units standing at 96 percent occupancy.

Our research suggests that there are no properties in the market area that are not yet stabilized. Unstabilized units (also referred to as pipeline units) include vacant units in lease up, construction, rehabilitation, proposed new construction, and units with proposed renovation plans.

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area

| Elderly |  |  |  |  | Family |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  | Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 100\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | Stabilized | 94\% | 95\% | 100\% | 95\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | Total | 94\% | 95\% | 100\% | 95\% |

Source: Allen \& Associates

Occupancies of stabilized market area properties broken out by occupancy type (elderly or family) and rent type (subsidized, restricted or market rate) are found below:


Our research suggests the following occupancy levels for the 112 stabilized elderly units in this market area:

- Subsidized, 100 percent (111 units in survey)
- Restricted, 100 percent (1 units in survey)
- Market Rate, not applicable (0 units in survey)

Our research suggests the following occupancy levels for the 733 stabilized family units in this market area:

- Subsidized, 94 percent (398 units in survey)
- Restricted, 95 percent (233 units in survey)
- Market Rate, 100 percent (102 units in survey)

Occupancy rates for stabilized market area properties broken out by occupancy type (elderly or family) and unit type are found below (supporting data is found in the pages that follow):


Our research suggests the following occupancy levels for the 112 stabilized elderly units in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 100 percent (112 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 3-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 4-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)

Our research suggests the following occupancy levels for the 733 stabilized family units in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 95 percent (162 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, 96 percent (477 units in survey)
- 3-Bedroom, 91 percent (94 units in survey)
- 4-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, 0-Bedroom Units

| Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, 1-Bedroom Units

| Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |


| Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |  |
| Stabilized | 9 |  |  | 4 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 17 |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation <br> Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 111 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 112 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 111 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 112 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 6 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 8 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 6 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 8 |


| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 100\% |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100\% |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 110 |  |  | 17 | 15 |  |  | 20 | 162 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 110 |  |  | 17 | 15 |  |  | 20 | 162 |

Occupancy Rate

|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stabilized | 95\% |  |  | 94\% | 93\% |  |  | 100\% | 95\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 95\% |  |  | 94\% | 93\% |  |  | 100\% | 95\% |

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, 2-Bedroom Units

| Elderly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 256 |  | 5 | 50 | 86 |  |  | 80 | 477 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 256 |  | 5 | 50 | 86 |  |  | 80 | 477 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 13 |  |  | 2 | 5 |  |  |  | 20 |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up <br> Construction <br> Rehabilitation <br> Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab <br> Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Total
Occupancy Rate

| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, 3-Bedroom Units

| Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 3 |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 8 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 3 |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 8 |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stabilized | 32 |  |  | 8 | 52 |  |  | 2 | 94 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 32 |  |  | 8 | 52 |  |  | 2 | 94 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  | ant |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 5 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 8 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 5 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 8 |


| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 84\% |  |  | 100\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% | 91\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 84\% |  |  | 100\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% | 91\% |

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, 4-Bedroom Units

| Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Properties with Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, by Year Built

The following tables and graph provide a summary of the confirmed market area properties included in this analysis broken out by year built:

| Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| $<1960$ |  |  |  |
| $1960-1969$ |  | 1 | 1 |
| $1970-1979$ | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| $1980-1989$ | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| $1990-1999$ |  | 1 | 1 |
| $2000+$ | 4 | 15 | 19 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |


| Total Units |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| $<1960$ |  |  |  |
| $1960-1969$ |  | 50 | 50 |
| $1970-1979$ | 24 | 468 | 492 |
| $1980-1989$ | 88 | 200 | 288 |
| $1990-1999$ |  | 15 | 15 |
| 2000+ |  |  |  |
| Unknown | 112 | 733 | 845 |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our research suggests that of the 19 confirmed market area properties ( 845 units) included in this report, 0 properties ( 0 units) were constructed before 1960, 0 properties ( 0 units) were constructed between 1960 and 1969, 1 property ( 50 units) between 1970 and 1979, 10 properties ( 492 units) between 1980 and 1989, 7 properties ( 288 units) between 1990 and 1999, and 1 property ( 15 units) after 2000. In addition, 0 properties (0 units) had an unknown date of construction.

## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, by Financing Source

The following tables and graph provide a summary of the confirmed market area properties included in this analysis broken out by financing source:

| Total Properties |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Conventional |  | 2 | 2 |
| Tax Credit | 3 | 11 | 14 |
| Bond |  | 1 | 1 |
| USDA-RD |  |  |  |
| HUD | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Total | 4 | 15 | 19 |
| Total Units |  |  |  |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Conventional |  | 102 | 102 |
| Tax Credit | 72 | 461 | 533 |
| Bond |  | 120 | 120 |
| USDA-RD |  |  |  |
| HUD | 40 | 50 | 90 |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Total | 112 | 733 | 845 |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our research suggests that of the 19 confirmed properties in the market area, 2 properties (consisting of 102 units) are conventionally financed, 14 properties (consisting of 533 units) include tax credit financing, 1 property (consisting of 120 units) is bond financed, 0 properties (consisting of 0 units) are exclusively USDA-RD financed, and 2 properties (consisting of 90 units) are exclusively HUD financed.

The average project size for this market area is 44 units. The smallest projects are tax credit financed, averaging 38 units in size. The largest projects are bond financed, averaging 120 units in size.

## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, Rent Summary

The following tables and graphs provide a summary of the rents charged at confirmed market area properties broken out by unit type:

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subsidized |  |  | Restricted |  |  | Market |  |  |
|  | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg |
| 0-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1-Bedroom | $\$ 514$ | $\$ 728$ | $\$ 610$ | $\$ 577$ | $\$ 682$ | $\$ 620$ | $\$ 889$ | $\$ 889$ | $\$ 889$ |
| 2-Bedroom | $\$ 587$ | $\$ 794$ | $\$ 676$ | $\$ 587$ | $\$ 1,038$ | $\$ 762$ | $\$ 960$ | $\$ 1,159$ | $\$ 1,059$ |
| 3-Bedroom | $\$ 748$ | $\$ 762$ | $\$ 755$ | $\$ 754$ | $\$ 1,194$ | $\$ 889$ | $\$ 1,300$ | $\$ 1,300$ | $\$ 1,300$ |
| 4-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


|  | Subsidized |  |  | Restricted |  |  | Market |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg |
| 0-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1-Bedroom | 506 | 700 | 581 | 506 | 632 | 569 | 650 | 650 | 650 |
| 2-Bedroom | 724 | 963 | 770 | 714 | 1,000 | 760 | 898 | 1,000 | 949 |
| 3-Bedroom | 967 | 1,191 | 1,054 | 937 | 1,320 | 1,057 | 1,250 | 1,250 | 1,250 |
| 4-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Rent per Square Foot

|  | Subsidized |  |  |  | Restricted |  |  | Market |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg |  |
| 0-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 1-Bedroom | $\$ 1.02$ | $\$ 1.04$ | $\$ 1.05$ | $\$ 1.08$ | $\$ 1.14$ | $\$ 1.09$ | $\$ 1.37$ | $\$ 1.37$ | $\$ 1.37$ |  |
| 2-Bedroom | $\$ 0.81$ | $\$ 0.82$ | $\$ 0.88$ | $\$ 0.82$ | $\$ 1.04$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.07$ | $\$ 1.16$ | $\$ 1.12$ |  |
| 3-Bedroom | $\$ 0.64$ | $\$ 0.77$ | $\$ 0.72$ | $\$ 0.80$ | $\$ 0.90$ | $\$ 0.84$ | $\$ 1.04$ | $\$ 1.04$ | $\$ 1.04$ |  |
| 4-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our research suggests the following average rent levels for confirmed restricted rent units:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable
- 1-Bedroom, \$1.09 per square foot
- 2-Bedroom, $\$ 1.0$ per square foot
- 3-Bedroom, \$0.84 per square foot
- 4-Bedroom, not applicable

Our research suggests the following average rent levels for confirmed market rate units:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable
- 1-Bedroom, $\$ 1.37$ per square foot
- 2-Bedroom, $\$ 1.12$ per square foot
- 3-Bedroom, \$1.04 per square foot
- 4-Bedroom, not applicable

A detailed listing of rents and floor areas for confirmed market area properties by unit type and income target is found in the following pages.

## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, Unit Mix Summary

In the tables and graphs found below we present a breakdown of unit mix for confirmed market area properties broken out by occupancy type (elderly or family):

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, Unit Mix Summary

| Elderly |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom <br> 1-Bedroom <br> 2-Bedroom <br> 3-Bedroom <br> 4-Bedroom | 111 | 1 |  | 112 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |


| Family |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | 110 | 32 | 20 | 162 |
| 2-Bedroom | 256 | 141 | 80 | 477 |
| 3-Bedroom | 32 | 60 | 2 | 94 |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 398 | 233 | 102 | 733 |


| Unit Mix |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom <br> 1-Bedroom <br> 2-Bedroom <br> 3-Bedroom <br> 4-Bedroom | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |


| Unit Mix |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | $28 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| 2-Bedroom | $64 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| 3-Bedroom | $8 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our research suggests the following unit mix for the 112 confirmed elderly units located in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 100 percent (112 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 3-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 4-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)

Our research suggests the following unit mix for the 733 confirmed family units located in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 22 percent (162 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, 65 percent (477 units in survey)
- 3-Bedroom, 13 percent (94 units in survey)
- 4-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)


## Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, Amenity Summary

In the table found below we present a summary of amenities found at confirmed market area properties:

| Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, Amenity Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Building Type |  |  |  | Air Conditioning |  |
| 1 Story | $16 \%$ |  | Central | $100 \%$ |  |
| $2-4$ Story | $84 \%$ |  | Wall Units | $0 \%$ |  |
| 5-10 Story | $0 \%$ |  | Window Units | $0 \%$ |  |
| $>10$ Story | $0 \%$ |  | None | $0 \%$ |  |


| Project Amenities |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Ball Field | $0 \%$ |
| BBQ Area | $5 \%$ |
| Billiards | $0 \%$ |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | $5 \%$ |
| Car Care Ctr | $5 \%$ |
| Comm Center | $63 \%$ |
| Elevator | $0 \%$ |
| Fitness Center | $11 \%$ |
| Gazebo | $0 \%$ |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | $0 \%$ |
| Horseshoe Pit | $0 \%$ |
| Lake | $0 \%$ |
| Library | $5 \%$ |
| Movie Theatre | $0 \%$ |
| Picnic Area | $11 \%$ |
| Playground | $74 \%$ |
| Pool | $11 \%$ |
| Sauna | $0 \%$ |
| Sports Court | $16 \%$ |
| Walking Trail | $0 \%$ |


| Unit Amenities |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Blinds | $100 \%$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $16 \%$ |
| Upgraded Flooring | $95 \%$ |
| Fireplace | $0 \%$ |
| Patio/Balcony | $26 \%$ |
| Storage | $16 \%$ |


|  | Heat |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Central |  | $100 \%$ |
| Wall Units |  | $0 \%$ |
| Baseboards |  | $0 \%$ |
| Radiators |  | $0 \%$ |
| None | $0 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Parking | $0 \%$ |
| Garage |  | $0 \%$ |
| Covered |  | $5 \%$ |
| Assigned |  | $0 \%$ |
| Open |  |  |
| None |  |  |


| Laundry |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Central | $95 \%$ |
| W/D Units | $5 \%$ |
| W/D Hookups | $11 \%$ |


| Security |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Call Buttons | $16 \%$ |
| Cont Access | $0 \%$ |
| Courtesy Officer | $0 \%$ |
| Monitoring | $5 \%$ |
| Security Alarms | $0 \%$ |
| Security Patrols | $11 \%$ |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  | After School | $5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Concierge | $0 \%$ |
| Stove | $100 \%$ |  | Hair Salon | $0 \%$ |
| Refrigerator | $100 \%$ |  | Health Care | $0 \%$ |
| Disposal | $16 \%$ | Linens | $0 \%$ |  |
| Dishwasher | $37 \%$ |  | Meals | $0 \%$ |
| Microwave | $11 \%$ | Transportation | $0 \%$ |  |

Source: Allen \& Associates
Our research suggests that 16 percent of confirmed market area properties are 1 story in height, 84 percent are 2-4 stories in height, 0 percent are 5-10 stories in height, and 0 percent are over 10 stories in height. In addition, surveyed properties benefit from the following project amenities: 5 percent have a business/computer center, 63 percent have a community center, 11 percent have a fitness center, 74 percent have a playground, and 16 percent have a sports court.

Our research also suggests that the following unit amenities are present at surveyed properties: 100 percent have blinds, 95 percent have carpeting, 26 percent have patios/balconies, and 16 percent have outside storage. Surveyed properties also include the following kitchen amenities: 100 percent have a stove, 100 percent have a refrigerator, 16 percent have a disposal, 37 percent have a dishwasher, and 11 percent have a microwave.

In addition, 100 percent of confirmed market area properties have central heat while 100 percent have central air. Our research also suggests that 95 percent of surveyed properties have open parking. A total of 95 percent of area properties have central laundry facilities, while 11 percent have washer/dryer hookups, and 5 percent have washer/dryer units in each residential unit.

A total of 16 percent of confirmed market area properties have call buttons, 0 percent have controlled access, and 0 percent have security alarms.

It is also our understanding that the majority of confirmed market area properties provide cable access.

Finally, in the following pages we provide a summary of vouchers, concessions and waiting lists for the confirmed market area properties included in this report. We also include any absorption information we have uncovered as part of our research.

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy | Concessions | Vouchers | Abs Rate | Waiting List |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 009 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 3 | 93.8\% | 0\% | 19\% |  | 14 people |
| 010 | Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 36.9737 | -76.9748 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 16 | 1 | 93.8\% | 0\% | 13\% | - | - |
| 013 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 36.9594 | -76.6012 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 120 | 1 | 99.2\% | 0\% | 67\% |  | no |
| 017 | Cedar Street Apartments | 36.9785 | -76.6353 | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 13\% |  | 9 people |
| 023 | Church Manor Apartments | 36.9785 | -76.6383 | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 50 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 34\% |  | 4 people |
| 027 | Covenant Place Apartments | 36.9707 | -76.6301 | 1993 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 40 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - |
| 028 | Covington Court Apartments | 37.0398 | -77.0826 | 1991 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | yes |
| 052 | Jersey Park Apartments | 36.9749 | -76.6461 | 1986 | 2006 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 80 | 3 | 96.3\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2 years |
| 054 | Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1431 | -76.8418 | 1989 | 2006 | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2 people |
| 055 | Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 2 | 37.1431 | -76.8418 | 1993 | 2012 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 4\% | - | 6 people |
| 063 | Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 36.9765 | -76.6099 | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 87 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 20 people |
| 070 | New Surry Village | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 3 | 90.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 078 | Patriots Landing Apartments | 36.9783 | -76.6357 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 15 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 092 | Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1487 | -76.8481 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 47 | 3 | 93.6\% | 0\% | 2\% | - | yes |
| 095 | Sussex Trace Apartments | 37.0221 | -77.1210 | 1982 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 50 | 8 | 84.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 101 | Waverly Village Apartments | 36.9740 | -76.9745 | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 40 | 4 | 90.0\% | 0\% | 3\% | - | no |
| 107 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 36.8240 | -76.7456 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 40 | 2 | 95.0\% | 0\% | 8\% | - | 5 people |
| 109 | Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 36.8237 | -76.7466 | 1990 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 24 | 1 | 95.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 2 people |
| 110 | Woods Edge Apartments | 36.9748 | -76.6453 | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 7 | 88.3\% | 0\% | 5\% |  | yes |

## RENT COMPARABILITY ANALYSIS

In this section we develop restricted and unrestricted market rent conclusions for the subject property on an "as if complete \& stabilized" basis. Our analysis begins with an evaluation of unrestricted market rents.

## Unrestricted Rent Analysis

In this section we develop an unrestricted market rent conclusion for the subject property units. Our analysis began by selecting comparable rentals to use to develop estimates of market rents for the units at the subject property, assuming that the subject was an unrestricted property. Our selection of comparables was based on location, age, condition, unit mix and amenities of the comparable properties relative to the subject property.

## Rental Property Inventory, by Unit Type

In the following pages we present an inventory of properties included in this analysis. Rents for these properties, broken out by unit type, were used in selecting the rent comparables used in this analysis.

The properties that we consider to be comparable to the subject property are highlighted in the tables found in the following pages. We attempted to select stabilized market rate properties as comparables for purposes of our rent comparability analysis.

Comparables with restricted rents are used when a sufficient number of market rent comparables are not available and when maximum allowable rents for properties with restricted rents exceed prevailing rents in the area. In the event that program rental rates exceed market rental rates, restricted units are, in fact, de facto market rate units.

## Rent Comparables, Market Rate, Map

A map showing the location of the properties selected as comparables in this analysis is found in the following pages. Properties identified with red pushpins have market rents, properties identified with yellow pushpins have restricted rents, and properties identified with blue pushpins have subsidized rents. Detailed write-ups for the select rent comparables are found in the Appendix to this report.

## Rent Comparability Grids

Our analysis employed the use of rent comparability grids and resulted in an unrestricted market rent estimate for each of the subject's unit types. These grids and a narrative describing our rent adjustments are found in the following pages.

Rental Property Inventory, 1-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 001 Autumn Ridge 1 | 1975 | 2016 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$950 |
| 025 Commons at Centerbrooke Village | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,030 |
| 032 Dick Kelly Apartments | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 034 Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 1 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,387 |
| 035 Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 2 | 2011 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,437 |
| 039 Forest Pine Apartments | 1992 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$660 |
| 047 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,031 |
| 051 Jefferson Manor Apartments | 1945 | 1985 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$599 |
| 060 Meadowridge Apartments | 1991 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,019 |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$889 |
| 067 Nest (The) on 17 | 2017 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,559 |
| 072 Noah At Beamon's Mill | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$975 |
| 078 Patriots Landing Apartments | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 084 Sadler Pond Apartments | 1989 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 090 Suffolk Station Apartments | 1987 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 096 Terrace (The) | 1985 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 105 Williamtown Commons Apartments | 1990 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Source: Allen \& Associates

Rental Property Inventory, 2-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 001 Autumn Ridge 1 | 1975 | 2016 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,200 |
| 025 Commons at Centerbrooke Village | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,009 |
| 032 Dick Kelly Apartments | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$725 |
| 034 Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 1 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,587 |
| 035 Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 2 | 2011 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,687 |
| 039 Forest Pine Apartments | 1992 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$805 |
| 047 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,143 |
| 051 Jefferson Manor Apartments | 1945 | 1985 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$699 |
| 060 Meadowridge Apartments | 1991 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,097 |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,159 |
| 067 Nest (The) on 17 | 2017 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,729 |
| 072 Noah At Beamon's Mill | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,498 |
| 078 Patriots Landing Apartments | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$960 |
| 084 Sadler Pond Apartments | 1989 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,055 |
| 090 Suffolk Station Apartments | 1987 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,035 |
| 096 Terrace (The) | 1985 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$800 |
| 105 Williamtown Commons Apartments | 1990 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$650 |

Source: Allen \& Associates

Rental Property Inventory, 3-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 001 Autumn Ridge 1 | 1975 | 2016 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,400 |
| 025 Commons at Centerbrooke Village | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 032 Dick Kelly Apartments | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 034 Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 1 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,757 |
| 035 Eagle Harbor Apartments Phase 2 | 2011 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,837 |
| 039 Forest Pine Apartments | 1992 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$863 |
| 047 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 051 Jefferson Manor Apartments | 1945 | 1985 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 060 Meadowridge Apartments | 1991 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,154 |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 067 Nest (The) on 17 | 2017 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,969 |
| 072 Noah At Beamon's Mill | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,573 |
| 078 Patriots Landing Apartments | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,300 |
| 084 Sadler Pond Apartments | 1989 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,130 |
| 090 Suffolk Station Apartments | 1987 | 2015 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,125 |
| 096 Terrace (The) | 1985 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$900 |
| 105 Williamtown Commons Apartments | 1990 | 2014 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$750 |



## Rent Adjustments

Our analysis included a property management survey and a technique known as "statistical extraction" to help us identify the best adjustments to use. Statistical extraction, which is similar to the matched pair method, helped us derive the optimal adjustments for our particular data set.

Here's a hypothetical example to illustrate how we derived our rent adjustments. Assume that property managers tell us we should expect rent adjustments ranging from $\$ 0.00$ to $\$ 0.50$ per square foot for a particular market. Next, assume that we select 25 rent comparables with an adjusted sample standard deviation (a statistical measure of variability) of $\$ 100$. We employ a square foot rent adjustment of $\$ 0.10$ for each comparable resulting in an adjusted sample standard deviation of $\$ 90$. This tells us that the assumed adjustment "explained" some of the variability in the data. We repeat this process for adjustments of $\$ 0.20, \$ 0.30, \$ 0.40$ and $\$ 0.50$ which yielded adjusted sample standard deviations of $\$ 80, \$ 70, \$ 65$ and $\$ 75$, respectively. The $\$ 0.40$ square foot adjustment "explains" the most variability because any other adjustment yields a higher adjusted sample standard deviation. Consequently, a $\$ 0.40$ rent adjustment is the best adjustment for purposes of this example. This is a simplified example because we actually adjusted for numerous variables simultaneously in our analysis.

Many adjustments (bedroom count, bathroom count and square footage) are highly interrelated. Statistical extraction helped us unravel the interrelationships between these variables. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is superior a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior a "minus" adjustment is made.

We used the Excel Solver function to help us with our analysis. The Solver function was programmed to minimize the adjusted standard deviation for our data set. We evaluated a total of 62 variables in 22 categories (AC systems, heating systems, technology, bedrooms, bathrooms, square feet, visibility, access, neighborhood, area amenities, condition, effective age, project amenities, elevator, unit amenities, storage, kitchen amenities, parking, laundry, security, on-site management, on-site maintenance) in an effort to identify the mix of adjustments that explained the most variability found in our raw data.

A discussion of our surveyed and concluded adjustments is found below.

## Concessions

The first step in our analysis was to account for any concessions at the subject and the comparables. We considered the advertised street rent and concessions being offered and derived a net nent estimate for each comparable. Net rent, defined as advertised street rent minus monthly concessions, represents the cash rent paid by new residents at the various properties. This is the best measure of market value (prior to any other adjustments) for the comparables included in this analysis.

## Tenant-Paid Utilities

The next step in our analysis was to account for differences in tenant-paid utilities between the comparable properties and the subject. We used the HUD Utility Schedule Model to derive our adjustments. The HUD model includes a current utility rate survey for the area. In the event that the tenant-paid utilities associated with a particular property are higher or lower than the subject, adjustments were made to account for the differences. Adjustments reflect the difference between the tenant-paid utilities for the comparable property minus that for the subject.

## Technology

We accounted for technology (cable and internet access) offered in the rent for each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per month for cable; internet access was valued at $\$ 0$.

| Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Cable | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Internet | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Bedrooms

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the number of bedrooms at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 110$ per bedroom.

| Bedrooms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Bedrooms | $\$ 50 \quad \$ 200$ | Concluded |  |

## Bathrooms

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the number of bathrooms at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 25$ per bathroom.

| Bathrooms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Bathrooms | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 25$ |

## Square Feet

Our analysis also included an adjustment for square footage at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.10$ per square foot.

| Square Feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Square Feet | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 0.10$ |

## Visibility

We also accounted for differences in visibility at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property in our analysis. Based on our field review, we assigned a visibility rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in visibility ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Visibility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Rating | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 100$ | Concluded |

## Access

Our analysis also included an adjustment for access at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Based on our field review, we assigned an access rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in access ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Access |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Rating | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 100$ | Concluded |

## Neighborhood

We considered differences in neighborhood at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property in our analysis. Based on our field review and our evaluation of local demographic and crime data (presented earlier in this report), we assigned a neighborhood rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in neighborhood ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 100$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Area Amenities

We also accounted for area amenities for each of the comparables as compared to the subject property in our analysis. Based on our field review and our evaluation of local amenity data (presented earlier in this report), we assigned a local amenity rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in amenity ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Area Amenities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 100$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Median Household Income

Our analysis also included an adjustment for median household income for the area in which each of the comparables is located as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.0000$ per dollar of median household income.

| Median Household Income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Med HH Inc | $\$ 0.0000 \quad \$ 0.0000$ | $\$ 0.0000$ |

## Average Commute

Our analysis also included an adjustment for average commute for the area in which each of the comparables is located as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.00$ per each minute of commute.

| Average Commute |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Avg Commute | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Public Transportation

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the existence of public transportation within walking distance of each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.00$ for publc transportation.

| Public Transportation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Public Trans | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Personal Crime

Our analysis also included an adjustment for personal crime rates for the area in which each of the comparables is located as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per 0.01 percentage points.

| Personal Crime |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Personal Crime | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Condition

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the condition of each comparable as compared to the subject property. Based on our field review, we assigned a condition rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 25$ per point for differences in condition ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Condition |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Rating | $\$ 10 \quad \$ 50$ | $\$ 25$ |  |

## Effective Age

We considered differences in effective age in our analysis. Based on our field review, we estimated the effective age for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our estimates reflected the condition-adjusted age and remaining useful life of each property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 5.00$ per year for differences in effective age between the subject and the comparables.

| Effective Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Rating | $\$ 1.00 \quad \$ 5.00$ | $\$ 5.00$ |  |

## Project Amenities

We considered the presence of various project amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Project amenities include ball fields, BBQ areas, billiards, business/computer centers, car care centers, community centers, elevators, fitness centers, gazebos, hot tubs/Jacuzzis, horseshoe pits, lakes, libraries, movie theatres, picnic areas, playgrounds, pools, saunas, sports courts and walking trails. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Project Amenities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Ball Field | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| BBQ Area | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Billiards | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Bus/Comp Ctrs | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Car Care Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Elevator | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Fitness Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Gazebo | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Horseshoe Pit | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Lake | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Library | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Movie Theatre | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Picnic Area | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Playground | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Pool | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Sauna | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Sports Court | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Walking Trail | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

## Unit Amenities

We considered the presence of various unit amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Unit amenities include blinds, ceiling fans, carpeting/upgraded flooring, fireplaces, patios/balconies and storage. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Unit Amenities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Blinds | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | Concluded |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Carpeting | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Fireplace | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Patio/Balcony | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Storage | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 10$ |

## Kitchen Amenities

We considered the presence of various kitchen amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Kitchen amenities include stoves, refrigerators, disposals, dishwashers and microwaves. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Stove | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Refrigerator | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Disposal | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Microwave | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

## Parking

We also adjusted for differing types of parking configurations. We classified parking five ways: (1) Garage, (2) Covered; (3) Assigned, (4) Open and (5) No parking offered. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of \$50 per month for garages; covered parking was valued at $\$ 20$; assigned parking was valued at $\$ 10$; open parking was valued at $\$ 0$; no parking was valued at $\$ 0$.

| Parking |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Garage | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 200$ | Concluded |
| Covered | $\$ 20$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 20$ |
| Assigned | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Open | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| None | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Laundry

We also evaluated differing types of laundry configurations. We classified laundry amenities three ways: (1) Central Laundry, (2) Washer/Dryer Units; and (3) Washer/Dryer Hookups. Our analysis resulted in an adjustment of \$15 per month for central laundries; washer/dryer units were valued at $\$ 10$; washer/dryer hookups were valued at $\$ 5$.

| Laundry |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Central | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 15$ |
| W/D Units | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 10$ |
| W/D Hookups | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 5$ |

## Security

We considered the presence of various security amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Security amenities include call buttons, controlled access, courtesy officers, monitoring, security alarms and security patrols. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Security |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Call Buttons | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | Concluded |
| Controlled Access | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Courtesy Officer | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Monitoring | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Security Alarms | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Security Patrols | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

Rent Conclusion, 1BR-1BA-550sf
The development of our rent conclusion for the 1BR-1BA-550sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 18 unit types found at 6 properties. We selected the 18 most comparable units to utilize as rent comparables for purposes of this analysis. A write-up for each of the properties included in this analysis is found in the Appendix.

Our analysis included the adjustments developed in the previous section. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is better, a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior, a "minus" adjustment is made. In the table below, we summarize the adjustments and the resulting indicated rent for the top 18 comparables included in this analysis. The units that we consider most comparable are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparable |  | Unadjusted Rent |  |  | Adjusted Rent |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\stackrel{1}{\lambda}}{\stackrel{1}{5}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & .0 .0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-04 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1BR-1BA-550sf | \$601 | \$0 | \$601 | - | \$0 | \$601 | - |
| 001-01 Autumn Ridge 1 | 1BR-1BA-556sf | \$950 | \$0 | \$950 | \$80 | -\$44 | \$906 | 1 |
| 001-02 Autumn Ridge 1 | 2BR-1BA-731sf | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$1,200 | \$184 | -\$148 | \$1,052 | 7 |
| 001-03 Autumn Ridge 1 | 3BR-1BA-990sf | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$351 | -\$239 | \$1,161 | 15 |
| 047-01 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 1BR-1BA-702sf | \$1,025 | \$0 | \$1,025 | \$136 | -\$112 | \$913 | 3 |
| 047-02 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 1BR-1BA-864sf | \$1,050 | \$0 | \$1,050 | \$152 | -\$128 | \$922 | 5 |
| 047-03 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2BR-1BA-902sf | \$1,130 | \$0 | \$1,130 | \$243 | -\$219 | \$911 | 9 |
| 047-04 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2BR-2BA-924sf | \$1,155 | \$0 | \$1,155 | \$270 | -\$246 | \$909 | 12 |
| 060-01 Meadowridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-765sf | \$1,050 | \$21 | \$1,029 | \$128 | -\$50 | \$980 | 2 |
| 060-02 Meadowridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-940sf | \$1,030 | \$21 | \$1,009 | \$145 | -\$67 | \$942 | 4 |
| 060-03 Meadowridge Apartments | 2BR-1BA-890sf | \$1,030 | \$21 | \$1,009 | \$227 | -\$149 | \$860 | 8 |
| 060-04 Meadowridge Apartments | 2BR-2BA-940sf | \$1,175 | \$21 | \$1,154 | \$257 | -\$179 | \$975 | 11 |
| 060-05 Meadowridge Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1090sf | \$1,175 | \$21 | \$1,154 | \$413 | -\$259 | \$895 | 17 |
| 063-01 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1BR-1BA-650sf | \$889 | \$0 | \$889 | \$175 | -\$101 | \$788 | 6 |
| 063-02 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 2BR-2BA-898sf | \$1,159 | \$0 | \$1,159 | \$320 | -\$246 | \$913 | 14 |
| 084-01 Sadler Pond Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,055 | \$0 | \$1,055 | \$318 | -\$144 | \$911 | 13 |
| 084-02 Sadler Pond Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1100sf | \$1,130 | \$0 | \$1,130 | \$469 | -\$219 | \$911 | 18 |
| 090-01 Suffolk Station Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,035 | \$0 | \$1,035 | \$249 | -\$201 | \$834 | 10 |
| 090-02 Suffolk Station Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1100sf | \$1,125 | \$0 | \$1,125 | \$400 | -\$276 | \$849 | 16 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 788$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 1,161$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 924$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 918$ |

Rent, Concluded \$880

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 880$ for the 1BR-1BA-550sf units at the subject property.

In our opinion, the 1BR-1BA-556sf units at Autumn Ridge 1 (Property \# 001), the 1BR-1BA-765sf units at Meadowridge Apartments (Property \# 060), the 1BR-1BA-702sf units at Hillpoint Woods Apartments (Property \# 047), the 1BR-1BA-650sf units at Morris Creek Landing Apartments (Property \# 063), and the 2BR-2BA-1000sf units at Suffolk Station Apartments (Property \# 090) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table below we derive our "as is" rent conclusion using the "as renovated" rent conclusion developed above:

| Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Conc <br> Adj | As <br> Ren | As <br> Is | $\$$ <br> Adj |
| Tenant Paid Utilities | 0 | $\$ 138$ | $\$ 99$ | $\$ 39$ |
| Effective Age | $\$ 5.00$ | 2012 | 1995 | $-\$ 85$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Adjustments |  | $-\$ 52$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\$ 736$ |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Minimum |  | $\$ 1,109$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum |  | $\$ 872$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Average |  | $\$ 866$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average |  | $\$ 830$ |  |  |

Our analysis suggests an "as is" rent of $\$ 830$ for the 1BR-1BA-550sf units at the subject property.


Rent Conclusion, 2BR-1BA-724sf
The development of our rent conclusion for the 2BR-1BA-724sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 18 unit types found at 6 properties. We selected the 18 most comparable units to utilize as rent comparables for purposes of this analysis. A write-up for each of the properties included in this analysis is found in the Appendix.

Our analysis included the adjustments developed in the previous section. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is better, a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior, a "minus" adjustment is made. In the table below, we summarize the adjustments and the resulting indicated rent for the top 18 comparables included in this analysis. The units that we consider most comparable are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparable |  | Unadjusted Rent |  |  | Adjusted Rent |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \text { No } \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-08 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 2BR-1BA-724sf | \$649 | \$0 | \$649 | - | \$0 | \$649 | - |
| 001-01 Autumn Ridge 1 | 1BR-1BA-556sf | \$950 | \$0 | \$950 | \$235 | \$55 | \$1,005 | 10 |
| 001-02 Autumn Ridge 1 | 2BR-1BA-731sf | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$1,200 | \$86 | -\$50 | \$1,150 | 1 |
| 001-03 Autumn Ridge 1 | 3BR-1BA-990sf | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$195 | -\$141 | \$1,259 | 7 |
| 047-01 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 1BR-1BA-702sf | \$1,025 | \$0 | \$1,025 | \$262 | -\$14 | \$1,011 | 14 |
| 047-02 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 1BR-1BA-864sf | \$1,050 | \$0 | \$1,050 | \$274 | -\$30 | \$1,020 | 16 |
| 047-03 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2BR-1BA-902sf | \$1,130 | \$0 | \$1,130 | \$145 | -\$121 | \$1,009 | 3 |
| 047-04 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2BR-2BA-924sf | \$1,155 | \$0 | \$1,155 | \$172 | -\$148 | \$1,007 | 6 |
| 060-01 Meadowridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-765sf | \$1,050 | \$21 | \$1,029 | \$249 | \$49 | \$1,078 | 12 |
| 060-02 Meadowridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-940sf | \$1,030 | \$21 | \$1,009 | \$267 | \$31 | \$1,040 | 15 |
| 060-03 Meadowridge Apartments | 2BR-1BA-890sf | \$1,030 | \$21 | \$1,009 | \$129 | -\$51 | \$958 | 2 |
| 060-04 Meadowridge Apartments | 2BR-2BA-940sf | \$1,175 | \$21 | \$1,154 | \$159 | -\$81 | \$1,073 | 5 |
| 060-05 Meadowridge Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1090sf | \$1,175 | \$21 | \$1,154 | \$257 | -\$161 | \$993 | 13 |
| 063-01 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1BR-1BA-650sf | \$889 | \$0 | \$889 | \$312 | -\$3 | \$886 | 17 |
| 063-02 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 2BR-2BA-898sf | \$1,159 | \$0 | \$1,159 | \$222 | -\$148 | \$1,011 | 9 |
| 084-01 Sadler Pond Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,055 | \$0 | \$1,055 | \$219 | -\$45 | \$1,010 | 8 |
| 084-02 Sadler Pond Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1100sf | \$1,130 | \$0 | \$1,130 | \$312 | -\$120 | \$1,010 | 18 |
| 090-01 Suffolk Station Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,035 | \$0 | \$1,035 | \$150 | -\$102 | \$933 | 4 |
| 090-02 Suffolk Station Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1100sf | \$1,125 | \$0 | \$1,125 | \$243 | -\$177 | \$948 | 11 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 886$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 1,259$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 1,022$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 1,016$ |

Rent, Concluded
\$1,015

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 1,015$ for the 2BR-1BA-724sf units at the subject property.

In our opinion, the 2BR-1BA-731sf units at Autumn Ridge 1 (Property \# 001), the 2BR-1BA-890sf units at Meadowridge Apartments (Property \# 060), the 2BR-1BA-902sf units at Hillpoint Woods Apartments (Property \# 047), the 2BR-2BA-1000sf units at Suffolk Station Apartments (Property \# 090), and the 2BR-2BA-1000sf units at Sadler Pond Apartments (Property \# 084) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table below we derive our "as is" rent conclusion using the "as renovated" rent conclusion developed above:

| Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Conc <br> Adj | As <br> Ren | As <br> Is | $\$$ <br> Adj |
| Tenant Paid Utilities | 0 | $\$ 167$ | $\$ 127$ | $\$ 40$ |
| Effective Age | $\$ 5.00$ | 2012 | 1995 | $-\$ 85$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Adjustments |  | $-\$ 51$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\$ 835$ |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Minimum |  | $\$ 1,208$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum |  | $\$ 971$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Average |  | $\$ 965$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average |  | $\$ 965$ |  |  |

Our analysis suggests an "as is" rent of $\$ 965$ for the 2BR-1BA-724sf units at the subject property.


## Rent Conclusion, 3BR-1BA-967sf

The development of our rent conclusion for the 3BR-1BA-967sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 18 unit types found at 6 properties. We selected the 18 most comparable units to utilize as rent comparables for purposes of this analysis. A write-up for each of the properties included in this analysis is found in the Appendix.

Our analysis included the adjustments developed in the previous section. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is better, a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior, a "minus" adjustment is made. In the table below, we summarize the adjustments and the resulting indicated rent for the top 18 comparables included in this analysis. The units that we consider most comparable are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparable |  | Unadjusted Rent |  |  | Adjusted Rent |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & .0 \\ & \vdots 00 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-11 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 3BR-1BA-967sf | \$754 | \$0 | \$754 | - | \$0 | \$754 |  |
| 001-01 Autumn Ridge 1 | 1BR-1BA-556sf | \$950 | \$0 | \$950 | \$426 | \$132 | \$1,082 | 14 |
| 001-02 Autumn Ridge 1 | 2BR-1BA-731sf | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$1,200 | \$276 | \$27 | \$1,227 | 5 |
| 001-03 Autumn Ridge 1 | 3BR-1BA-990sf | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$100 | -\$64 | \$1,336 | 1 |
| 047-01 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 1BR-1BA-702sf | \$1,025 | \$0 | \$1,025 | \$454 | \$64 | \$1,089 | 17 |
| 047-02 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 1BR-1BA-864sf | \$1,050 | \$0 | \$1,050 | \$437 | \$47 | \$1,097 | 16 |
| 047-03 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2BR-1BA-902sf | \$1,130 | \$0 | \$1,130 | \$301 | -\$44 | \$1,087 | 8 |
| 047-04 Hillpoint Woods Apartments | 2BR-2BA-924sf | \$1,155 | \$0 | \$1,155 | \$323 | -\$71 | \$1,084 | 10 |
| 060-01 Meadowridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-765sf | \$1,050 | \$21 | \$1,029 | \$432 | \$126 | \$1,155 | 15 |
| 060-02 Meadowridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-940sf | \$1,030 | \$21 | \$1,009 | \$415 | \$109 | \$1,118 | 13 |
| 060-03 Meadowridge Apartments | 2BR-1BA-890sf | \$1,030 | \$21 | \$1,009 | \$287 | \$27 | \$1,036 | 6 |
| 060-04 Meadowridge Apartments | 2BR-2BA-940sf | \$1,175 | \$21 | \$1,154 | \$307 | -\$3 | \$1,151 | 9 |
| 060-05 Meadowridge Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1090sf | \$1,175 | \$21 | \$1,154 | \$161 | -\$83 | \$1,071 | 3 |
| 063-01 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1BR-1BA-650sf | \$889 | \$0 | \$889 | \$503 | \$74 | \$963 | 18 |
| 063-02 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 2BR-2BA-898sf | \$1,159 | \$0 | \$1,159 | \$378 | -\$70 | \$1,089 | 12 |
| 084-01 Sadler Pond Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,055 | \$0 | \$1,055 | \$362 | \$32 | \$1,087 | 11 |
| 084-02 Sadler Pond Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1100sf | \$1,130 | \$0 | \$1,130 | \$217 | -\$43 | \$1,087 | 4 |
| 090-01 Suffolk Station Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,035 | \$0 | \$1,035 | \$293 | -\$25 | \$1,010 | 7 |
| 090-02 Suffolk Station Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1100sf | \$1,125 | \$0 | \$1,125 | \$148 | -\$100 | \$1,025 | 2 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 963$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 1,336$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 1,100$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 1,093$ |
|  |  |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 1,120$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 1,120$ for the 3BR-1BA-967sf units at the subject property.

In our opinion, the 3BR-1BA-990sf units at Autumn Ridge 1 (Property \# 001), the 3BR-2BA-1100sf units at Suffolk Station Apartments (Property \# 090), the 3BR-2BA-1090sf units at Meadowridge Apartments (Property \# 060), the 3BR-2BA-1100sf units at Sadler Pond Apartments (Property \# 084), and the 2BR-1BA-902sf units at Hillpoint Woods Apartments (Property \# 047) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table below we derive our "as is" rent conclusion using the "as renovated" rent conclusion developed above:

| Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Conc <br> Adj | As <br> Ren | As <br> Is | $\$$ <br> Adj |
| Tenant Paid Utilities | 0 | $\$ 224$ | $\$ 173$ | $\$ 51$ |
| Effective Age | $\$ 5.00$ | 2012 | 1995 | $-\$ 85$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Adjustments |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $-\$ 40$ |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum |  | $\$ 923$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Average |  | $\$ 1,296$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average |  | $\$ 1,060$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Rent, Concluded, As Is |  |  |  |  |

Our analysis suggests an "as is" rent of $\$ 1,080$ for the 3BR-1BA-967sf units at the subject property.


## Unrestricted Market Rent Conclusion

Based on our evaluation of the rents at the select comparable properties, and considering the location, quality and amenities of the subject property, we conclude the following market rents for the subject property units, assuming that the subject were an unrestricted property:

| Unrestricted Market Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Market | Proposed | Advantage |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$988 | \$651 | 34.1\% |

Our analysis suggests an average unrestricted market rent of $\$ 988$ for the subject property. This is compared with an average proposed rent of $\$ 651$, yielding an unrestricted market rent advantage of 34.1 percent. Overall, the subject property appears to be priced at or below unrestricted market rents for the area.

We selected a total of 6 properties as comparables for purposes of our analysis. The average occupancy at the select rent comparables currently stands at 98 percent.

Occupancy rates for the selected rent comparables are broken out below:

| Occupancy Rate, Select Comparables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subsidized | 20\% of AMI | 30\% of AMI | $40 \%$ of AMI | 50\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | 80\% of AMI | Market |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| 2-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 98\% |
| 3-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 96\% |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 98\% |

Occupancy rates for all stabilized market area properties are broken out below:

| Occupancy Rate, Stabilized Properties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subsidized | 20\% of AMI | $30 \%$ of AMI | 40\% of AMI | 50\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | 80\% of AMI | Market |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | 97\% |  |  | 94\% | 93\% |  |  | 100\% |
| 2-Bedroom | 95\% |  | 100\% | 96\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% |
| 3-Bedroom | 84\% |  |  | 100\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 95\% |  | 100\% | 96\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% |

HUD conducts an annual rent survey to derive Fair Market Rent estimates for an area. Based on this, 2bedroom rents for the area grew from $\$ 930$ to $\$ 1163$ since 2010. This represents an average $2.3 \%$ annual increase over this period.

Fair market rent data for the area is found below:

| HUD Fair Market Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rent |  |  | Change |  |
| Year | 1 BR | 2 BR | $3 B R$ | 1 BR | $2 B R$ | - |
| 2008 | $\$ 779$ | $\$ 870$ | $\$ 1,161$ | - | - | - |
| 2009 | $\$ 828$ | $\$ 925$ | $\$ 1,234$ | $6.3 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 832$ | $\$ 930$ | $\$ 1,241$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 857$ | $\$ 958$ | $\$ 1,278$ | $3.0 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 786$ | $\$ 878$ | $\$ 1,171$ | $-8.3 \%$ | $-8.4 \%$ | $-8.4 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 826$ | $\$ 979$ | $\$ 1,287$ | $5.1 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 830$ | $\$ 984$ | $\$ 1,294$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 838$ | $\$ 993$ | $\$ 1,306$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 835$ | $\$ 966$ | $\$ 1,276$ | $-0.4 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ | $-2.3 \%$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 871$ | $\$ 1,005$ | $\$ 1,332$ | $4.3 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 907$ | $\$ 1,042$ | $\$ 1,386$ | $4.1 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 932$ | $\$ 1,067$ | $\$ 1,421$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 932$ | $\$ 1,061$ | $\$ 1,410$ |  | $-0.6 \%$ | $-0.8 \%$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 1,020$ | $\$ 1,163$ | $\$ 1,538$ | $9.4 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |

Source: HUD
Unrestricted Market Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table found below we summarize the market rents for the subject property units on an "as is" basis, assuming that the subject were an unrestricted property:

| Unrestricted Market Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Market | Proposed | Advantage |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$830 | \$601 | 27.6\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 8 | \$830 | \$601 | 27.6\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$830 | \$601 | 27.6\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$830 | \$601 | 27.6\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 5 | \$965 | \$649 | 32.7\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 13 | \$965 | \$649 | 32.7\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 1 | \$965 | \$649 | 32.7\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$965 | \$649 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,080 | \$754 | 30.2\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,080 | \$754 | 30.2\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$1,080 | \$754 | 30.2\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$939 | \$651 | 30.7\% |

## Restricted Rent Analysis

In this section we develop a restricted market rent conclusion and an achievable rent conclusion for the subject property units. Our analysis began by selecting comparable rentals to use to develop estimates of market rents for the units at the subject property, assuming that the subject was a restricted property. Our selection of comparables was based on location, age, condition, unit mix and amenities of the comparable properties relative to the subject property.

## Rental Property Inventory, by Unit Type

In the following pages we present an inventory of properties included in this analysis. Rents for these properties, broken out by unit type, were used in selecting the rent comparables used in this analysis.

The properties that we consider to be comparable to the subject property are highlighted in the tables found in the following pages. We attempted to select stabilized restricted rent properties as comparables for purposes of our rent comparability analysis.

Comparables with market rents are used when a sufficient number of restricted rent comparables are not available and when maximum allowable rents for properties with restricted rents exceed prevailing rents in the area. In the event that program rental rates exceed market rental rates, restricted units are, in fact, de facto market rate units.

## Rent Comparables, Restricted Rent, Map

A map showing the location of the properties selected as comparables in this analysis is found in the following pages. Properties identified with red pushpins have market rents, properties identified with yellow pushpins have restricted rents, and properties identified with blue pushpins have subsidized rents. Detailed write-ups for the select rent comparables are found in the Appendix to this report.

## Rent Comparability Grids

Our analysis employed the use of rent comparability grids and resulted in a restricted market rent estimate for each of the subject's unit types. These grids and a narrative describing our rent adjustments are found in the following pages.

Rental Property Inventory, 1-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 002 Autumn Ridge 2-LC1 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 003 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 009 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$601 |  |  | \$601 | \$601 |  |  |  |
| 010 Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$577 |  |  | \$577 |  |  |  |  |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 017 Cedar Street Apartments | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 022 Chuckatuck Village Apartments | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$707 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 023 Church Manor Apartments | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$659 |  |  |  |  |
| 040 Franklin South | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$569 |  |  |  | \$664 |  |  |  |
| 049 Holland Trace Senior Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$500 | \$550 |  |  |  |
| 053 King's Landing Apartments | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$865 |  |  |  |
| 055 Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 2 | 1993 | 2012 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | \$619 |  |  | \$619 |  |  |  |  |
| 070 New Surry Village | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$529 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 071 Newport Village | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$525 |  |  | \$525 |  |  |  |  |
| 075 October Station Apartments | 2016 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 083 Residences at October (The) | 2013 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 092 Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$557 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 099 Villas at Reid Landing (The) | 2020 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | \$898 |  |  | \$701 | \$809 |  |  |  |
| 101 Waverly Village Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$621 |  |  |  | \$621 |  |  |  |
| 107 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$596 |  |  | \$596 |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$682 |  |  |  | \$682 |  |  |  |

Source: Allen \& Associates

Rental Property Inventory, 2-Bedroom Units

|  | Overview |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 002 Autumn Ridge 2-LC1 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$846 | \$1,036 |  |  |  |
| 003 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$846 | \$1,036 |  |  |  |
| 009 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$649 |  |  | \$649 | \$649 |  |  |  |
| 010 Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$628 |  |  | \$721 |  |  |  |  |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,038 |  |  |  |
| 017 Cedar Street Apartments | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$693 |  |  | \$886 |  |  |  |  |
| 022 Chuckatuck Village Apartments | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$752 |  |  | \$882 |  |  |  |  |
| 023 Church Manor Apartments | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  | \$624 | \$775 |  |  |  |  |
| 040 Franklin South | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$609 |  |  |  | \$662 |  |  |  |
| 049 Holland Trace Senior Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$550 | \$650 |  |  |  |
| 053 King's Landing Apartments | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,005 |  |  |  |
| 055 Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 2 | 1993 | 2012 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 070 New Surry Village | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$587 |  |  | \$587 |  |  |  |  |
| 071 Newport Village | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$584 |  |  | \$759 |  |  |  |  |
| 075 October Station Apartments | 2016 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$799 |  |  | \$799 | \$950 |  |  |  |
| 083 Residences at October (The) | 2013 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$768 |  |  |  |  |
| 092 Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$630 |  |  | \$630 |  |  |  |  |
| 099 Villas at Reid Landing (The) | 2020 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | \$1,063 |  |  | \$834 | \$960 |  |  |  |
| 101 Waverly Village Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$667 |  |  |  | \$859 |  |  |  |
| 107 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$645 |  |  | \$850 |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$722 |  |  |  | \$878 |  |  |  |

[^0]Rental Property Inventory, 3-Bedroom Units

|  | Overview |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 002 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC1 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$977 | \$1,197 |  |  |  |
| 003 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 1998 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$977 | \$1,197 |  |  |  |
| 009 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$754 |  |  |  | \$754 |  |  |  |
| 010 Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,194 |  |  |  |
| 017 Cedar Street Apartments | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 022 Chuckatuck Village Apartments | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 023 Church Manor Apartments | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$845 |  |  |  |  |
| 040 Franklin South | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 049 Holland Trace Senior Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 053 King's Landing Apartments | 1992 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 055 Lebanon Village Apartments Phase 2 | 1993 | 2012 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 070 New Surry Village | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 071 Newport Village | 1990 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 075 October Station Apartments | 2016 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,040 |  |  |  |
| 083 Residences at October (The) | 2013 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$909 |  |  |  |  |
| 092 Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 099 Villas at Reid Landing (The) | 2020 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Waverly Village Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 107 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$762 |  |  |  | \$762 |  |  |  |

Source: Allen \& Associates


## Rent Adjustments

Our analysis included a property management survey and a technique known as "statistical extraction" to help us identify the best adjustments to use. Statistical extraction, which is similar to the matched pair method, helped us derive the optimal adjustments for our particular data set.

Here's a hypothetical example to illustrate how we derived our rent adjustments. Assume that property managers tell us we should expect rent adjustments ranging from $\$ 0.00$ to $\$ 0.50$ per square foot for a particular market. Next, assume that we select 25 rent comparables with an adjusted sample standard deviation (a statistical measure of variability) of $\$ 100$. We employ a square foot rent adjustment of $\$ 0.10$ for each comparable resulting in an adjusted sample standard deviation of $\$ 90$. This tells us that the assumed adjustment "explained" some of the variability in the data. We repeat this process for adjustments of $\$ 0.20, \$ 0.30, \$ 0.40$ and $\$ 0.50$ which yielded adjusted sample standard deviations of $\$ 80, \$ 70, \$ 65$ and $\$ 75$, respectively. The $\$ 0.40$ square foot adjustment "explains" the most variability because any other adjustment yields a higher adjusted sample standard deviation. Consequently, a $\$ 0.40$ rent adjustment is the best adjustment for purposes of this example. This is a simplified example because we actually adjusted for numerous variables simultaneously in our analysis.

Many adjustments (bedroom count, bathroom count and square footage) are highly interrelated. Statistical extraction helped us unravel the interrelationships between these variables. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is superior a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior a "minus" adjustment is made.

We used the Excel Solver function to help us with our analysis. The Solver function was programmed to minimize the adjusted standard deviation for our data set. We evaluated a total of 62 variables in 22 categories (AC systems, heating systems, technology, bedrooms, bathrooms, square feet, visibility, access, neighborhood, area amenities, condition, effective age, project amenities, elevator, unit amenities, storage, kitchen amenities, parking, laundry, security, on-site management, on-site maintenance) in an effort to identify the mix of adjustments that explained the most variability found in our raw data.

A discussion of our surveyed and concluded adjustments is found below.

## Concessions

The first step in our analysis was to account for any concessions at the subject and the comparables. We considered the advertised street rent and concessions being offered and derived a net nent estimate for each comparable. Net rent, defined as advertised street rent minus monthly concessions, represents the cash rent paid by new residents at the various properties. This is the best measure of market value (prior to any other adjustments) for the comparables included in this analysis.

## Tenant-Paid Utilities

The next step in our analysis was to account for differences in tenant-paid utilities between the comparable properties and the subject. We used the HUD Utility Schedule Model to derive our adjustments. The HUD model includes a current utility rate survey for the area. In the event that the tenant-paid utilities associated with a particular property are higher or lower than the subject, adjustments were made to account for the differences. Adjustments reflect the difference between the tenant-paid utilities for the comparable property minus that for the subject.

## Technology

We accounted for technology (cable and internet access) offered in the rent for each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per month for cable; internet access was valued at $\$ 0$.

| Technology |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Cable | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Internet | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Bedrooms

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the number of bedrooms at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 120$ per bedroom.

| Bedrooms |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Bedrooms | $\$ 50 \quad \$ 200$ | $\$ 120$ |

## Bathrooms

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the number of bathrooms at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 50$ per bathroom.

| Bathrooms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Bathrooms | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 50$ |

## Square Feet

Our analysis also included an adjustment for square footage at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.10$ per square foot.

| Square Feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Square Feet | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 0.10$ |

## Visibility

We also accounted for differences in visibility at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property in our analysis. Based on our field review, we assigned a visibility rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in visibility ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Visibility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Rating | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 100$ | Concluded |

## Access

Our analysis also included an adjustment for access at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Based on our field review, we assigned an access rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in access ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Access |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Rating | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 100$ | Concluded |

## Neighborhood

We considered differences in neighborhood at each of the comparables as compared to the subject property in our analysis. Based on our field review and our evaluation of local demographic and crime data (presented earlier in this report), we assigned a neighborhood rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per point for differences in neighborhood ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Neighborhood |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Area Amenities

We also accounted for area amenities for each of the comparables as compared to the subject property in our analysis. Based on our field review and our evaluation of local amenity data (presented earlier in this report), we assigned a local amenity rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 80$ per point for differences in amenity ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Area Amenities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 100$ | $\$ 80$ |

## Median Household Income

Our analysis also included an adjustment for median household income for the area in which each of the comparables is located as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.0000$ per dollar of median household income.

| Median Household Income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Med HH Inc | $\$ 0.0000 \quad \$ 0.0000$ | $\$ 0.0000$ |

## Average Commute

Our analysis also included an adjustment for average commute for the area in which each of the comparables is located as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.00$ per each minute of commute.

| Average Commute |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Avg Commute | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Public Transportation

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the existence of public transportation within walking distance of each of the comparables as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0.00$ for publc transportation.

| Public Transportation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Public Trans | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Personal Crime

Our analysis also included an adjustment for personal crime rates for the area in which each of the comparables is located as compared to the subject property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 0$ per 0.01 percentage points.

| Personal Crime |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Personal Crime | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Condition

Our analysis also included an adjustment for the condition of each comparable as compared to the subject property. Based on our field review, we assigned a condition rating for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our ratings ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 10$ per point for differences in condition ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Condition |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 10 \quad \$ 50$ | $\$ 10$ |  |

## Effective Age

We considered differences in effective age in our analysis. Based on our field review, we estimated the effective age for each of the properties included in this analysis. Our estimates reflected the condition-adjusted age and remaining useful life of each property. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 1.00$ per year for differences in effective age between the subject and the comparables.

| Effective Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Rating | $\$ 1.00 \quad \$ 5.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ |  |

## Project Amenities

We considered the presence of various project amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Project amenities include ball fields, BBQ areas, billiards, business/computer centers, car care centers, community centers, elevators, fitness centers, gazebos, hot tubs/Jacuzzis, horseshoe pits, lakes, libraries, movie theatres, picnic areas, playgrounds, pools, saunas, sports courts and walking trails. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Project Amenities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Ball Field | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| BBQ Area | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Billiards | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Bus/Comp Ctrs | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Car Care Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Elevator | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Fitness Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Gazebo | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Horseshoe Pit | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Lake | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Library | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Movie Theatre | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Pienic Area | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Playground | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Pool | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Sauna | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Sports Court | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Walking Trail | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

## Unit Amenities

We considered the presence of various unit amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Unit amenities include blinds, ceiling fans, carpeting/upgraded flooring, fireplaces, patios/balconies and storage. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Unit Amenities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Blinds | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | Concluded |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Carpeting | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Fireplace | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Patio/Balcony | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Storage | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 10$ |

## Kitchen Amenities

We considered the presence of various kitchen amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Kitchen amenities include stoves, refrigerators, disposals, dishwashers and microwaves. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Stove | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Refrigerator | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Disposal | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Microwave | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

## Parking

We also adjusted for differing types of parking configurations. We classified parking five ways: (1) Garage, (2) Covered; (3) Assigned, (4) Open and (5) No parking offered. Statistical extraction resulted in an adjustment of \$50 per month for garages; covered parking was valued at $\$ 20$; assigned parking was valued at $\$ 10$; open parking was valued at $\$ 0$; no parking was valued at $\$ 0$.

| Parking |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Garage | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 200$ | Concluded |
| Covered | $\$ 20$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 20$ |
| Assigned | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Open | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| None | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Laundry

We also evaluated differing types of laundry configurations. We classified laundry amenities three ways: (1) Central Laundry, (2) Washer/Dryer Units; and (3) Washer/Dryer Hookups. Our analysis resulted in an adjustment of $\$ 5$ per month for central laundries; washer/dryer units were valued at $\$ 10$; washer/dryer hookups were valued at $\$ 25$.

| Laundry |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Central | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ | Concluded |
| W/D Units | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 5$ |
| W/D Hookups | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 25$ |

## Security

We considered the presence of various security amenities at the comparables as compared to the subject property. Security amenities include call buttons, controlled access, courtesy officers, monitoring, security alarms and security patrols. The survey range and our concluded adjustment for each amenity is summarized below.

| Security |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Call Buttons | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Controlled Access | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Courtesy Officer | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Monitoring | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Security Alarms | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Security Patrols | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

## Rent Conclusion, 1BR-1BA-550sf

The development of our rent conclusion for the 1BR-1BA-550sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 11 unit types found at 5 properties. We selected the 11 most comparable units to utilize as rent comparables for purposes of this analysis. A write-up for each of the properties included in this analysis is found in the Appendix.

Our analysis included the adjustments developed in the previous section. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is better, a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior, a "minus" adjustment is made. In the table below, we summarize the adjustments and the resulting indicated rent for the top 11 comparables included in this analysis. The units that we consider most comparable are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparable |  | Unadjusted Rent |  |  | Adjusted Rent |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N}}{5} \\ & \frac{1}{5} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & .0 \\ & 00 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\Psi} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 䔍 |
| Sub-04 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1BR-1BA-550sf | \$601 | \$0 | \$601 |  | \$0 | \$601 |  |
| 003-02 Autumn Ridge 2-LC2 | 2BR-1BA-850sf | \$1,036 | \$0 | \$1,036 | \$339 | -\$313 | \$723 | 4 |
| 003-04 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 3BR-2BA-1013sf | \$1,197 | \$0 | \$1,197 | \$544 | -\$454 | \$743 | 10 |
| 013-02 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,038 | \$0 | \$1,038 | \$443 | -\$425 | \$613 | 8 |
| 013-04 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 3BR-2BA-1320sf | \$1,194 | \$0 | \$1,194 | \$574 | -\$556 | \$638 | 11 |
| 053-01 King's Landing Apartments | 1BR-1BA-661sf | \$865 | \$0 | \$865 | \$305 | -\$293 | \$572 | 3 |
| 053-02 King's Landing Apartments | 2BR-1BA-858sf | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$1,005 | \$417 | -\$405 | \$600 | 7 |
| 075-04 October Station Apartments | 2BR-2BA-887sf | \$950 | \$0 | \$950 | \$380 | -\$376 | \$574 | 6 |
| 075-05 October Station Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1015sf | \$1,040 | \$0 | \$1,040 | \$528 | -\$482 | \$559 | 9 |
| 110-02 Woods Edge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-572sf | \$682 | \$0 | \$682 | \$107 | -\$39 | \$643 |  |
| 110-04 Woods Edge Apartments | 2BR-1BA-752sf | \$878 | \$0 | \$878 | \$227 | -\$159 | \$719 | 2 |
| 110-06 Woods Edge Apartments | 3BR-1BA-1003sf | \$762 | \$0 | \$762 | \$367 | -\$239 | \$523 | 5 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 523$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 743$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 628$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 627$ |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 625$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 625$ for the 1BR-1BA-550sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 1BR-1BA-572sf units at Woods Edge Apartments (Property \# 110), the 1BR-1BA-661sf units at King's Landing Apartments (Property \# 053), the 2BR-1BA-850sf units at Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 (Property \# 003), the 2BR-2BA887sf units at October Station Apartments (Property \# 075), and the 2BR-2BA-1000sf units at Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 (Property \# 013) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table below we derive our "as is" rent conclusion using the "as renovated" rent conclusion developed above:

| Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Conc <br> Adj | As <br> Ren | As <br> Is | $\$$ <br> Adj |
| Tenant Paid Utilities | 0 | $\$ 138$ | $\$ 99$ | $\$ 39$ |
| Effective Age | $\$ 1.00$ | 2012 | 1995 | $-\$ 17$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 10$ | yes | no | $-\$ 10$ |
| Adjustments |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 8$ |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum |  | $\$ 531$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Average |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average |  | $\$ 751$ |  |  |
| Rent, Concluded, As Is |  |  |  |  |

Our analysis suggests an "as is" rent of $\$ 635$ for the 1BR-1BA-550sf units at the subject property.

| Comparable |  | Subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property-Unit Key |  | Sub-04 | 003-02 | 013-02 | 053-01 | 075-04 | 110-02 |
| Unit Type |  | 18R-1BA-550sf | 2BR-1BA-850sf | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | 1BR-1BA-661sf | 2BR-2BA-887sf | 1BR-1BA-572sf |
| Property Name |  | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | King's Landing Apartments | October Station Apartments | Woods Edge Apartments |
| Address |  | 10322 Penny Lane | 116 Nancy Drive | 100 Cattail Lane | 1000 Litton Lane | 2065 Freeney Avenue | 764 Wrenn Road |
| City |  | Wakefield | Suffolk | Smithfield | Suffolk | Suffolk | Smithfield |
| State |  | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia |
| Zip |  | 23888 | 23434 | 23430 | 23434 | 23434 | 23430 |
| Latitude |  | 36.97372 | 36.71214 | 36.95939 | 36.77780 | 36.72995 | 36.97482 |
| Longitude |  | -76.97483 | -76.58937 | -76.60123 | -76.58845 | -76.55692 | -76.64529 |
| Miles to Subject |  | 0.00 | 26.38 | 21.17 | 24.53 | 27.40 | 18.66 |
| Year Built |  | 1984 | 1998 | 1994 | 1992 | 2016 | 1984 |
| Year Rehab |  | 2022 | na | 2013 | na | na | 1999 |
| Project Rent |  | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted |
| Project Type |  | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family |
| Project Status |  | Prop Rehab | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized |
| Phone |  | (757) 899-4803 | (757) 934-0847 | (757) 357-0707 | (877) 883-0784 | 757-935-5212 | (757) 357-3263 |
| Effective Date |  | 05-Mar-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 11 -Feb-22 | 11 -Feb-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 10 -Feb-22 |
| Project Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 48 | 24 | 120 | 120 | 48 | 60 |
| Vacant Units |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 6\% | 4\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 12\% |
| Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 4 | 8 | 66 | 48 | 12 | 4 |
| Vacant Units |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Street Rent |  | \$601 | \$1,036 | \$1,038 | \$865 | \$950 | \$682 |
| Concessions |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Net Rent |  | \$601 | \$1,036 | \$1,038 | \$865 | \$950 | \$682 |
|  | Adj | Data | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj |
| Tenant-Paid Utilities | TPU | \$138 | \$125 -\$13 | \$103 -\$35 | \$60 -\$78 | \$132 -\$6 | \$85 -\$53 |
| Cable | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Internet | \$0 | yes | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bedrooms | \$120 | 1 | -\$120 | 2 -\$120 | \$0 | -\$120 | 1 \$0 |
| Bathrooms | \$50 | 1.00 | 1.00 \$0 | 2.00 -\$50 | 1.00 \$0 | 2.00 -\$50 | 1.00 \$0 |
| Square Feet | \$0.10 | 550 | $850-\$ 30$ | 1000 -\$45 | 661 -\$11 | 887 -\$34 | 572 -\$2 |
| Visibility | \$0 | 3.00 | 2.00 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 3.25 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$0 |
| Access | \$0 | 3.50 | 2.00 \$0 | 3.50 \$0 | 3.25 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$0 |
| Neighborhood | \$0 | 2.90 | 2.20 \$0 | 4.30 \$0 | 4.20 \$0 | 2.00 \$0 | 3.30 \$0 |
| Area Amenities | \$80 | 2.00 | 3.60 -\$128 | 3.50 -\$120 | 4.00 - \$160 | 3.40 -\$112 | 2.20 -\$16 |
| Median HH Income | \$0.0000 | \$31,250 | \$15,417 \$0 | \$88,141 \$0 | \$70,801 \$0 | \$26,731 \$0 | \$35,714 \$0 |
| Average Commute | \$0 | 24.41 | 27.61 \$0 | 33.09 \$0 | 41.13 \$0 | 28.22 \$0 | 25.58 \$0 |
| Public Transportation | \$0 | na | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 |
| Personal Crime | \$0 | 3.4\% | 13.2\% \$0 | 1.8\% \$0 | 2.8\% \$0 | 17.9\% \$0 | 4.6\% \$0 |
| Condition | \$10 | 2.50 | $3.50-\$ 10$ | 4.00 -\$15 | 4.00 -\$15 | 4.00 -\$15 | 2.50 \$0 |
| Effective Age | \$1.00 | 2012 | 2005 \$7 | 2005 \$7 | 2010 \$2 | 2016 -\$4 | 1990 \$ ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |
| Ball Field | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| BBQ Area | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Billiards | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bus/Comp Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Car Care Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Community Center | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | yes \$0 | \$2 | yes \$0 | no \$2 |
| Elevator | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Fitness Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Gazebo | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Horseshoe Pit | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Lake | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Library | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Movie Theatre | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Picnic Area | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Playground | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Pool | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sauna | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sports Court | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Walking Trail | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Blinds | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Ceiling Fans | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | no \$2 | some \$2 | no \$2 | yes \$0 |
| Carpeting | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Fireplace | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Patio/Balcony | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | yes $\quad$ \$2 | no \$0 |
| Storage | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Stove | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Refrigerator | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Disposal | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Dishwasher | \$10 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | no \$10 |
| Microwave | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Garage | \$50 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Covered | \$20 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Assigned | \$10 | no | no \$0 | yes $\quad-\$ 10$ | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Open | \$0 | yes | yes \$0 | no \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| None | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Central | \$5 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| W/D Units | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| WID Hookups | \$25 | no | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | no \$0 |
| Call Buttons | \$2 | some | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Controlled Access | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Courtesy Officer | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Monitoring | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Alarms | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Patrols | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 |
| Indicated Rent |  | \$625 | \$723 | \$613 | \$572 | \$574 | \$643 |

## Rent Conclusion, 2BR-1BA-724sf

The development of our rent conclusion for the 2BR-1BA-724sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 11 unit types found at 5 properties. We selected the 11 most comparable units to utilize as rent comparables for purposes of this analysis. A write-up for each of the properties included in this analysis is found in the Appendix.

Our analysis included the adjustments developed in the previous section. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is better, a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior, a "minus" adjustment is made. In the table below, we summarize the adjustments and the resulting indicated rent for the top 11 comparables included in this analysis. The units that we consider most comparable are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparable |  | Unadjusted Rent |  |  | Adjusted Rent |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\hat{1}} \\ & \stackrel{I}{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 茞 |
| Sub-08 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 2BR-1BA-724sf | \$649 | \$0 | \$649 | - | \$0 | \$649 | - |
| 003-02 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 2BR-1BA-850sf | \$1,036 | \$0 | \$1,036 | \$231 | -\$205 | \$831 | 3 |
| 003-04 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 3BR-2BA-1013sf | \$1,197 | \$0 | \$1,197 | \$378 | -\$346 | \$851 | 9 |
| 013-02 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,038 | \$0 | \$1,038 | \$335 | -\$317 | \$721 | 7 |
| 013-04 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 3BR-2BA-1320sf | \$1,194 | \$0 | \$1,194 | \$466 | -\$448 | \$746 | 11 |
| 053-01 King's Landing Apartments | 1BR-1BA-661sf | \$865 | \$0 | \$865 | \$449 | -\$185 | \$680 | 10 |
| 053-02 King's Landing Apartments | 2BR-1BA-858sf | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$1,005 | \$308 | -\$296 | \$709 | 6 |
| 075-04 October Station Apartments | 2BR-2BA-887sf | \$950 | \$0 | \$950 | \$271 | -\$267 | \$683 | 5 |
| 075-05 October Station Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1015sf | \$1,040 | \$0 | \$1,040 | \$377 | -\$373 | \$667 | 8 |
| 110-02 Woods Edge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-572sf | \$682 | \$0 | \$682 | \$269 | \$69 | \$751 | 4 |
| 110-04 Woods Edge Apartments | 2BR-1BA-752sf | \$878 | \$0 | \$878 | \$119 | -\$51 | \$827 | 1 |
| 110-06 Woods Edge Apartments | 3BR-1BA-1003sf | \$762 | \$0 | \$762 | \$201 | -\$131 | \$631 | 2 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 631$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 851$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 736$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 735$ |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 750$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 750$ for the 2BR-1BA-724sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 2BR-1BA-752sf units at Woods Edge Apartments (Property \# 110), the 2BR-1BA-850sf units at Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 (Property \# 003), the 2BR-2BA-887sf units at October Station Apartments (Property \# 075), the 2BR-1BA-858sf units at King's Landing Apartments (Property \# 053), and the 2BR-2BA-1000sf units at Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 (Property \# 013) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table below we derive our "as is" rent conclusion using the "as renovated" rent conclusion developed above:

| Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Conc <br> Adj | As <br> Ren | As <br> Is | $\$$ <br> Adj |
| Tenant Paid Utilities | 0 | $\$ 167$ | $\$ 127$ | $\$ 40$ |
| Effective Age | $\$ 1.00$ | 2012 | 1995 | $-\$ 17$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 10$ | yes | no | $-\$ 10$ |
| Adjustments |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 9$ |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum |  | $\$ 640$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Average |  | $\$ 860$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average |  | $\$ 745$ |  |  |
| Rent, Concluded, As Is |  |  |  |  |

Our analysis suggests an "as is" rent of $\$ 760$ for the 2BR-1BA-724sf units at the subject property.

| Comparable |  | Subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property-Unit Key |  | Sub-08 | 003-02 | 013-02 | 053-02 | 075-04 | 110-04 |
| Unit Type |  | 2BR-1BA-724sf | 2BR-1BA-850sf | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | 2BR-1BA-858sf | 2BR-2BA-887sf | 2BR-1BA-752sf |
| Property Name |  | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | King's Landing Apartments | October Station Apartments | Woods Edge Apartments |
| Address |  | 10322 Penny Lane | 116 Nancy Drive | 100 Cattail Lane | 1000 Litton Lane | 2065 Freeney Avenue | 764 Wrenn Road |
| City |  | Wakefield | Suffolk | Smithfield | Suffolk | Suffolk | Smithfield |
| State |  | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia |
| Zip |  | 23888 | 23434 | 23430 | 23434 | 23434 | 23430 |
| Latitude |  | 36.97372 | 36.71214 | 36.95939 | 36.77780 | 36.72995 | 36.97482 |
| Longitude |  | -76.97483 | -76.58937 | -76.60123 | -76.58845 | -76.55692 | -76.64529 |
| Miles to Subject |  | 0.00 | 26.38 | 21.17 | 24.53 | 27.40 | 18.66 |
| Year Built |  | 1984 | 1998 | 1994 | 1992 | 2016 | 1984 |
| Year Rehab |  | 2022 | na | 2013 | na | na | 1999 |
| Project Rent |  | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted |
| Project Type |  | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family |
| Project Status |  | Prop Rehab | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized |
| Phone |  | (757) 899-4803 | (757) 934-0847 | (757) 357-0707 | (877) 883-0784 | 757-935-5212 | (757) 357-3263 |
| Effective Date |  | 05-Mar-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 11 -Feb-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 10 -Feb-22 |
| Project Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 48 | 24 | 120 | 120 | 48 | 60 |
| Vacant Units |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 6\% | 4\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 12\% |
| Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 5 | 8 | 66 | 72 | 12 | 4 |
| Vacant Units |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% |
| Street Rent |  | \$649 | \$1,036 | \$1,038 | \$1,005 | \$950 | \$878 |
| Concessions |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Net Rent |  | \$649 | \$1,036 | \$1,038 | \$1,005 | \$950 | \$878 |
|  | Adj | Data | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj |
| Tenant-Paid Utilities | TPU | \$167 | \$125 -\$42 | \$103 -\$64 | \$88 -\$79 | \$132 -\$35 | \$103 -\$64 |
| Cable | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Internet | \$0 | yes | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bedrooms | \$120 | 2 | \$0 | 2 \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 2 \$0 |
| Bathrooms | \$50 | 1.00 | 1.00 \$0 | 2.00 -\$50 | 1.00 \$0 | 2.00 -\$50 | 1.00 \$0 |
| Square Feet | \$0.10 | 724 | 850 -\$13 | 1000 - \$28 | 858 -\$13 | 887 -\$16 | 752 -\$3 |
| Visibility | \$0 | 3.00 | 2.00 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 3.25 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$0 |
| Access | \$0 | 3.50 | 2.00 \$0 | 3.50 \$0 | 3.25 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$0 |
| Neighborhood | \$0 | 2.90 | 2.20 \$0 | 4.30 \$0 | 4.20 \$0 | 2.00 \$0 | 3.30 \$0 |
| Area Amenities | \$80 | 2.00 | 3.60 -\$128 | 3.50 -\$120 | 4.00 - \$160 | 3.40 -\$112 | 2.20 -\$16 |
| Median HH Income | \$0.0000 | \$31,250 | \$15,417 \$0 | \$88,141 \$0 | \$70,801 \$0 | \$26,731 \$0 | \$35,714 \$0 |
| Average Commute | \$0 | 24.41 | 27.61 \$0 | 33.09 \$0 | 41.13 \$0 | 28.22 \$0 | 25.58 \$0 |
| Public Transportation | \$0 | na | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 |
| Personal Crime | \$0 | 3.4\% | 13.2\% \$0 | 1.8\% \$0 | 2.8\% \$0 | 17.9\% \$0 | 4.6\% \$0 |
| Condition | \$10 | 2.50 | $3.50-\$ 10$ | 4.00 -\$15 | 4.00 -\$15 | 4.00 -\$15 | 2.50 \$0 |
| Effective Age | \$1.00 | 2012 | 2005 \$7 | 2005 \$7 | 2010 \$2 | 2016 -\$4 | 1990 \$ ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |
| Ball Field | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| BBQ Area | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Billiards | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bus/Comp Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Car Care Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Community Center | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | yes \$0 | \$2 | yes \$0 | no \$2 |
| Elevator | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Fitness Center | \$2 | no | \$0 | yes -\$2 | \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Gazebo | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Horseshoe Pit | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Lake | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Library | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Movie Theatre | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Picnic Area | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Playground | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Pool | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sauna | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sports Court | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Walking Trail | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Blinds | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Ceiling Fans | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | no \$2 | some \$2 | no \$2 | yes \$0 |
| Carpeting | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Fireplace | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Patio/Balcony | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Storage | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Stove | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Refrigerator | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Disposal | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Dishwasher | \$10 | yes | yes $\quad \$ 0$ | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | no $\quad \$ 10$ |
| Microwave | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Garage | \$50 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Covered | \$20 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Assigned | \$10 | no | no \$0 | yes $\quad-\$ 10$ | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Open | \$0 | yes | yes \$0 | no \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| None | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Central | \$5 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| W/D Units | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| WID Hookups | \$25 | no | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | no \$0 |
| Call Buttons | \$2 | some | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Controlled Access | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Courtesy Officer | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Monitoring | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Alarms | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Patrols | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 |
| Indicated Rent |  | \$750 | \$831 | \$721 | \$709 | \$683 | \$827 |

## Rent Conclusion, 3BR-1BA-967sf

The development of our rent conclusion for the 3BR-1BA-967sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 11 unit types found at 5 properties. We selected the 11 most comparable units to utilize as rent comparables for purposes of this analysis. A write-up for each of the properties included in this analysis is found in the Appendix.

Our analysis included the adjustments developed in the previous section. Adjustments represent dollar amounts by which the subject property varies from the comparable properties. If the subject is better, a "plus" adjustment is made. If the subject is inferior, a "minus" adjustment is made. In the table below, we summarize the adjustments and the resulting indicated rent for the top 11 comparables included in this analysis. The units that we consider most comparable are highlighted for the reader's reference.

| Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comparable |  | Unadjusted Rent |  |  | Adjusted Rent |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\stackrel{1}{\lambda}}{\stackrel{1}{5}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\ddot{\omega}} \\ & \stackrel{\vdots}{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-11 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 3BR-1BA-967sf | \$754 | \$0 | \$754 | - | \$0 | \$754 | - |
| 003-02 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 2BR-1BA-850sf | \$1,036 | \$0 | \$1,036 | \$407 | -\$117 | \$919 | 6 |
| 003-04 Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | 3BR-2BA-1013sf | \$1,197 | \$0 | \$1,197 | \$285 | -\$259 | \$938 | 2 |
| 013-02 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 2BR-2BA-1000sf | \$1,038 | \$0 | \$1,038 | \$487 | -\$229 | \$809 | 10 |
| 013-04 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 3BR-2BA-1320sf | \$1,194 | \$0 | \$1,194 | \$378 | -\$360 | \$834 | 5 |
| 053-01 King's Landing Apartments | 1BR-1BA-661sf | \$865 | \$0 | \$865 | \$651 | -\$97 | \$768 | 11 |
| 053-02 King's Landing Apartments | 2BR-1BA-858sf | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$1,005 | \$483 | -\$209 | \$796 | 9 |
| 075-04 October Station Apartments | 2BR-2BA-887sf | \$950 | \$0 | \$950 | \$440 | -\$180 | \$770 | 7 |
| 075-05 October Station Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1015sf | \$1,040 | \$0 | \$1,040 | \$290 | -\$286 | \$754 | 3 |
| 110-02 Woods Edge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-572sf | \$682 | \$0 | \$682 | \$471 | \$157 | \$839 | 8 |
| 110-04 Woods Edge Apartments | 2BR-1BA-752sf | \$878 | \$0 | \$878 | \$315 | \$37 | \$915 | 4 |
| 110-06 Woods Edge Apartments | 3BR-1BA-1003sf | \$762 | \$0 | \$762 | \$112 | -\$44 | \$718 | 1 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 718$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 938$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 824$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 822$ |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 800$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 800$ for the 3BR-1BA-967sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 3BR-1BA-1003sf units at Woods Edge Apartments (Property \# 110), the 3BR-2BA-1013sf units at Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 (Property \# 003), the 3BR-2BA-1015sf units at October Station Apartments (Property \# 075), the 3BR-2BA1320sf units at Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 (Property \# 013), and the 2BR-1BA-858sf units at King's Landing Apartments (Property \# 053) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

Rent Conclusion, As Is
In the table below we derive our "as is" rent conclusion using the "as renovated" rent conclusion developed above:

| Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Conc <br> Adj | As <br> Ren | As <br> Is | $\$$ <br> Adj |
| Tenant Paid Utilities | 0 | $\$ 224$ | $\$ 173$ | $\$ 51$ |
| Effective Age | $\$ 1.00$ | 2012 | 1995 | $-\$ 17$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $\$ 2$ | yes | no | $-\$ 2$ |
| Dishwasher | $\$ 10$ | yes | no | $-\$ 10$ |
| Adjustments |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 20$ |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum |  | $\$ 738$ |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Average |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average |  | $\$ 958$ |  |  |
| Rent, Concluded, As Is |  |  |  |  |

Our analysis suggests an "as is" rent of $\$ 820$ for the 3BR-1BA-967sf units at the subject property.

| Comparable |  | Subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property-Unit Key |  | Sub-11 | 003-04 | 013-04 | 053-02 | 075-05 | 110-06 |
| Unit Type |  | 3BR-1BA-967sf | 3BR-2BA-1013sf | 3BR-2BA-1320sf | 2BR-1BA-858sf | 3BR-2BA-1015sf | 3BR-1BA-1003sf |
| Property Name |  | Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 | Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | King's Landing Apartments | October Station Apartments | Woods Edge Apartments |
| Address |  | 10322 Penny Lane | 116 Nancy Drive | 100 Cattail Lane | 1000 Litton Lane | 2065 Freeney Avenue | 764 Wrenn Road |
| City |  | Wakefield | Suffolk | Smithfield | Suffolk | Suffolk | Smithfield |
| State |  | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia |
| Zip |  | 23888 | 23434 | 23430 | 23434 | 23434 | 23430 |
| Latitude |  | 36.97372 | 36.71214 | 36.95939 | 36.77780 | 36.72995 | 36.97482 |
| Longitude |  | -76.97483 | -76.58937 | -76.60123 | -76.58845 | -76.55692 | -76.64529 |
| Miles to Subject |  | 0.00 | 26.38 | 21.17 | 24.53 | 27.40 | 18.66 |
| Year Built |  | 1984 | 1998 | 1994 | 1992 | 2016 | 1984 |
| Year Rehab |  | 2022 | na | 2013 | na | na | 1999 |
| Project Rent |  | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted | Restricted |
| Project Type |  | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family |
| Project Status |  | Prop Rehab | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized |
| Phone |  | (757) 899-4803 | (757) 934-0847 | (757) 357-0707 | (877) 883-0784 | 757-935-5212 | (757) 357-3263 |
| Effective Date |  | 05-Mar-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 11 -Feb-22 | 11 -Feb-22 | 11-Feb-22 | 10 -Feb-22 |
| Project Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 48 | 24 | 120 | 120 | 48 | 60 |
| Vacant Units |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 6\% | 4\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 12\% |
| Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 4 | 4 | 36 | 72 | 12 | 2 |
| Vacant Units |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| Street Rent |  | \$754 | \$1,197 | \$1,194 | \$1,005 | \$1,040 | \$762 |
| Concessions |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Net Rent |  | \$754 | \$1,197 | \$1,194 | \$1,005 | \$1,040 | \$762 |
|  | Adj | Data | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj |
| Tenant-Paid Utilities | TPU | \$224 | \$170 -\$54 | \$124 -\$100 | \$88 -\$136 | \$159 -\$65 | \$168 -\$56 |
| Cable | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Internet | \$0 | yes | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bedrooms | \$120 | 3 | \$0 | 3 \$0 | 2 \$120 | \$0 | 3 \$0 |
| Bathrooms | \$50 | 1.00 | 2.00 -\$50 | 2.00 -\$50 | 1.00 \$0 | 2.00 -\$50 | 1.00 \$0 |
| Square Feet | \$0.10 | 967 | 1013 -\$5 | 1320 -\$35 | 858 \$11 | 1015 -\$5 | 1003 -\$4 |
| Visibility | \$0 | 3.00 | 2.00 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 3.25 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$0 |
| Access | \$0 | 3.50 | 2.00 \$0 | 3.50 \$0 | 3.25 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$0 |
| Neighborhood | \$0 | 2.90 | 2.20 \$0 | 4.30 \$0 | 4.20 \$0 | 2.00 \$0 | 3.30 \$0 |
| Area Amenities | \$80 | 2.00 | 3.60 -\$128 | 3.50 -\$120 | $4.00 \quad$-\$160 | 3.40 -\$112 | 2.20 -\$16 |
| Median HH Income | \$0.0000 | \$31,250 | \$15,417 \$0 | \$88,141 \$0 | \$70,801 \$0 | \$26,731 \$0 | \$35,714 \$0 |
| Average Commute | \$0 | 24.41 | 27.61 \$0 | 33.09 \$0 | 41.13 \$0 | 28.22 \$0 | 25.58 \$0 |
| Public Transportation | \$0 | na | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 |
| Personal Crime | \$0 | 3.4\% | 13.2\% \$0 | 1.8\% \$0 | 2.8\% \$0 | 17.9\% \$0 | 4.6\% \$0 |
| Condition | \$10 | 2.50 | $3.50-\$ 10$ | 4.00 -\$15 | 4.00 -\$15 | 4.00 -\$15 | 2.50 \$0 |
| Effective Age | \$1.00 | 2012 | 2005 \$7 | 2005 \$7 | 2010 \$2 | 2016 -\$4 | 1990 \$ ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |
| Ball Field | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| BBQ Area | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Billiards | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bus/Comp Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Car Care Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Community Center | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | yes \$0 | \$2 | yes \$0 | no \$2 |
| Elevator | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Fitness Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Gazebo | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Horseshoe Pit | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Lake | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Library | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Movie Theatre | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Picnic Area | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Playground | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Pool | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sauna | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sports Court | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Walking Trail | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Blinds | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Ceiling Fans | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | no \$2 | some \$2 | no \$2 | yes \$0 |
| Carpeting | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Fireplace | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Patio/Balcony | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | yes $\quad$ \$2 | no \$0 |
| Storage | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Stove | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Refrigerator | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Disposal | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Dishwasher | \$10 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | no \$10 |
| Microwave | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Garage | \$50 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Covered | \$20 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Assigned | \$10 | no | no \$0 | yes $\quad-\$ 10$ | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Open | \$0 | yes | yes \$0 | no \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| None | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Central | \$5 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| W/D Units | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| WID Hookups | \$25 | no | yes -\$25 | yes -\$25 | yes - $\$ 25$ | yes -\$25 | no \$0 |
| Call Buttons | \$2 | some | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Controlled Access | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Courtesy Officer | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Monitoring | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Alarms | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Patrols | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ - ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |
| Indicated Rent |  | \$800 | \$938 | \$834 | \$796 | \$754 | \$718 |

## Restricted Market Rent Conclusion

Based on our evaluation of the rents at the select comparable properties, and considering the location, quality and amenities of the subject property, we conclude the following market rents for the subject property units, assuming that the subject were a restricted property:

| Restricted Market Rent Conclusion |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Market |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$625 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$625 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$625 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$625 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$750 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$750 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$750 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$750 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$800 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$800 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$800 |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$717 |

Our analysis suggests an average restricted market rent of $\$ 717$ for the subject property.
We selected a total of 5 properties as comparables for purposes of our analysis. The average occupancy at the select rent comparables currently stands at 99 percent.

The occupancy rate of the selected rent compatrables is broken out in the tables below:

| Occupancy Rate, Select Comparables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subsidized | 20\% of AMI | $30 \%$ of AMI | 40\% of AMI | 50\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | 80\% of AMI | Market |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | 90\% |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 2-Bedroom | 100\% |  |  | 96\% | 99\% |  |  |  |
| 3-Bedroom | 67\% |  |  | 100\% | 95\% |  |  |  |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 93\% |  |  | 97\% | 99\% |  |  |  |

Occupancy rates for all stabilized market area properties are broken out below:

| Occupancy Rate, Stabilized Properties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subsidized | 20\% of AMI | $30 \%$ of AMI | 40\% of AMI | 50\% of AMI | 60\% of AMI | 80\% of AMI | Market |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | 97\% |  |  | 94\% | 93\% |  |  | 100\% |
| 2-Bedroom | 95\% |  | 100\% | 96\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% |
| 3-Bedroom | 84\% |  |  | 100\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 95\% |  | 100\% | 96\% | 94\% |  |  | 100\% |

Rents at rent restricted properties tend to move with median household incomes for an area. Given HUD's published median incomes, we were able to derive 1, 2 and 3 -bedroom $60 \%$ of AMI rent limits for the subject's primary market area. According to our analysis, maximum 2-bedroom rents for the area grew from $\$ 998$ to $\$ 1215$ since 2010. This represents an average 2.0\% annual increase over this period.

Maximum tax credit rent data for the area is found below:

|  | Rent |  |  | Change |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 1BR | 2BR | 3BR | 1BR | 2BR | 3BR |
| 2008 | \$780 | \$936 | \$1,081 | - | - | - |
| 2009 | \$824 | \$988 | \$1,142 | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% |
| 2010 | \$831 | \$998 | \$1,153 | 0.8\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% |
| 2011 | \$839 | \$1,007 | \$1,164 | 1.0\% | 0.9\% | 1.0\% |
| 2012 | \$851 | \$1,021 | \$1,179 | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.3\% |
| 2013 | \$831 | \$998 | \$1,153 | -2.4\% | -2.3\% | -2.2\% |
| 2014 | \$820 | \$984 | \$1,137 | -1.3\% | -1.4\% | -1.4\% |
| 2015 | \$835 | \$1,002 | \$1,158 | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | 1.8\% |
| 2016 | \$814 | \$977 | \$1,129 | -2.5\% | -2.5\% | -2.5\% |
| 2017 | \$885 | \$1,062 | \$1,228 | 8.7\% | 8.7\% | 8.8\% |
| 2018 | \$936 | \$1,123 | \$1,298 | 5.8\% | 5.7\% | 5.7\% |
| 2019 | \$972 | \$1,166 | \$1,348 | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 3.9\% |
| 2020 | \$1,006 | \$1,207 | \$1,395 | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| 2021 | \$1,012 | \$1,215 | \$1,404 | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% |

Source: HUD

## Restricted Market Rent Conclusion, As Is

In the table found below we summarize the market rents for the subject property units on an "as is" basis, assuming that the subject were a restricted property:

| Restricted Market Rent Conclusion, As Is |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Market |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$635 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 8 | \$635 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$635 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$635 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 5 | \$760 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 13 | \$760 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 1 | \$760 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$760 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$820 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$820 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$820 |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$728 |

## Achievable Rent Conclusion

The next step in our analysis is to develop an achievable rent conclusion for the subject property. Achievable rents represent the absolute highest rent permissible for the area, considering market rents, program rent limits, and any other applicable rent restrictions on the subject property.

Our analysis begins by establishing the applicable program rent limits for the subject property. Program rent limits include any applicable LIHTC and FMR rent limits. LIHTC rent limits typically apply to units benefitting from tax credit and/or bond financing. The LIHTC rent limits for applicable units at the subject property follow:

| LIHTC Rent Limits |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Gross Rent | Utilities | Net Rent |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$675 | \$138 | \$537 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$843 | \$138 | \$705 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,012 | \$138 | \$874 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,012 | \$138 | \$874 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$810 | \$167 | \$643 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$1,012 | \$167 | \$845 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$1,215 | \$167 | \$1,048 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$1,215 | \$167 | \$1,048 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$936 | \$224 | \$712 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,170 | \$224 | \$946 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,404 | \$224 | \$1,180 |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$1,060 | \$167 | \$893 |

Our analysis suggests an average net LIHTC rent limit of $\$ 893$ for 48 applicable units at the subject property.
FMR rent limits typically apply to units benefitting from HOME funds. The FMR rent limits for applicable units at the subject property follow:

| FMR Rent Limits |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Gross Rent | Utilities | Net Rent |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |

Total / Average

HOME funding is not proposed for the subject property.
Units benefitting exclusively from tax credits and/or bond financing are subject to LIHTC rent limits. Units benefitting from HOME funds in addition to tax credit and/or bond financing are subject to the lesser of LIHTC rent limits or FMR rent limits. Units benefitting from project-based rental assistance are normally limited to unrestricted market rent. With these parameters in mind, the following table sets forth the concluded program rent limits for applicable units at the subject property:

| Program Rent Limits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | LIHTC | FMR | Market | Program |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$537 | - | \$880 | \$880 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$705 | - | \$880 | \$880 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$874 | - | \$880 | \$880 |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$874 | - | - | \$874 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$643 | - | \$1,015 | \$1,015 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$845 | - | \$1,015 | \$1,015 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$1,048 | - | \$1,015 | \$1,015 |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$1,048 | - | - | \$1,048 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$712 | - | \$1,120 | \$1,120 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$946 | - | \$1,120 | \$1,120 |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,180 | - | - | \$1,180 |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$893 | - | \$981 | \$995 |

Our analysis suggests an average program rent limit of $\$ 995$ for 48 applicable units at the subject property.
Now that we have established program rent limits, we are in a position to develop an achievable rent conclusion for the subject property. Achievable rents represent the absolute highest rent permissible for the area, considering unrestricted and restricted market rents, program rent limits, and any other applicable rent restrictions on the subject property. The following table summarizes our findings:

| Achievable Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Program | Unrestricted | Restricted | Achievable | Proposed | Advantage |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$880 | \$880 | \$625 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 6 | \$880 | \$880 | \$625 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$880 | \$880 | \$625 | \$880 | \$601 | 31.7\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / $60 \%$ of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$874 | \$880 | \$625 | \$625 | \$601 | 3.8\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,015 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 10 | \$1,015 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | Yes | 7 | \$1,015 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$1,015 | \$649 | 36.1\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$1,048 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$750 | \$649 | 13.5\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 1 | \$1,120 | \$1,120 | \$800 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf/ $50 \%$ of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,120 | \$1,120 | \$800 | \$1,120 | \$754 | 32.7\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,180 | \$1,120 | \$800 | \$800 | \$754 | 5.8\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$995 | \$988 | \$717 | \$912 | \$651 | 28.7\% |

Our analysis suggests an average achievable rent of $\$ 912$ for the subject property. This is compared with an average proposed rent of $\$ 651$, yielding an achievable rent advantage of 28.7 percent. Overall, the subject property appears to be priced at or below achievable rents for the area.

Finally, assuming no rent subsidies, we arrive at the following achievable rents for units at this property:

| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Program | Unrestricted | Restricted | Achievable | Proposed | Advantage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 40\% of AMI / $40 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$537 | \$880 | \$625 | \$537 | \$601 | -11.9\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 6 | \$705 | \$880 | \$625 | \$625 | \$601 | 3.8\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$874 | \$880 | \$625 | \$625 | \$601 | 3.8\% |
| 1BR-1BA-550sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$874 | \$880 | \$625 | \$625 | \$601 | 3.8\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$643 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$643 | \$649 | -0.9\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / $50 \%$ of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 10 | \$845 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$750 | \$649 | 13.5\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 7 | \$1,048 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$750 | \$649 | 13.5\% |
| 2BR-1BA-724sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 5 | \$1,048 | \$1,015 | \$750 | \$750 | \$649 | 13.5\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | No | 1 | \$712 | \$1,120 | \$800 | \$712 | \$754 | -5.9\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$946 | \$1,120 | \$800 | \$800 | \$754 | 5.8\% |
| 3BR-1BA-967sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,180 | \$1,120 | \$800 | \$800 | \$754 | 5.8\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 48 | \$893 | \$988 | \$717 | \$707 | \$651 | 8.0\% |

## DEMAND ANALYSIS

## Overview

In this section we evaluate demand for the subject property using the recommended demand methodology promulgated by the National Council of Housing Market Analysts (NCHMA). For purposes of this analysis, we define demand as the number of income-qualified renter households (by household size and unit type) that would qualify to live at the subject property at the lesser of the developer's proposed rents or achievable rents.

Our analysis begins by developing a breakdown of the number of renter households, by income, by size as of the date of market entry for this development. This breakdown, which utilizes demographic data presented earlier in this report, is presented below:

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2022 ~ \$ ~$ | Max |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min |  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person | Total |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 | 561 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 | 1,333 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 | 1,875 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 | 2,231 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 | 2,573 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 | 2,754 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 | 2,964 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 | 3,310 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 | 3,437 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 | 3,554 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 | 3,596 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 | 3,658 |

Source: ESRI \& Ribbon Demographics

Our analysis includes an estimate of demand along with capture rate and penetration rate estimates. Capture rates were computed two ways: (1) On a gross basis (the number of proposed units divided by qualified demand) and (2) On a net basis (the number of proposed units divided by qualified demand minus competing \& pipeline units). Penetration rates are defined as the number of proposed units plus competing \& pipeline units divided by incomequalified demand. In the following pages we provide detailed listings of competing \& pipeline units in the market area broken by unit type.

Competing \& Pipeline Units, 1-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 009 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 11 |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 010 Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 3 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 017 Cedar Street Apartments | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 023 Church Manor Apartments | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 052 Jersey Park Apartments | 1986 | 2006 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 070 New Surry Village | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 078 Patriots Landing Apartments | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 092 Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 095 Sussex Trace Apartments | 1982 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Waverly Village Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 8 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 107 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 12 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 109 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 1990 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 20 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 110 |  |  | 17 | 15 |  |  | 20 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |

Competing \& Pipeline Units, 2-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 009 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 18 |  |  | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| 010 Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 3 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 017 Cedar Street Apartments | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 18 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 023 Church Manor Apartments | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  | 5 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 052 Jersey Park Apartments | 1986 | 2006 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 070 New Surry Village | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 23 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 078 Patriots Landing Apartments | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 092 Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 30 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 095 Sussex Trace Apartments | 1982 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Waverly Village Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 19 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 107 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 19 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 109 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 1990 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 24 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 256 |  | 5 | 50 | 86 |  |  | 80 | 13 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |

Competing \& Pipeline Units, 3-Bedroom Units

| Overview |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 009 Birch Island Apartments Phase 1 | 1984 | 2000 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 010 Birch Island Apartments Phase 2 | 1988 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 013 Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2013 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 017 Cedar Street Apartments | 1990 | 2010 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 023 Church Manor Apartments | 1972 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 052 Jersey Park Apartments | 1986 | 2006 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 063 Morris Creek Landing Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 070 New Surry Village | 1990 | 2015 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 078 Patriots Landing Apartments | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 092 Surry Village Apartments Phase 1 | 1985 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 095 Sussex Trace Apartments | 1982 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Waverly Village Apartments | 1988 | 2004 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 107 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 1 | 1988 | 2005 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 109 Windsor Court Apartments Phase 2 | 1990 | na | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Woods Edge Apartments | 1984 | 1999 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  | 8 | 52 |  |  | 2 | 5 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Subsidized, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Subsidized / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 12 units, 6 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2023. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 12 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 6 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 138$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 394$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 4,731$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
|  | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 949 | 544 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 128 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 820 | 506 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
1,327
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,327 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2023. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 601$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 739$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,111$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
|  | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 949 | 544 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 766 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 183 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 384
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 384 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Subsidized, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Subsidized / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 19 units, 9 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2023. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 19 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 9 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 167$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 477$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 5,726$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 949 | 544 | 371 | 267 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 157 | 46 | 51 | 37 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 792 | 498 | 320 | 230 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,841
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,841 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 5 units, 3 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2023. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 5 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 649$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 816$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,331$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 27,977$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 0$ | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
|  | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 949 | 544 | 371 | 267 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 821 | 371 | 264 | 172 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 128 | 173 | 107 | 95 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
503
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 503 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Subsidized, 50\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Subsidized / 50\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2023. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | $50 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 224$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 640$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 7,680$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 52,200$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 891 | 474 | 342 | 235 | 146 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 214 | 62 | 70 | 50 | 16 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 677 | 412 | 272 | 185 | 131 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,676
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,676 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2023. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 754$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 978$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,794$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 33,531$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 949 | 544 | 371 | 267 | 168 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 910 | 443 | 304 | 200 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 39 | 101 | 68 | 67 | 72 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 347
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 347 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Subsidized

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the subsidized units at the subject property.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,008 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to 50\% of AMI at the subject property.

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |  |  |

Demand Estimate, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

| 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Maximum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Income, 1BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowabl Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Maximum Allowable Income | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Minimum Qualified Income

-     - 



| HH Below Upper Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HH Below Lower Income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
0

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 0 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI at the subject property.

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 655 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 876 | 399 | 284 | 195 | 80 | 41 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 973 | 524 | 340 | 210 | 126 | 60 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,125 | 590 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,161 | 671 | 391 | 278 | 173 | 79 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,195 | 768 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,252 | 913 | 487 | 381 | 191 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,271 | 941 | 501 | 439 | 199 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,308 | 963 | 520 | 463 | 210 | 90 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,323 | 971 | 522 | 465 | 222 | 94 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,339 | 996 | 533 | 469 | 227 | 94 |  |  |

Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | - |
|  |  | - |  |  |  | - |
| Minimum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH Below Upper Income | 949 | 544 | 371 | 267 | 168 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income | 766 | 343 | 264 | 172 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 183 | 201 | 107 | 95 | 72 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 659 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Project-Level

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a project-level demand estimate for the subject property.


Our analysis suggests project-level demand for a total of 2,030 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.

## Capture Rates

In this section, we summarize our demand conclusions and estimate the capture rate for the subject property. Our analysis begins by summarizing the estimated number of vacant subject property units on the date of market entry.

| Subject Property Units (Total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 12 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 16 |
| 2BR | 19 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 24 |
| 3BR | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 35 |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  | 48 |


|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 2BR | 9 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 12 |
| 3BR | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 17 |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 24 |

The next step in our analysis is to summarize the demand conclusions derived previously. For purposes of this analysis, we define demand as age- and income- qualified renter households for each of the unit types proposed at the subject property. Unit-level demand estimates are found in the body of the chart found below; project-level demand estimates are found in the column and row totals.

Please note: Because of income-band overlap, unit-level demand may not add up to project-level demand. The overlap, which was quantified in the demand estimates presented earlier, has been accounted for in our estimates of project-level demand.

| Gross Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 1,327 |  |  |  | 384 |  |  |  | 1,711 |
| 2BR | 1,841 |  |  |  | 503 |  |  |  | 2,344 |
| 3BR | 1,676 |  |  |  | 347 |  |  |  | 2,023 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 2,008 |  |  |  | 659 |  |  |  | 2,030 |

The next step in our analysis is to compute the capture rate for the project. For purposes of this computation, we define capture rate as the number of subject property units divided by gross demand. Underwriters often utilize capture rate limits of 10 to 25 percent using this methodology. Our estimates are presented below:

| Capture Rates (Subject Property Units / Gross Demand) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $0.5 \%$ |  |  |  | $0.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $0.5 \%$ |  |  |  | $0.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3BR | $0.1 \%$ |  |  |  | $0.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | $0.8 \%$ |  |  |  | $1.1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to tabulate the number of vacant competing \& pipeline units in the market area by
unit/income type. This information will be used to further refine our capture rate estimate for the subject property. A table showing the distribution of vacant competing \& pipeline units is found below.

| Vacant Competing \& Pipeline Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 6 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 7 |
| 2BR | 13 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 18 |
| 3BR | 5 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 24 |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  | 33 |

The next step in our analysis is to subtract the number of vacant competing \& pipeline units from gross demand to arrive at a net demand estimate for the subject property units. As described earlier, unit-level net demand estimates are found in the body of the chart found below; project-level net demand estimates are found in the column and row totals.

Please note: Because of income-band overlap, unit-level net demand may not add up to project-level net demand. The overlap, which was quantified in the demand estimates presented earlier, has been accounted for in our estimates of project-level net demand.

| Net Demand (Gross Demand - Vacant Competing \& Pipeline Units) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 1,321 |  |  |  | 383 |  |  |  | 1,704 |
| 2BR | 1,828 |  |  |  | 498 |  |  |  | 2,326 |
| 3BR | 1,671 |  |  |  | 344 |  |  |  | 2,015 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 1,984 |  |  |  | 650 |  |  |  | 1,997 |

The next step in our analysis is to compute the capture rate for the project. For purposes of this computation, we define capture rate as the number of subject property units divided by net demand. A capture rate in excess of 20 percent is considered excessive using this methodology. Our estimates are presented below:

| Capture Rates (Subject Property Units / Net Demand) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $0.5 \%$ |  |  |  | $0.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $0.5 \%$ |  |  |  | $0.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3BR | $0.1 \%$ |  |  |  | $0.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | $0.9 \%$ |  |  |  | $1.1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

In our opinion, the estimated project-level capture rate suggests an appropriate number of units for the subject property. The unit level capture rates suggest an appropriate mix of units for the subject property.

## Penetration Rates

In this section, we summarize our demand conclusions and estimate the penetration rate for the subject property. Our analysis begins by summarizing the estimated number of vacant subject property units on the date of market entry.

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 12 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 19 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Tot | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |


|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 2BR | 9 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 12 |
| 3BR | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 17 |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 24 |

The next step in our analysis is to summarize the demand conclusions derived previously. For purposes of this analysis, we define demand as age- and income- qualified renter households for each of the unit types proposed at the subject property. Unit-level demand estimates are found in the body of the chart found below; project-level demand estimates are found in the column and row totals.

Please note: Because of income-band overlap, unit-level demand may not add up to project-level demand. The overlap, which was quantified in the demand estimates presented earlier, has been accounted for in our estimates of project-level demand.

| Gross Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 1,327 |  |  |  | 384 |  |  |  | 1,711 |
| 2BR | 1,841 |  |  |  | 503 |  |  |  | 2,344 |
| 3BR | 1,676 |  |  |  | 347 |  |  |  | 2,023 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 2,008 |  |  |  | 659 |  |  |  | 2,030 |

The next step in our analysis is to tabulate the number of competing \& pipeline units in the market area by unit/income type. This information will be used to derive our penetration rate estimate for the subject property. A table showing the distribution of competing \& pipeline units is found below.

| Competing \& Pipeline Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 110 |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  | 125 |
| 2BR | 256 |  |  |  | 86 |  |  |  | 342 |
| 3BR | 32 |  |  |  | 52 |  |  |  | 84 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 398 |  |  |  | 153 |  |  |  | 551 |

The next step in our analysis is to compute inclusive supply for the market area by unit/income type. Inclusive
supply will be taken into account in our penetration rate estimate for the subject property. For purposes of this estimate, inclusive supply consists of vacant subject property units plus competing \& pipeline units.

| Inclusive Supply (Subject Property Units + Competing \& Pipeline Units) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 116 |  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  | 133 |
| 2BR | 265 |  |  |  | 89 |  |  |  | 354 |
| 3BR | 34 |  |  |  | 54 |  |  |  | 88 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 415 |  |  |  | 160 |  |  |  | 575 |

The next step in our analysis is to compute the penetration rate for the project. For purposes of this computation, penetration rate is defined as inclusive supply divided by gross demand. A penetration rate in excess of 100 percent is considered excessive using this methodology. Our estimates are presented below:

| Penetration Rates (Inclusive Supply / Gross Demand) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $8.7 \%$ |  |  |  | $4.4 \%$ |  |  |  | $7.8 \%$ |
| 2BR | $14.4 \%$ |  |  |  | $17.7 \%$ |  |  |  | $15.1 \%$ |
| 3BR | $2.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $15.6 \%$ |  |  |  | $4.3 \%$ |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | $20.7 \%$ |  |  |  | $24.3 \%$ |  |  |  | $28.3 \%$ |

In our opinion, the estimated project-level penetration rate suggest an appropriate number of units for the subject property. The unit-level penetration rates suggest an appropriate mix of units for the subject property.

## Absorption Period

In this section, we estimate the absorption period for the subject property. Our analysis begins by summarizing the estimated number of vacant subject property units on the date of market entry.

| Subject Property Units (Total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 12 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 19 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Property Units (Vacant at Market Entry)

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 9 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to summarize the demand conclusions derived previously. For purposes of this analysis, we define demand as age- and income- qualified renter households for each of the unit types proposed at the subject property. Our analysis uses the unit-level demand estimates derived previously.

| Gross Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 1,327 |  |  |  | 384 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 1,841 |  |  |  | 503 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 1,676 |  |  |  | 347 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to apply an annual growth \& movership rate to derive an annual rental household growth \& movership estimate for the market area. Our estimates are found in the tables below.

| Annual Growth \& Movership Rate |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Growth | $0.1 \%$ |
| Movership | $25.2 \%$ |
| Total | $25.3 \%$ |


| Growth \& Movership Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 336 |  |  |  | 97 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 466 |  |  |  | 127 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 424 |  |  |  | 88 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to account for secondary market area migration in our annual rental household growth \& movership estimate for the market area. Our estimates are found in the tables below.

| Growth \& Movership Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 420 |  |  |  | 122 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 583 |  |  |  | 159 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 530 |  |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to estimate fair share, or the proportion of growth and movership that we would expect the subject property to capture. The fair share analysis is used extensively in single-family, multifamily, commercial, and retail market studies. The books entitled Market Analysis for Valuation Appraisals (1994, Appraisal Institute) and Market Analysis and Highest \& Best Use (2005, Appraisal institute) provide a good overview of this technique and its application to a variety of property types.

Based on our review of the subject and competing properties, along with their relative conditions/locations, we arrive at the following fair share estimates for the various unit/income types at the subject property.

|  | Competing Properties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |  |
| 1BR | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 11 |  |  |  | 4 | 3 |  |  |
| 3BR | 3 |  |  | 7 | 4 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Fair Share |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 3BR | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Applying the concluded fair share estimates to annual growth \& movership and dividing by twelve yields the following monthly absorption rate estimates for the various unit/income types at the subject property.

| Monthly Absorption Rate Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 3.5 |  |  |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 4.9 |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 4.4 |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to estimate stabilized occupancy by unit/income type for the subject property. These estimates, which were based on data previously presented in the supply analysis and rent comparability analysis sections of this report, are found below.

| Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area, Family, Stabilized Occupancy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $95 \%$ |  |  | $94 \%$ | $93 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $95 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $94 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ |  |
| 3BR | $84 \%$ |  |  | $100 \%$ | $94 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ |  |

Occupancy Rate, Select Comparables

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $90 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $100 \%$ |  |  | $96 \%$ | $99 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 3BR | $67 \%$ |  |  | $100 \%$ | $95 \%$ |  | $98 \%$ |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Concluded Stabilized Occupancy Rate

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | $95 \%$ |  |  |  | $94 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $95 \%$ |  |  |  | $94 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 3BR | $95 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Applying the stabilized occupancy rate estimates to the number of vacant subject property units at market entry, yields the number of occupied units by unit/income type at stabilization as set forth below.

| Occupied Units at Stabilization |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 9 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Dividing the number of occupied units at stabilization by the monthly absorption rate yields an absorption period estimate by unit/income type for the various units at the subject property. Underwriters often utilize absorption period limits of 12 to 18 months for projects similar to the subject property. Our absorption period estimates are found below.

| Absorption Period (Months to Stabilization) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 3BR | $<1$ |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Our analysis suggests that the subject property will stabilize at 95 percent occupancy. We estimate 2 months of absorption and an average absorption rate of 10.7 units per month for this project. In our opinion, the absorption period suggests an appropriate number and mix of units for the subject property.

Absorption rates for multifamily properties depend on a variety of factors: (1) The competitive environment in which the property resides; (2) The pricing of the subject property units relative to competing units, (3) The presence of rent or income restrictions at the subject property; and (4) The availability of any rent concessions or rental assistance at the subject property. Subsidized properties normally lease up at a rate of 15-20 units per month. Unsubsidized properties with rent and income restrictions tyically fill at a rate of 5-10 units per month. Market rate properties normally lease up at a rate of 10-15 units per month.

As part of our analysis, we inquired about the absorption history for every property we surveyed. The following list summarizes our findings:

| Key | Project | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Tot Units |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 061 | Meridian Obici | 2016 | na | Market Rate | Family | 224 |
| 083 | Residences at October (The) | 2013 | na | Restricted | Family | 72 |

## Absorption Analysis

In this section, we analyze the anticipated lease up for the subject property. We begin our analysis by taking the the absorption period conclusions from the previous section and restating them graphically as illustrated below.


Our analysis suggests that the subject property will achieve 70 percent occupancy in 0 months, 80 percent occupancy in 1 months, and 90 percent occupancy in 1 months. We anticipate that the subject property will stabilize at 95 percent occupancy in 2 months.

It is important to note that this analysis does not account for pent-up demand, pre-leasing efforts or rent concessions. In our opinion, an effective pre-leasing effort could result in a month-for-month reduction in the estimated absorption period for this project. In addition, any concessions or rent subsidies not accounted for already in this analysis could cut capture rates and absorption periods significantly.

## VHDA DEMAND ANALYSIS

## Overview

In this section we evaluate demand for the subject property using the VHDA demand methodology. For purposes of this analysis, we define VHDA demand as the number of new income-qualified and existing income-qualified overburdened and substandard renter households that would qualify to live at the subject property at the lesser of achievable rents or the sponsor's proposed rents. Our analysis accounts for any rent subsidies for the subject property.

Our analysis begins by developing a breakdown of the number of renter households, by income, by size as of the date of market entry for this development. This breakdown, which utilizes demographic data presented earlier in this report, is presented below:

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

| 2022 \$ |  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min |  | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person | Total |
| \$0 | to | \$9,999 | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 | 560 |
| \$0 | to | \$19,999 | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 | 1,331 |
| \$0 | to | \$29,999 | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 | 1,872 |
| \$0 | to | \$39,999 | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 | 2,229 |
| \$0 | to | \$49,999 | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 | 2,570 |
| \$0 | to | \$59,999 | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 | 2,750 |
| \$0 | to | \$74,999 | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 | 2,960 |
| \$0 | to | \$99,999 | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 | 3,305 |
| \$0 | to | \$124,999 | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 | 3,433 |
| \$0 | to | \$149,999 | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 | 3,550 |
| \$0 | to | \$199,999 | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 | 3,591 |
| \$0 | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 | 3,654 |

Source: ESRI \& Ribbon Demographics

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Subsidized, 50\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Subsidized / 50\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 12 units, 6 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | 50\% of AMI |
| Total Units | 12 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 6 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 138$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 394$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 4,731$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 52,200$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 890 | 473 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 128 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 761 | 436 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,197
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,197 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 601$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 739$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,111$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 765 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 183 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 384
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 384 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Subsidized, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Subsidized / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 19 units, 9 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 19 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 9 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 167$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 477$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 5,726$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 157 | 46 | 51 | 37 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 791 | 497 | 320 | 230 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,839
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,839 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 5 units, 3 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 5 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 649$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 816$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,331$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 27,977$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 820 | 370 | 264 | 171 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 128 | 173 | 107 | 96 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 504
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 504 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Subsidized, 50\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Subsidized / 50\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | $50 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 224$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 640$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 7,680$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 52,200$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 890 | 473 | 341 | 235 | 146 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 214 | 62 | 70 | 50 | 16 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 676 | 411 | 271 | 184 | 131 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,673
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,673 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 754$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 978$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,794$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 33,531$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 168 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 909 | 442 | 303 | 199 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 39 | 101 | 68 | 68 | 72 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 348
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 348 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Subsidized

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the subsidized units at the subject property.

| 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | \$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| \$0 | to | \$9,999 | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| \$0 | to | \$19,999 | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| \$0 | to | \$29,999 | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| \$0 | to | \$39,999 | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| \$0 | to | \$49,999 | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| \$0 | to | \$59,999 | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| \$0 | to | \$74,999 | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| \$0 | to | \$99,999 | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| \$0 | to | \$124,999 | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| \$0 | to | \$149,999 | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| \$0 | to | \$199,999 | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| \$0 | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |
| Demand Estimate, Subsidized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| Maximum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR |  |  | \$31,500 | \$36,000 | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR |  |  | \$37,800 | \$43,200 | \$48,600 | \$54,000 | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR |  |  | \$31,500 | \$36,000 | \$40,500 | \$45,000 | \$48,600 | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income |  |  | \$37,800 | \$43,200 | \$48,600 | \$54,000 | \$48,600 | - |
| Minimum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR |  |  | \$4,731 | \$4,731 | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR |  |  | \$5,726 | \$5,726 | \$5,726 | \$5,726 | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR |  |  | \$7,680 | \$7,680 | \$7,680 | \$7,680 | \$7,680 | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |  | \$4,731 | \$4,731 | \$5,726 | \$5,726 | \$7,680 | - |
| HH Below Upper Income |  |  | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 146 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income |  |  | 128 | 37 | 51 | 37 | 16 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 820 | 505 | 320 | 230 | 131 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,006 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI at the subject property.

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |  |  |

Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Minimum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH Below Upper Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 168 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income | 765 | 343 | 264 | 171 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 183 | 200 | 107 | 96 | 72 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 659 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate

In this section, we derive our overburdened demand and capture rate estimates for the subject property. Our analysis, which begins with the income-qualified renter household estimates developed above, is found below.

| Income Qualified Renter Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | 2,006 |  |  |  | 659 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to account for 2 years of growth to estimate the demand stemming from new income qualified rental households. Our estimates are found below.


The next step in our analysis is to estimate existing demand stemming from income-qualified overburdened renter households in this market area. Our estimates are found below.


The next step in our analysis is to estimate existing demand stemming from income-qualified substandard renter households in this market area. Our estimates are found below.


The next step in our analysis is to account for elderly homeowners likely to convert to rental housing. This component may not comprise more than 20 percent of total demand. Our estimates are found below.

| Elderly Homeowners Likely to Convert to Rental Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to account for existing qualifying tenants likely to remain after renovation. Our estimates are found below.

| Subject Property Units (Total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | 35 |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |

Existing Qualifying Tenants Likely to Remain after Renovation

| Existing Qualifying Tenants Likely to Remain after Renovation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | 18 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to tally up total demand for the subject property. Our estimates are found below.

| Total Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | 836 |  |  |  | 275 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to tabulate the number of vacant competing \& pipeline units in the market area by unit/income type. This information will be used to further refine our capture rate estimate for the subject property. A table showing the distribution of vacant competing \& pipeline units is found below.

| Vacant Competing \& Pipeline Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | 24 |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to subtract the number of vacant competing \& pipeline units from total demand to arrive at a net demand estimate for the subject property. Our estimates are found below.

| Net Demand (Total Demand - Vacant Competing \& Pipeline Units) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | 812 |  |  |  | 266 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to compute the capture rate for the project. For purposes of this computation, we define capture rate as the total number of subject property units divided by net demand. Underwriters often utilize capture rate limits of 10 to 20 percent using this methodology. Our estimates are presented below:

| Capture Rates (Subject Property Units / Net Demand) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot | $4.3 \%$ |  |  |  | $4.9 \%$ |  |  |  |

Our findings are summarized below.

| Project-Wide Capture Rate - LIHTC Units | $4.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - Market Units |  |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - All Units | $4.5 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period (Months) | 2 months |

Please note: Project-wide capture rate estimates do not account for income band overlap at the project level.

## VHDA DEMAND ANALYSIS (UNSUBSIDIZED)

## Overview

In this section we evaluate demand for the subject property using the VHDA demand methodology. For purposes of this analysis, we define VHDA demand as the number of new income-qualified and existing income-qualified overburdened and substandard renter households that would qualify to live at the subject property at the lesser of achievable rents or the sponsor's proposed rents. Our analysis ignores any rent subsidies for the subject property.

Our analysis begins by developing a breakdown of the number of renter households, by income, by size as of the date of market entry for this development. This breakdown, which utilizes demographic data presented earlier in this report, is presented below:

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

| $2022 ~ \$ ~$ |  | Max |  |  |  |  |  | 1 Person | 2 Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min |  | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person | Total |  |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 | 560 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 | 1,331 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 | 1,872 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 | 2,229 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 | 2,570 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 | 2,750 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 | 2,960 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 | 3,305 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 | 3,433 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 | 3,550 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 | 3,591 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 | 3,654 |

Source: ESRI \& Ribbon Demographics

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Restricted, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Restricted / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 2 units, 1 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 2 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 1 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 537$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 675$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 1,929$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 23,143$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 25,200$ | $\$ 28,800$ | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 38,880$ | $\$ 41,760$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 765 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 720 | 320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 44 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 105
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 105 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Restricted / $50 \%$ of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 6 units, 3 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $50 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 6 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 601$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 739$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,111$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 52,200$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 890 | 473 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 765 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 125 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 256
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 256 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 1-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 1-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 8 units, 4 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 2-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 1-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 8 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 4 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 601$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 138$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 739$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,111$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 765 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 183 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 384
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 384 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Restricted, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 2 units, 1 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 2 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 1 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 643$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 810$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,314$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 27,771$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 25,200$ | $\$ 28,800$ | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 38,880$ | $\$ 41,760$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 381 | 295 | 203 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 370 | 264 | 171 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 11 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
74

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 74 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / $50 \%$ of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 10 units, 5 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $50 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 10 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 5 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 649$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 816$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,331$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 27,977$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 52,200$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 890 | 473 | 341 | 235 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 820 | 370 | 264 | 171 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 70 | 103 | 77 | 63 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 313
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 313 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 12 units, 6 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 4-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 2-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 12 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 6 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 649$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 167$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 816$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,331$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 27,977$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 820 | 370 | 264 | 171 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 128 | 173 | 107 | 96 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 504
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 504 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Restricted, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 1 units, 1 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5 -person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 1 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 1 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 712$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 936$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,674$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 32,091$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 25,200$ | $\$ 28,800$ | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 38,880$ | $\$ 41,760$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 295 | 203 | 119 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 295 | 197 | 89 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 30 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 36 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / $50 \%$ of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 3 units, 1 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $50 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 3 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 1 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 754$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 978$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,794$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 33,531$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 52,200$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 473 | 341 | 235 | 146 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 442 | 303 | 199 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 31 | 38 | 35 | 50 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
154
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 154 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, 3-Bedroom, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 4 units, 2 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2022. Our analysis assumes a $35 \%$ income qualification ratio and 5-person households.

| Unit Details |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Target Population | Family Households |
| Unit Type | 3-Bedroom |
| Rent Type | Restricted |
| Income Limit | $60 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 2 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 754$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 224$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 978$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,794$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 33,531$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | $\$ 62,640$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |
| Size Qualified | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 168 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 909 | 442 | 303 | 199 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 39 | 101 | 68 | 68 | 72 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 348
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 348 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This unit-level demand estimate does not account for income band overlap with other units. Projectlevel demand estimates taking these factors into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Restricted, 40\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI at the subject property.

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |  |  |

Demand Estimate, Restricted, 40\% of AMI

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR | $\$ 25,200$ | $\$ 28,800$ | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR | - | $\$ 28,800$ | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 36,000$ | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR | - | - | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 38,880$ | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 25,200$ | $\$ 28,800$ | $\$ 32,400$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 38,880$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Minimum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR | $\$ 23,143$ | $\$ 23,143$ | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR | - | $\$ 27,771$ | $\$ 27,771$ | $\$ 27,771$ | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR | - | - | $\$ 32,091$ | $\$ 32,091$ | $\$ 32,091$ | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 23,143$ | $\$ 23,143$ | $\$ 27,771$ | $\$ 27,771$ | $\$ 32,091$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH Below Upper Income | 765 | 381 | 295 | 203 | 119 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income | 720 | 320 | 264 | 171 | 89 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 44 | 61 | 31 | 32 | 30 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 198 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to 50\% of AMI at the subject property.

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |  |  |

Demand Estimate, Restricted, 50\% of AMI

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR | - | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 31,500$ | $\$ 36,000$ | $\$ 40,500$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 48,600$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Minimum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR | - | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH Below Upper Income | 890 | 473 | 341 | 235 | 146 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income | 765 | 343 | 264 | 171 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 125 | 131 | 77 | 63 | 50 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 446 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI at the subject property.

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 285 | 83 | 93 | 67 | 21 | 12 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 654 | 287 | 204 | 103 | 54 | 29 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 875 | 398 | 284 | 194 | 80 | 41 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 972 | 523 | 339 | 209 | 126 | 60 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 1,124 | 589 | 377 | 260 | 150 | 71 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 1,160 | 670 | 390 | 278 | 173 | 79 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 1,194 | 767 | 414 | 323 | 181 | 82 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 1,251 | 912 | 486 | 380 | 191 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 1,269 | 940 | 501 | 438 | 199 | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 1,306 | 961 | 519 | 463 | 210 | 90 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 1,321 | 969 | 522 | 464 | 221 | 94 |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 1,338 | 994 | 533 | 468 | 227 | 94 |  |  |

Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 37,800$ | $\$ 43,200$ | $\$ 48,600$ | $\$ 54,000$ | $\$ 58,320$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Minimum Income, 0BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 25,337$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 27,977$ | $\$ 33,531$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH Below Upper Income | 948 | 543 | 371 | 267 | 168 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income | 765 | 343 | 264 | 171 | 96 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 183 | 200 | 107 | 96 | 72 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 659 size- and income-qualified units in the market area.
Please note: This demand estimate does not account for income band overlap at the project level. A demand estimate taking this into consideration will be developed later.

## Demand Estimate

In this section, we derive our overburdened demand and capture rate estimates for the subject property. Our analysis, which begins with the income-qualified renter household estimates developed above, is found below.

| Income Qualified Renter Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  | 198 | 446 | 659 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to account for 2 years of growth to estimate the demand stemming from new income qualified rental households. Our estimates are found below.


The next step in our analysis is to estimate existing demand stemming from income-qualified overburdened renter households in this market area. Our estimates are found below.


The next step in our analysis is to estimate existing demand stemming from income-qualified substandard renter households in this market area. Our estimates are found below.


The next step in our analysis is to account for elderly homeowners likely to convert to rental housing. This component may not comprise more than 20 percent of total demand. Our estimates are found below.

Elderly Homeowners Likely to Convert to Rental Housing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tot | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |

The next step in our analysis is to account for existing qualifying tenants likely to remain after renovation. Our estimates are found below.

| Subject Property Units (Total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  | 5 | 19 | 24 |  |  |  |

Existing Qualifying Tenants Likely to Remain after Renovation

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tot |  |  | 2 | 10 | 12 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to tally up total demand for the subject property. Our estimates are found below.

| Total Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  | 83 | 192 | 281 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to tabulate the number of vacant competing \& pipeline units in the market area by unit/income type. This information will be used to further refine our capture rate estimate for the subject property. A table showing the distribution of vacant competing \& pipeline units is found below.

| Vacant Competing \& Pipeline Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  |  | 3 | 9 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to subtract the number of vacant competing \& pipeline units from total demand to arrive at a net demand estimate for the subject property. Our estimates are found below.

| Net Demand (Total Demand - Vacant Competing \& Pipeline Units) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  | 83 | 189 | 272 |  |  |  |

The next step in our analysis is to compute the capture rate for the project. For purposes of this computation, we define capture rate as the total number of subject property units divided by net demand. Underwriters often utilize capture rate limits of 10 to 20 percent using this methodology. Our estimates are presented below:

| Capture Rates (Subject Property Units / Net Demand) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| Tot |  |  | $6.0 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ |  |  |  |

Our findings are summarized below.

| Project-Wide Capture Rate - LIHTC Units | $8.8 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - Market Units |  |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - All Units | $8.8 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period (Months) | 2 months |

Please note: Project-wide capture rate estimates do not account for income band overlap at the project level.

RENT COMPARABLES, MARKET RATE

|  | Project Information |
| :--- | ---: |
| Property Name | Autumn Ridge 1 |
| Street Number | 114 |
| Street Name | Nancy |
| Street Type | Drive |
| City | Suffolk |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23434 |
| Phone Number | (757) $934-0847$ |
| Year Built | 1975 |
| Year Renovated | 2016 |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | 1 month |
| Other Fees | $\$ 69$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Bond |
| Vouchers | 20 |
| Latitude | 2002 |
| Longitude |  |
| Nearest Crossroads |  |
| AAC Code |  |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Ruby, Leasing Agent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 934-0847 |
| Interview Date | $15-$ Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | AK |

2002 Bond awarded for rehabilitation of this HUD property without project based rental assistance. 2012 renovations included new roofs, gutters, siding, doors and other exterior work. Rehab which began in 2016 includes flooring, cabinets and countertops, which is still on going as of our 2022 survey. Units have carpet and vinyl, with contacts
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Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | yes | yes |
| Sewer | yes | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Similar

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |  |
| Cable | yes | yes |  |
| Internet | yes | no |  |
| Comp vs | Subject | Inferior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.25 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.25 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.20 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.60 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.75 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2010 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | no | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | no | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | no | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | no | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | no | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Air Conditioning |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Window Units | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Heat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Baseboards | no | no |
| Boiler/Radiators | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Garage | no | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | no | no |
| Open | yes | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| W/D Units | no | no |
| W/D Hookups | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Autumn Ridge 1 is an existing multifamily development located at 114 Nancy Drive in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 128 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1975 with bond financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 96 percent occupancy.

Project Information

| Property Name | Hillpoint Woods Apartments |
| :--- | ---: |
| Street Number | 601 |
| Street Name | Hill Point |
| Street Type | Road |
| City | Suffolk |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23434 |
| Phone Number | (757) $923-2700$ |
| Year Built | 2005 |
| Year Renovated | na |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 300$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 50$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Conventional |
| Vouchers |  |
| Latitude | 36.7816 |
| Longitude | -76.5783 |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |
| AAC Code | 047 |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Allison, Manager |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 923-2700 |
| Interview Date | $16-$ Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | AK |

4 units rehabbed due to fire in 2014. Contact advised new apartments
"Port 58", which we have included in our study.


Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | yes | yes |
| Sewer | yes | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Similar

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs Subject | Inferior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.00 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 4.50 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.50 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 4.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2010 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | yes | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | yes | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | yes | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | yes | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | yes | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Air Conditioning |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Window Units | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Heat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Baseboards | no | no |
| Boiler/Radiators | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Garage | no | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | no | no |
| Open | yes | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| W/D Units | no | no |
| W/D Hookups | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Hillpoint Woods Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 601 Hill Point Road in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 144 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2005 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 99 percent occupancy.

| Project Information | Meadowridge Apartments |
| :--- | ---: |
| Property Name | 340 |
| Street Number | N. College |
| Street Name | Drive |
| Street Type | Franklin |
| City | Virginia |
| State | 23851 |
| Zip | (757) $657-4421$ |
| Phone Number | 1991 |
| Year Built | 2018 |
| Year Renovated | 12 |
| Minimum Lease | 1 month rent |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 50$ |
| Other Fees | yes |
| Waiting List | Market Rate |
| Project Rent | Family |
| Project Type | Stabilized |
| Project Status | Conventional |
| Financing |  |
| Vouchers | 36.6774 |
| Latitude | -76.9441 |
| Longitude | na |
| Nearest Crossroads | 060 |
| AAC Code | $22-022$ |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Paula, Manager |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 986-6287 |
| Interview Date | 14-Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | AK |

Property began renovations in 2012 and are continuing at a rate of about 6 per year, which include new cabinets, counter tops, flooring and flooring. Contact advised renovated units have a $\$ 60$ premium over the non-renovated units. This report reflects rates for the renovated units. Higher rate for smaller 1 bedroom units due to unit location.


Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | yes | yes |
| Sewer | yes | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Similar

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs |  |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.75 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.00 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.50 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 4.00 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | no | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | no | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Air Conditioning |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Window Units | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Heat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Baseboards | no | no |
| Boiler/Radiators | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Garage | no | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | yes | no |
| Open | yes | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| W/D Units | no | no |
| W/D Hookups | some | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Meadowridge Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 340 N . College Drive in Franklin, Virginia. The property, which consists of 97 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1991 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

|  | Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | Morris Creek Landing Apartments |  |
| Street Number | 982 |  |
| Street Name | John Rolfe |  |
| Street Type | Drive |  |
| City | Smithfield |  |
| State | Virginia |  |
| Zip | 23430 |  |
| Phone Number | (757) $357-0102$ |  |
| Year Built | 1988 |  |
| Year Renovated | 2004 |  |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |  |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 450$ |  |
| Other Fees | $\$ 165$ |  |
| Waiting List | 20 people |  |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |  |
| Project Type | Family |  |
| Project Status | Stabilized |  |
| Financing | Conventional |  |
| Vouchers |  |  |
| Latitude | 36.9765 |  |
| Longitude | -76.6099 |  |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |  |
| AAC Code | $22-022$ | 063 |



Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Gas | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Gas | yes | yes |
| Water | no | yes |
| Sewer | no | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inerior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.75 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.00 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 4.10 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.90 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.75 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | yes | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | yes | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | some | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | yes | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Morris Creek Landing Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 982 John Rolfe Drive in Smithfield, Virginia. The property, which consists of 87 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1988 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

| Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Property Name | Sadler Pond Apartments |
| Street Number | 2500 |
| Street Name | Sandy Spring |
| Street Type | Lane |
| City | Suffolk |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23434 |
| Phone Number | (757) $934-0738$ |
| Year Built | 1989 |
| Year Renovated | 2015 |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 450$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 199$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Conventional |
| Vouchers |  |
| Latitude | 36.7669 |
| Longitude | -76.5993 |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |
| AAC Code | 084 |



Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | yes | yes |
| Sewer | yes | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Similar

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |  |
| Cable | yes | yes |  |
| Internet | yes | no |  |
| Comp vs | Subject | Inferior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.25 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.25 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 3.40 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.50 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.25 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2000 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | no | yes |
| Pool | yes | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | yes | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | yes | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | yes | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Sadler Pond Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 2500 Sandy Spring Lane in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 109 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1989 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

Project Information

| Property Name | Suffolk Station Apartments |
| :--- | ---: |
| Street Number | 100 |
| Street Name | Forest Oak |
| Street Type | Lane |
| City | Suffolk |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23434 |
| Phone Number | (757) $934-3444$ |
| Year Built | 1987 |
| Year Renovated | 2015 |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 450$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 199$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Conventional |
| Vouchers | 25 |
| Latitude | 36.7185 |
| Longitude | -76.5878 |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |
| AAC Code | 090 |


| Interview Notes |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Person Interviewed | Ms. Brenda, Reginal Manager |
| Phone Number | (757) 934-3444 |
| Interview Date | 15-Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | AK |

2010 renovations included new roofs on 2 buildings, 20151 more roof. 2015-2018 renovations of kitchens and baths as units become available. In 2022, contact advised replacing cabinets, storage door, patio doors and balconies as needed. All reported rents for renovated units.


Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | yes | yes |
| Sewer | yes | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Similar

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs |  |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.25 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.90 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 4.50 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.25 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2010 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | no | no |
| Playground | no | yes |
| Pool | no | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Air Conditioning |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Window Units | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Heat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Baseboards | no | no |
| Boiler/Radiators | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Garage | no | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | no | no |
| Open | yes | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| W/D Units | no | no |
| W/D Hookups | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Suffolk Station Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 100 Forest Oak Lane in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 111 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1987 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 95 percent occupancy.

RENT COMPARABLES, RESTRICTED RENT

| Project Information |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Name |  | Autumn Ridge 2 - LC2 |
| Street Number |  | 116 |
| Street Name |  | Nancy |
| Street Type |  | Drive |
| City |  | Suffolk |
| State |  | Virginia |
| Zip |  | 23434 |
| Phone Number |  | (757) 934-0847 |
| Year Built |  | 1998 |
| Year Renovated |  | na |
| Minimum Lease |  | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. |  | 1 month |
| Other Fees |  | \$69 |
| Waiting List |  | no |
| Project Rent |  | Restricted |
| Project Type |  | Family |
| Project Status |  | Stabilized |
| Financing | 1994 | Tax Credit |
| Vouchers |  | 7 |
| Latitude |  | 36.7121 |
| Longitude |  | -76.5894 |
| Nearest Crossroads |  | ansemond Square Apts |
| AAC Code | 22-022 | 003 |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Ruthie, Leasing Agent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 934-0847 |
| Interview Date | 11-Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

1994 TC's awarded for construction of this property without project based rental assistance. Units have carpet and vinyl, although contact advised in 2016, property is changing to laminate wood. 2019
renovations included countertops and windows. Contact advised of new
Kroger and several new shopping centers in the area.



Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | no | yes |
| Sewer | no | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inerior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.00 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.20 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.60 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | no | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | no | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | no | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | no | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Air Conditioning |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Window Units | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Heat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Baseboards | no | no |
| Boiler/Radiators | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Garage | no | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | no | no |
| Open | yes | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| W/D Units | no | no |
| W/D Hookups | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Autumn Ridge $2-$ LC2 is an existing multifamily development located at 116 Nancy Drive in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 24 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1998 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 96 percent occupancy.

Project Information

| Property Name |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Street Number | 100 |
| Street Name | Cattail |
| Street Type | Lane |
| City | Smithfield |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23430 |
| Phone Number | (757) $357-0707$ |
| Year Built | 1994 |
| Year Renovated | 2013 |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 175$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 32$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Restricted |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Bond |
| Vouchers | 80 |
| Latitude | 2012 |
| Longitude | 36.9594 |
| Nearest Crossroads | -76.6012 |
| AAC Code | na |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Kendra, Leasing Agent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 357-0707 |
| Interview Date | 11-Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

2012 Bond awarded for construction of this property without units of project based rental assistance available to tenants. 2012 and 2013 renovations included kitchen cabinets, appliances, counter tops, H/W heaters, A/C units, windows, hardwood laminate in entry halls and dinning rooms. New roofs in 2010.
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Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | no | yes |
| Sewer | no | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inerior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.50 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 4.30 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.50 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 4.00 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | yes | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | yes | no |
| Comm Center | yes | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | yes | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | yes | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | na | no |
| Concierge | na | no |
| Hair Salon | na | no |
| Health Care | na | no |
| Housekeeping | na | no |
| Meals | na | no |
| Transportation | na | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Bradford Mews Phase 1 \& 2 is an existing multifamily development located at 100 Cattail Lane in Smithfield, Virginia. The property, which consists of 120 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1994 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 99 percent occupancy.

Project Information

| Property Name | King's Landing Apartments |
| :--- | ---: |
| Street Number | 1000 |
| Street Name | Litton |
| Street Type | Lane |
| City | Suffolk |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23434 |
| Phone Number | (877) $883-0784$ |
| Year Built | 1992 |
| Year Renovated | na |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 500$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 32$ |
| Waiting List | 6 people |
| Project Rent |  |
| Project Type | Restricted |
| Project Status | Family |
| Financing | Stabilized |
| Vouchers | Tax Credit |
| Latitude | 24 |
| Longitude | 1990 |
| Nearest Crossroads |  |
| AAC Code |  |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Amanda, Management |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (877) 883-0784 |
| Interview Date | 11-Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

1990 TC's awarded for construction of this property without project based rental assistance. 2014 and 2015 property replaced stoves and refrigerators. 2013 replaced all AC units. 2017 new roof. 2018 rehab of some 1BR units - kitchen countertops, flooring, and cabinets. 2021 resurfaced parking lot. There are no new apartments or businesses


Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | no | yes |
| Sewer | no | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs |  |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.25 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.25 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 4.20 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 4.00 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 4.00 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2010 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | yes | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | yes | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | yes | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | some | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | no | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | yes | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

King's Landing Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 1000 Litton Lane in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 120 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1992 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

|  | Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | October Station Apartments |  |
| Street Number | 2065 |  |
| Street Name | Freeney |  |
| Street Type | Avenue |  |
| City | Suffolk |  |
| State | Virginia |  |
| Zip | 23434 |  |
| Phone Number | $757-935-5212$ |  |
| Year Built | 2016 |  |
| Year Renovated | na |  |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |  |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 250$ |  |
| Other Fees | $\$ 160$ |  |
| Waiting List | no |  |
| Project Rent | Restricted |  |
| Project Type | Family |  |
| Project Status | Stabilized |  |
| Financing | Tax Credit |  |
| Vouchers | 27 |  |
| Latitude | 2016 | 36.7299 |
| Longitude | -76.5569 |  |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |  |
| AAC Code |  | 075 |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Jasmine, Manager |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 935-5212 |
| Interview Date | 11-Feb-22 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

2016 \& 2017 Tax Credits were awarded for new construction of this property with 8 HUD project based rental assistance units available to tenants. 5 HC units. Lawson Investment - Carl Hardee 757-499-6161.
Property has a clubhouse patio for residents in lieu of a gazebo. There are no new apartments or businesses nearby.


Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | yes | yes |
| Sewer | yes | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Similar

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs Subject | Inferior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.50 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.50 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.00 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 3.40 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 4.00 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2016 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | yes | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | yes | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | yes | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | yes | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | no | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | na | no |
| Concierge | na | no |
| Hair Salon | na | no |
| Health Care | na | no |
| Housekeeping | na | no |
| Meals | na | no |
| Transportation | na | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

October Station Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 2065 Freeney Avenue in Suffolk, Virginia. The property, which consists of 48 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2016 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

| Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Property Name | Woods Edge Apartments |
| Street Number | 764 |
| Street Name | Wrenn |
| Street Type | Road |
| City | Smithfield |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23430 |
| Phone Number | (757) $357-3263$ |
| Year Built | 1984 |
| Year Renovated | 1999 |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | 1 month |
| Other Fees | $\$ 19$ |
| Waiting List |  |
| Project Rent | Res |
| Project Type |  |
| Project Status |  |
| Financing | Family |
| Vouchers |  |
| Latitude |  |
| Longitude |  |
| Nearest Crossroads |  |
| AAC Code |  |



Unit Configuration


| Tenant-Paid Utilities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Utility | Comp | Subj |
| Heat-Electric | yes | yes |
| Cooking-Electric | yes | yes |
| Other Electric | yes | yes |
| Air Cond | yes | yes |
| Hot Water-Electric | yes | yes |
| Water | no | yes |
| Sewer | no | yes |
| Trash | no | no |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inerior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 4.00 | 3.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 4.00 | 3.50 |
| Comp vs Subject | Superior |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 3.30 | 2.90 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 2.20 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 1990 | 2012 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | no | no |
| Billiard/Game | no | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | no | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | no | yes |
| Elevator | no | no |
| Fitness Ctr | no | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | no | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | no | no |
| Library | no | no |
| Movie/Media Ctr | no | no |
| Picnic Area | no | no |
| Playground | yes | yes |
| Pool | no | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | yes | yes |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | no | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Kitchen Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Stove | yes | yes |
| Refrigerator | yes | yes |
| Disposal | no | no |
| Dishwasher | no | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Air Conditioning |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Window Units | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Heat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| Wall Units | no | no |
| Baseboards | no | no |
| Boiler/Radiators | no | no |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Garage | no | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | no | no |
| Open | yes | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | yes | yes |
| W/D Units | no | no |
| W/D Hookups | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | some |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | no |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | no |
| Concierge | no | no |
| Hair Salon | no | no |
| Health Care | no | no |
| Housekeeping | no | no |
| Meals | no | no |
| Transportation | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Woods Edge Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 764 Wrenn Road in Smithfield, Virginia. The property, which consists of 60 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1984 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 88 percent occupancy.

## STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS \& LIMITING CONDITIONS

- The title to the subject property is merchantable, and the property is free and clear of all liens and encumbrances, except as noted.
- No liability is assumed for matters legal in nature.
- Ownership and management are assumed to be in competent and responsible hands.
- No survey has been made by the appraiser. Dimensions are as supplied by others and are assumed to be correct.
- The report was prepared for the purpose so stated and should not be used for any other reason.
- All direct and indirect information supplied by the owner and their representatives concerning the subject property is assumed to be true and accurate.
- No responsibility is assumed for information supplied by others and such information is believed to be reliable and correct. This includes zoning and tax information provided by Municipal officials.
- The signatories shall not be required to give testimony or attend court or be at any governmental hearing with respect to the subject property unless prior arrangements have been made with the client.
- Disclosure of the contents of this report is governed by the By-Laws and Regulations of the Appraisal Institute.
- The legal description is assumed to be accurate.
- This report specifically assumes that there are no site, subsoil, or building contaminates present resulting from residual substances or construction materials, such as asbestos, radon gas, PCB, etc. Should any of these factors exist, the appraiser reserves the right to review these findings, review the value estimates, and change the estimates, if deemed necessary.
- The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective January 26, 1992. We have not made a specific compliance survey and analysis of this property to determine whether or not it is in conformity with
- This analysis specifically assumes that the subject property is operated as described in this report.
- This analysis specifically assumes that the subject property is constructed/rehabilitated as described in this report.
- This analysis specifically assumes that the subject property is financed as described in this report.
- This analysis specifically assumes the timing set forth in this report.


## CERTIFICATION

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions and are my personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
- I performed an appraisal and market study for the subject property in 2019.
- I have performed no services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.
- I have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
- My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
- My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of the appraisal.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the requirements of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.
- I made a personal inspection of the property that is the subject of this report.
- No one provided significant real property appraisal assistance to the person signing this certification. Debbie Rucker (Allen \& Associates Consulting) assisted in compiling the data used in this report.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the requirements of the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.
- The use of this report is subject to the requirements of the Appraisal Institute relating to review by its duly authorized representatives.
- As of the date of this report, I have completed the Standards and Ethics Education Requirements for Members of the Appraisal Institute.
- I am presently licensed in good standing as a Certified General Real Estate Appraiser in the states of Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, allowing me to appraise all types of real estate.

Respectfully submitted:
ALLEN \& ASSOCIATES CONSULTING, INC.


Jeff Carroll

## VHDA CERTIFICATION

I affirm the following:

1) I have made a physical inspection of the site and market area.
2) The appropriate information has been used in the comprehensive evaluation of the need and demand for the proposed rental units.
3) To the best of my knowledge the market can support the demand shown in this study. I understand that any misrepresentation in this statement may result in the denial of participation in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program in Virginia as administered by the VHDA.
4) Neither I nor anyone at my firm has any interest in the proposed development or a relationship with the ownership entity.
5) Neither I nor anyone at my firm nor anyone acting on behalf of my firm in connection with the preparation of this report has communicated to others that my firm is representing VHDA or in any way acting for, at the request of, or on behalf of VHDA.
6) Compensation for my services is not contingent upon this development receiving a LIHTC reservation or allocation.

March 6, 2022

Jeff Carroll
Date

## NCHMA MARKET STUDY INDEX

Introduction: Members of the National Council of Housing Market Analysts provide the following checklist referencing various components necessary to conduct a comprehensive market study for rental housing. By completing the following checklist, the NCHMA Analyst certifies that he or she has performed all necessary work to support the conclusions included within the comprehensive market study. By completion of this checklist, the analyst asserts that he/she has completed all required items per section.

| Executive Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Executive Summary | Executive Summary |
| Scope of Work |  |  |
| 2 | Scope of Work | Letter of Transmittal |
| Project Description |  |  |
| 3 | Unit mix including bedrooms, bathrooms, square footage, rents, and in targeting <br> Utilities (and utility sources) included in rent <br> Target market/population description <br> Project description including unit features and community amenities <br> Date of construction/preliminary completion <br> If rehabilitation, scope of work, existing rents, and existing vacancies | Section 1 |
| 4 |  | Section 2 |
| 5 |  | Section 1 |
| 6 |  | Section 2 |
| 7 |  | Section 1 |
| 8 |  | Section 1 |
| Location |  |  |
| 9 | Concise description of the site and adjacent parcels | Sections 3 \& 4 |
| 10 | Site photos/maps | Section 5 |
| 11 | Map of community services | Section 4 |
| 12 | Site evaluation/neighborhood including visibility, accessibility, and crime | Section 4 |
| Market Area |  |  |
| 13 | PMA description | Section 6 |
| 14 | PMA Map | Section 6 |
| Employment and Economy |  |  |
| 15 | At-Place employment trends <br> Employment by sector <br> Unemployment rates <br> Area major employers/employment centers and proximity to site <br> Recent or planned employment expansions/reductions | Section 7 |
| 16 |  | Section 7 |
| 17 |  | Section 7 |
| 18 |  | Section 7 |
| 19 |  | Section 7 |
| Demographic Characteristics |  |  |
| 20 | Population and household estimates and projections <br> Area building permits <br> Population and household characteristics including income, tenure, and size <br> For senior or special needs projects, provide data specific to target market | Section 8 |
| 21 |  | Section 7 |
| 22 |  | Section 8 |
| 23 |  | Section 8 |
| Competitive Environment |  |  |
| 24 | Comparable property profiles and photos <br> Map of comparable properties <br> Existing rental housing evaluation including vacancy and rents <br> Comparison of subject property to comparable properties <br> Discussion of availability and cost of other affordable housing options including homeownership, if applicable <br> Rental communities under construction, approved, or proposed <br> For senior or special needs populations, provide data specific to target market | Appendix |
| 25 |  | Section 10 |
| 26 |  | Section 9 |
| 27 |  | Section 10 |
| 28 |  | NA |
| 29 |  | Section 9 |
| 30 |  | Section 8 |

## NCHMA MARKET STUDY INDEX

Introduction: Members of the National Council of Housing Market Analysts provide the following checklist referencing various components necessary to conduct a comprehensive market study for rental housing. By completing the following checklist, the NCHMA Analyst certifies that he or she has performed all necessary work to support the conclusions included within the comprehensive market study. By completion of this checklist, the analyst asserts that he/she has completed all required items per section.

| Affordability, Demand, and Penetration Rate Analysis |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | Estimate of demand | Section 11 |
| 32 | Affordability analysis with capture rate | Section 11 |
| 33 | Penetration rate analysis with capture rate | Section 11 |
| Analysis/Conclusions |  |  |
| 34 | Absorption rate and estimated stabilized occupancy for subject Evaluation of proposed rent levels including estimate of market/achievable rents. | Section 11 |
| 35 |  | Section 10 |
| 36 | Precise statement of key conclusions <br> Market strengths and weaknesses impacting project <br> Product recommendations and/or suggested modifications to subject <br> Discussion of subject property's impact on existing housing <br> Discussion of risks or other mitigating circumstances impacting subject <br> Interviews with area housing stakeholders | Executive Summary |
| 37 |  | Executive Summary |
| 38 |  | Executive Summary |
| 39 |  | Executive Summary |
| 40 |  | Executive Summary |
| 41 |  | Appendix |
| Other Requirements |  |  |
| 42 | Certifications <br> Statement of qualifications <br> Sources of data not otherwise identified | Appendix |
| 43 |  | Appendix |
| 44 |  | NA |

## MISCELLANEOUS

## Certificate of Professional Designation

This certificate verifies that<br>Jeff Carroll<br>Allen \& Associates Consulting Inc.

Has completed NCHMA's Professional Designation Requirements and is hence an approved member in good standing of:


Formerly known as NCAHMA

National Council of Housing Market Analysts
$140016^{\text {th }}$ St. NW
Suite 420
Washington, DC 20036
202-939-1750

## Membership Term

1/1/2022 to 12/31/2022


Thomas Amdur President, NCHMA

Real Estate Advisory Services

## QUALIFICATIONS

Allen \& Associates Consulting is a real estate advisory firm specializing in affordable housing. Practice areas include low-income housing tax credits, tax-exempt bond transactions, HUD assisted and financed multifamily, USDA-RD assisted and financed properties, public housing, historic tax credits, conventional multifamily, and manufactured housing. Services include development consulting, rent comparability studies, market analysis, feasibility studies, appraisals, capital needs assessments, and utility studies.

Allen \& Associates Consulting and its sister organization Allen \& Associates Appraisal maintain offices in Charlotte, North Carolina and Detroit, Michigan, respectively. Allen \& Associates is approved to provide its services throughout the United States.

The following is a listing of key personnel for Allen \& Associates Consulting:

## Jeffrey B. Carroll

Jeffrey B. Carroll is President of Allen \& Associates Consulting. Since 2000, Mr. Carroll has completed over 3000 development consulting assignments in 46 states. Major projects include:

- Market Feasibility - Completed market studies for 13 proposed tax credit apartment developments on behalf of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The portfolio included 5 family and 8 senior communities. Our analysis identified the 4 best deals for the housing finance agency to consider funding.
- Valuation - Developed a disposition plan for a 30-property portfolio of apartments on behalf of a private owner. The 921-unit portfolio (located in MD, DE, PA and VA) was valued at $\$ 23$ million. Our client relied on our valuations and advice to maximize sales proceeds for the portfolio.
- Capital Needs Assessments - Completed capital needs assessments for an 8property portfolio of RD-financed apartments on behalf of a private developer. The portfolio (located in FL) included 6 family and 2 senior communities. Our client utilized our assessments to develop a scope of work for the proposed acquisition and renovation of the 214-unit portfolio.
- Utility Allowance Studies - Completed utility allowance studies for a portfolio of tax credit apartments on behalf of a large national owner/developer. The portfolio (located in CT, DC, IL, IN, MA, NC, OH, PA and VA) included 31 properties. Our client utilized our research to maximize rents and net operating income for the portfolio.
- Underwriting - Conducted a financial review on behalf of a local housing authority for the proposed redevelopment of a vacant historic textile mill into loft apartments. Our client had been asked to issue $\$ 4$ million in tax-exempt bonds for


## P.O. Box 79196

Charlotte, North Carolina 28271
Phone: 704-905-2276 • Fax: 704-220-0470
the $\$ 15$ million project. Our assistance in underwriting the transaction resulted in the green light for the development.

Mr. Carroll is a certified general appraiser, licensed to appraise real estate in the states of Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia. Mr. Carroll is also a designated member of the Appraisal Institute (MAI).

Mr. Carroll is a peer-reviewed member of the National Council of Housing Market Analysts, where he served on the Executive Committee and chaired the Data and Ethics Committees.

In addition, Mr. Carroll has also served as a market study reviewer for the Georgia and Michigan housing finance agencies.

Mr. Carroll has written articles on affordable housing, development, property management, market feasibility, and financial analysis for Urban Land magazine, The Journal of Property Management, Community Management magazine, Merchandiser magazine, HousingThink, and a publication of the Texas A\&M Real Estate Research Center known as Terra Grande.

Mr. Carroll has conducted seminars on affordable housing, development, property management, market feasibility, and financial analysis for the American Planning Association, Community Management magazine, the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, the Manufactured Housing Institute, the National Association of State and Local Equity Funds, the Virginia Community Development Corporation, and the National Council of Affordable Housing Market Analysts.

Mr. Carroll is also an experienced developer and property manager. His experience includes the development of tax credit apartment communities, conventional market rate apartments, manufactured home communities, and single-family subdivisions. He has also managed a portfolio of apartment complexes and manufactured home communities.

The following is a summary of Mr. Carroll's relevant educational background:
Clemson University, Bachelor of Science Degree
Major in Engineering
Minor Concentration in Economics 1983
Harvard University, Master's Degree in Business Administration
Major in General Management
Minor Concentration in Economics and Real Estate
Appraisal Institute
Qualifying Education for Licensure
2001
Continuing Education for Licensure \& MAI Designation 2020
ASTM International
Property Condition Assessments E2018.01
September 2006

# The Institute for Professional and Executive Development 

 Tax Credit Property DispositionOctober 2007
National Council of Affordable Housing Market Analysts Semi-Annual Meeting \& Continuing Education

2002-2014
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Utility Allowance Guidebook
MAP Training \& Certification
September 2007
September 2007
USDA Rural Development
Capital Needs Assessment Provider Training
Accessibility Standards Training
September 2007
September 2007
Mr. Carroll, who was awarded a scholarship on the Clemson University varsity wrestling team, has served as an assistant coach for a local high school wrestling team. Mr. Carroll resides in Charlotte, North Carolina with his wife Becky and his two children, Luke and Brittany.

## Debbie Rucker

Debbie Rucker is an analyst with Allen \& Associates Consulting, coordinating market research for the company. Mrs. Rucker has worked on over 2000 assignments and has conducted over 40,000 rent surveys.

Mrs. Rucker was also responsible for compiling the database of detailed information on of every tax credit and tax-exempt bond transaction in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Texas since 1999.

The following is a summary of Mrs. Rucker's relevant educational background:
National Council of Affordable Housing Market Analysts
Semi-Annual Meeting \& Continuing Education
Semi-Annual Meeting \& Continuing Education
September 2005
October 2006
Carolinas Council for Affordable Housing Spectrum $\mathrm{C}^{3}$ P Certification

October 2008
Mrs. Rucker is active in her church and helps run a local judo club. Mrs. Rucker is the mother of three and resides in Weddington, North Carolina.

Michael W. Lash
Michael W. Lash is President of Lash Engineering, an engineering firm located in Charlotte, North Carolina that works closely with Allen \& Associates Consulting on utility allowance studies and other specific engagements. Since 1981, Mr. Lash has completed hundreds of assignments including the design of industrial, commercial, multifamily, and single family developments. Mr. Lash is an expert in the design of utility systems, including wastewater and storm water treatment facilities.

Mr. Lash is a certified professional engineer, licensed in the states of Kansas, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. Mr. Lash graduated from Louisiana Tech University in Civil Engineering in 1981 and has conducted seminars on advanced wastewater treatment, storm water quality treatment and automated engineering drafting and design with Eagle Point Software.

Mr. Lash is active in his church and volunteers his time teaching karate at a local martial arts academy. Mr. Lash resides in Charlotte, North Carolina with his wife and three children.


[^0]:    Source: Allen \& Associates

