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Allen \& Associates Consulting, Inc.
P.O. Box 79196
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E-mail: jcarroll@allenadvisors.com

March 9, 2022
Mr. James R. Welter II
Community Housing Partners
4915 Radford Avenue \#300
Richmond, Virginia 23230
Re: Woods At Yorktown NC
Dear Mr. James R. Welter II:
The subject property, known as Woods at Yorktown NC, is a proposed affordable multifamily development to be located at 2801 Old Williamsburg Road in Yorktown, Virginia. The subject property is proposed to consist of 60 revenue-producing units to be constructed with an allocation of tax credits. The subject property is an open age community.

The subject property is proposed to consist of 60 revenue-producing units including 2 and 3-bedroom garden apartments. A total of 6 units are proposed to be income restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI; a total of 30 units are proposed to be income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 12 units are proposed to be income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI; a total of 12 units are proposed to be income restricted to $80 \%$ of AMI ; no units are proposed to be set aside as market rate units; a total of 12 units are proposed to benefit from project-based rental assistance; no units are proposed to benefit from HOME financing. The sponsor proposes to use $60 \%$ income averaging; the proposed unit mix yields $57 \%$ for the subject property. 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 Virginia Housing (fka 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 Community Housing Partners. Virginia Housing (fka 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 Woods at Yorktown NC, is a proposed affordable multifamily development to be located at 2801 Old Williamsburg Road in Yorktown, Virginia. The subject property is proposed to consist of 60 revenueproducing units to be constructed 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 60 revenue-producing units including 2 and 3 -bedroom garden apartments. A total of 6 units are proposed to be income restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 30 units are proposed to be income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI; a total of 12 units are proposed to be income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI; a total of 12 units are proposed to be income restricted to $80 \%$ of AMI; no units are proposed to be set aside as market rate units; a total of 12 units are proposed to benefit from project-based rental assistance; no units are proposed to benefit from HOME financing. The sponsor proposes to use $60 \%$ income averaging; the proposed unit mix yields $57 \%$ for the subject property. 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 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,053 | \$153 | \$900 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,053 | \$153 | \$900 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / $50 \%$ of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$941 | \$153 | \$788 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$1,158 | \$153 | \$1,005 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,282 | \$182 | \$1,100 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,282 | \$182 | \$1,100 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | \$1,087 | \$182 | \$905 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 12 | \$1,307 | \$182 | \$1,125 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | \$1,322 | \$182 | \$1,140 |
| Total/Average |  |  | 60 | \$1,180 | \$176 | \$1,004 |

## Site Description

The subject property is proposed to be constructed on a 6.84 -acre portion of a larger irregular-shaped parcel with approximately 1100 feet of road frontage.

A total of 124 parking spaces are planned for this development (112 regular / 12 accessible / 2.07 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 found in the immediate area. In our opinion, the current parking appears adequate for the subject property.

Additional Considerations:

| Zoning | RMF. Legal, conforming use. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Environmental | New construction. No suspected environmental conditions. |
| Topography | No issues detected. |
| Flood | Zone X. Outside the 100-year flood zone. |
| DDA Status | York County, Virginia. Not designated as a Difficult to Develop Area. |
| QCT Status | Tract 505.00. Not designated as a Qualified Census Tract. |
| Access | Fair/Good. Located near a moderately-traveled road. |
| Visibility | Fair/Good. Significant frontage but moderate drive-by traffic. |

In our opinion, the site is suitable for development.

## Neighborhood Description

In our opinion, the subject property has a fair 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 Similar crime rates to market average.
Schools Lower graduation rates than market average.
Average Commute Longer 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 15-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 94,813 persons and covers a total of 132.2 square miles, making it 13.0 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 94,813 and is projected to |
| :--- | :--- |
| grow 0.8 percent this year. |  |
| Households | Market area households currently stand at 32,988 and is projected to <br> grow 0.5 percent this year. |
| Renter Households | Market area renter households currently stand at 12,562 and is <br> projected to grow 0.6 percent this year. |
| Renter Tenure | Market area renter tenure currently stands at 38.1 percent. <br> Rent Growth |
| Market area rents have grown $2.07 \%$ 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 237,164 and is <br> projected to grow 1.1 percent this year. <br> Regional civilian employment currently stands at 161,888 and is <br> Civ Employment <br> projected to grow 0.6 percent this year. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Regional establishment employment currently stands at 237,164. The |  |
| data suggests that Manufacturing is the largest employment category |  |
| accounting for 13.5\% of total regional employment. Health Care and |  |
| Social Assistance is the second largest category accounting for 10.4\% |  |
| of total employment. State and Local Government is the third largest |  |
| category accounting for 9.9\% of total employment. Retail Trade is the |  |
| fourth largest category accounting for 9.2\% of total employment. |  |
| Accommodation and Food Services is the fifth largest category |  |
| accounting for $8.9 \%$ of total employment. |  |

Top Employers The top employers include: (1) Huntington Ingalls Industries (20000 employees); (2) Newport News Shipbuilding (16335 employees) and; (3) College-William-Mary Student (4800 employees).

Layoffs/Expansions Major employers are currently hiring; none reported any pending layoffs.

## Supply Analysis

Our analysis includes a total of 41 confirmed market area properties consisting of 6,831 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 | 23 | 4,656 | 231 | $95 \%$ |
| Restricted | 15 | 1,910 | 14 | $99 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 3 | 265 | 2 | $99 \%$ |
| Total | 41 | 6,831 | 247 | $96 \%$ |


| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family |  |  |  |  |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 21 | 4,404 | 77 | $98 \%$ |
| Restricted | 12 | 1,607 | 12 | $99 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 2 | 217 | 2 | $99 \%$ |
| Total | 35 | 6,228 | 91 | $99 \%$ |


| Elderly |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Restricted | 3 | 303 | 2 | $99 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Total | 3 | 303 | 2 | $99 \%$ |


| Pipeline |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family |  |  |  |  |
| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| Market Rate | 1 | 102 | 4 | $96 \%$ |
| Restricted | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Total | 1 | 102 | 4 | $96 \%$ |

Elderly

| Project Type | Properties | Units | Vacant | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Rate | 1 | 150 | 150 | $0 \%$ |
| Restricted | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Subsidized | 1 | 48 | 0 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 2 | 198 | 150 | $24 \%$ |

## 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 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 216 | $100 \%$ | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | 3.57 |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apar | 96 | $100 \%$ | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | 5.33 |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 232 | $100 \%$ | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | 5.40 |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartm | 89 | $100 \%$ | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | 3.96 |

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 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 228 | $100 \%$ | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | 4.54 |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 274 | $100 \%$ | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | 5.77 |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 296 | $100 \%$ | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | 5.65 |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 182 | $100 \%$ | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | 4.34 |

## Achievable Rents

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

| Achievable Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | Achievable | Proposed | Advantage |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,240 | \$900 | 27.4\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,240 | \$900 | 27.4\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$798 | \$788 | 1.3\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$1,015 | \$1,005 | 1.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,340 | \$1,100 | 17.9\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,340 | \$1,100 | 17.9\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | \$916 | \$905 | 1.2\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 12 | \$1,136 | \$1,125 | 1.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | \$1,150 | \$1,140 | 0.9\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | \$1,069 | \$1,004 | 6.1\% |

Our analysis suggests an average achievable rent of $\$ 1,069$ for the subject property. This is compared with an average proposed rent of $\$ 1,004$, yielding an achievable rent advantage of 6.1 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2-Bedroom / Subsidized / 40\% of AMI | 5 | 2,904 | 2 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 5.9\% | <1 |
| 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 50\% of AMI | 4 | 400 | 4 | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 61.0\% | <1 |
| 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI | 3 | 1,844 | 0 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | <1 |
| 3-Bedroom / Subsidized / 40\% of AMI | 7 | 3,049 | 0 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 1.2\% | <1 |
| 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 50\% of AMI | 20 | 192 | 0 | 10.4\% | 10.4\% | 43.8\% | 7 |
| 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 60\% of AMI | 12 | 226 | 0 | 5.3\% | 5.3\% | 118.6\% | 3 |
| 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI | 9 | 1,373 | 0 | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | <1 |
|  | Project-Wide Gross Capture Rate |  |  | 0.8\% |  |  |  |
|  | Project-Wide Net Capture Rate |  |  | 0.8\% |  |  |  |
|  | Project-Wide Penetration Rate |  |  | 11.3\% |  |  |  |
|  | Stabilized Occupancy |  |  | 97\% |  |  |  |
|  | Project-Wide Absorption Period |  |  | 7 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 elevated 3BR/60\% of AMI penetration rates suggest a competitive marketplace for these units. The sponsor should monitor these units closely during lease up.

Our analysis suggests that the subject property will stabilize at 97 percent occupancy. We estimate 7 months of absorption and an average absorption rate of 8.8 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.

## Virginia Housing Demand Analysis

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

| Project-Wide Capture Rate - LIHTC Units | $2.7 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - Market Units | $0.0 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - All Units | $2.7 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period (Months) | 7 mos |

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the subject property appears to be feasible from a market standpoint. The units appear to be priced appropriately and we anticipate a rapid lease-up after construction.

Because of the demonstrated depth of demand in this area, we do not believe the construction of this property will have an adverse impact on existing projects in the market area.

Woods At Yorktown NC
2801 Old Williamsburg Road
Yorktown, Virginia 23690

|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Income | \$5,246 |  |  | \$32,263 | \$44,811 |  | \$39,703 |  | \$5,246 |
| Maximum Income | \$36,520 |  |  | \$45,650 | \$54,780 |  | \$73,040 |  | \$73,040 |
| New Rental Households | 38 |  |  | 6 | 3 |  | 26 |  | 73 |
| (+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Households Overburdened | 928 |  |  | 141 | 66 |  | 622 |  | 1,757 |
| $(+)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Households - | 203 |  |  | 31 | 15 |  | 136 |  | 384 |
| Substandard Housing $(+)$ | 203 |  |  | 31 | 15 |  | 136 |  | 384 |
| Elderly Households - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Likely to Convert to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rental Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Qualifying |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenants - To Remain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| After Renovation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Demand | 1,169 |  |  | 178 | 84 |  | 783 |  | 2,214 |
| (-) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supply (Directly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comparable Vacant | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units Completed or in | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Pipeline in PMA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $=$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Demand | 1,167 |  |  | 174 | 84 |  | 783 |  | 2,208 |
| Proposed Units | 12 |  |  | 24 | 12 |  | 12 |  | 60 |
| Capture Rate | 1.0\% |  |  | 13.8\% | 14.3\% |  | 1.5\% |  | 2.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Absorption Period | 7 mos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Months) | 7 mos |  |  | 7 mos | 7 mos |  | 7 mos |  | 7 mos |
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## PROJECT OVERVIEW

## Project Description

The subject property, known as Woods at Yorktown NC, is a proposed affordable multifamily development to be located at 2801 Old Williamsburg Road in Yorktown, Virginia. The subject property is proposed to consist of 60 revenue-producing units to be constructed with an allocation of tax credits. The subject property is an open age community.

Select project details are summarized below:

| Project Description |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | Woods At Yorktown NC |
| Street Number | 2801 |
| Street Name | Old Williamsburg |
| Street Type | Road |
| City | Yorktown |
| County | York County |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23690 |
| Units | 60 |
| Project Rent | Restricted |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Prop Const |
| Financing Type | Bonds |
| Latitude | 37.2351 |
| Longitude | -76.5389 |

## Construction and Lease-Up Schedule

We anticipate a 14-month construction period for this project. Assuming a May 1, 2023 closing, this yields a date of completion of July 1, 2024. Our demand analysis (found later in this report) suggests a 7-month absorption period. This yields a date of stabilization of February 1, 2025.

## Unit Configuration

The subject property is proposed to consist of 60 revenue-producing units including 2 and 3-bedroom garden apartments. A total of 6 units are proposed to be income restricted to $40 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 30 units are proposed to be income restricted to $50 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 12 units are proposed to be income restricted to $60 \%$ of AMI ; a total of 12 units are proposed to be income restricted to $80 \%$ of AMI ; no units are proposed to be set aside as market rate units; a total of 12 units are proposed to benefit from project-based rental assistance; no units are proposed to benefit from HOME financing. The sponsor proposes to use $60 \%$ income averaging; the proposed unit mix yields $57 \%$ for the subject property. The rent and income restrictions associated with the proposed allocation of tax credits will run for the next 30 years.

| BR | BA | SF | Unit <br> Type | Income Limit | Rent <br> Limit | HOME Units | Subs <br> Units | Total <br> Units | Gross <br> Rent | Net <br> Rent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | 40\% | 40\% | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,053 | \$900 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | 50\% | 50\% | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,053 | \$900 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | 50\% | 50\% | No | No | 4 | \$941 | \$788 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | 80\% | 80\% | No | No | 3 | \$1,158 | \$1,005 |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | 40\% | 40\% | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,282 | \$1,100 |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | 50\% | 50\% | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,282 | \$1,100 |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | 50\% | 50\% | No | No | 20 | \$1,087 | \$905 |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | 60\% | 60\% | No | No | 12 | \$1,307 | \$1,125 |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | 80\% | 80\% | No | No | 9 | \$1,322 | \$1,140 |
| Tota | age | 1,087 |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | \$1,180 | \$1,004 |

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 | $\$ 17,760$ | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 35,520$ | $\$ 41,440$ | $\$ 47,360$ |
| 2.0 Person | $\$ 20,280$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 40,560$ | $\$ 47,320$ | $\$ 54,080$ |
| 3.0 Person | $\$ 22,830$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 45,660$ | $\$ 53,270$ | $\$ 60,880$ |
| 4.0 Person | $\$ 25,350$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 50,700$ | $\$ 59,150$ | $\$ 67,600$ |
| 5.0 Person | $\$ 27,390$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 54,780$ | $\$ 63,910$ | $\$ 73,040$ |
| 6.0 Person | $\$ 29,430$ | $\$ 39,240$ | $\$ 49,050$ | $\$ 58,860$ | $\$ 68,670$ | $\$ 78,480$ |
| 7.0 Person | $\$ 31,440$ | $\$ 41,920$ | $\$ 52,400$ | $\$ 62,880$ | $\$ 73,360$ | $\$ 83,840$ |
| 8.0 Person | $\$ 33,480$ | $\$ 44,640$ | $\$ 55,800$ | $\$ 66,960$ | $\$ 78,120$ | $\$ 89,280$ |

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 | $\$ 68,200$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 69,900$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 70,900$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 73,300$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 70,600$ | $-3.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 70,900$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 70,500$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 73,000$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 75,000$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 79,300$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 82,500$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 84,500$ | $2.4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O Bedroom | $\$ 444$ | $\$ 592$ | $\$ 740$ | $\$ 88$ | $\$ 1,036$ | $\$ 1,184$ |
| 1 Bedroom | $\$ 475$ | $\$ 634$ | $\$ 792$ | $\$ 951$ | $\$ 1,109$ | $\$ 1,268$ |
| 2 Bedroom | $\$ 570$ | $\$ 761$ | $\$ 951$ | $\$ 1,141$ | $\$ 1,331$ | $\$ 1,522$ |
| 3 Bedroom | $\$ 659$ | $\$ 879$ | $\$ 1,098$ | $\$ 1,318$ | $\$ 1,538$ | $\$ 1,758$ |
| 4 Bedroom | $\$ 735$ | $\$ 981$ | $\$ 1,226$ | $\$ 1,471$ | $\$ 1,716$ | $\$ 1,962$ |

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 | $\$ 993$ |
| 1 Bedroom | $\$ 1,015$ |
| 2 Bedroom | $\$ 1,193$ |
| 3 Bedroom | $\$ 1,676$ |
| 4 Bedroom |  |
| Source: HUD |  |



## 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 is proposed to consist of 60 revenue-producing units in 5 residential buildings and 1 nonresidential building. The development is proposed to include approximately 65,244 square feet of net rentable area and 77,049 square feet of gross building area.

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

## Exterior Wall - Exterior Finishes, Doors, Windows, Exterior Stairs, etc.

The subject is proposed to include fiber cement siding \& brick veneer, single hung vinyl double pane windows, and steel clad insulated six-panel unit entry doors.

Roof - Sheathing, Coverings, Warranties, Gutters \& Downspouts, Soffit \& Fascia, etc. The subject is proposed to include sloped asphalt shingle roofs.

## Vertical Transportation - Elevator, Interior Stair Systems

The subject property is proposed to consist of 3-story walk-up buildings with no elevators.

## Plumbing - Sanitary, Storm, Sewer, Fixtures, Domestic Hot Water

Domestic water piping is proposed to be constructed of CPVC pipe and fittings. Wastewater lines consist of PVC pipe and fittings. Potable hot water is proposed to be supplied via individual electric hot water heaters.

## HVAC - Heating, Air Conditioning, Ventilation

The subject property is proposed to include individual interior-mounted electric heat, individual exterior-mounted a/c compressors with interior-mounted air handlers.

Electrical and Communications - Distribution, Aluminum Wiring, etc. Buildings are proposed to receive electrical power from exterior pad-mounted transformers. Electrical service to units is proposed to consist of $120 / 240 \mathrm{~V}$ AC with 125 amps available for each panel. Electrical wiring is proposed to consist of copper. Properly grounded, three-prong outlets are proposed in each dwelling unit. The outlets located in the wet areas are proposed to be Ground Fault Circuit Interrupter (GFCI) outlets. Surface-mounted flourescent \& LED fixtures are proposed.

## Fire Suppression

The subject property is proposed to be equipped with an NFPA-13 fully automatic fire suppression (sprinkler) system. In addition, hard-wired smoke detectors with battery backup are proposed in each bedroom area.

## Unit Features

The subject property is proposed to contain 60 revenue-producing units including 54 regular units and 6 accessible units, including 168 bedrooms, 120 full bathrooms and 0 half bathrooms.

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

## Walls / Ceilings / Interior Doors

Subject property units are proposed to include 8 foot ceilings, painted gypsum wallboard \& ceilings, wood hollow-core two-panel interior doors and wood hollow-core two-panel closet doors.

## Floor Covering

Floor covering is proposed to consist of luxury vinyl plank in the entryways, bathrooms, and kitchens along with luxury vinyl plank in the living areas and bedrooms.

## Kitchens

Kitchens are proposed to include electric four-top ranges, range hoods, frost-free refrigerators, dishwashers, wood cabinets, laminated countertops and stainless steel sinks.

## Bathrooms

Bathrooms are proposed to include wood vanities, cultured marble countertops, porcelain sinks $\&$ toilets, along with fiberglass tubs \& surrounds.

## Project Amenities

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

## Site \& Common Area Amenities

A community center and a playground are proposed for the subject property.

## Parking

Open parking is proposed for the subject property.

## Laundry

A central laundry and washer/dryer hookups are proposed for the subject property.

## Security

Monitoring is proposed for the subject property.

## Services

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

## Utility Configuration

The subject property is proposed to include electric heat, electric cooking and electric hot water. 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 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | $40 \%$ of AMI | $40 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 153$ | $\$ 184$ |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | $\$ 153$ | $\$ 184$ |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 4 | $\$ 153$ | $\$ 184$ |
| 2 | 2.0 | 957 | Garden/Flat | $80 \%$ of AMI | $80 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 3 | $\$ 153$ | $\$ 184$ |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | $40 \%$ of AMI | $40 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 182$ | $\$ 245$ |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | $\$ 182$ | $\$ 245$ |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | $50 \%$ of AMI | $50 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 20 | $\$ 182$ | $\$ 245$ |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | $60 \%$ of AMI | $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 12 | $\$ 182$ | $\$ 245$ |
| 3 | 2.0 | 1,120 | Garden/Flat | $80 \%$ of AMI | $80 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 9 | $\$ 182$ | $\$ 245$ |
| Total/Average |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | $\$ 176$ | $\$ 233$ |  |

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 lower 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

We anticipate a useful/economic life of 50 years for this development, assuming that appropriate replacement reserves are established for this property.

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 |  |  |
| $\underset{\text { ৷̀ }}{\text { ৷ }}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\widetilde{N}} \\ & \stackrel{U}{U} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\square} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $$ |  |  |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | 2022 | 2021 | 4.50 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 2000 | 2000 | 3.00 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 1971 | 2005 | 3.00 | 8 | 5 | 6 |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1969 | 2005 | 3.00 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 2003 | 2005 | 3.50 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2019 | 2019 | 4.50 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 1996 | 2005 | 3.00 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 2006 | 2006 | 4.00 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 2014 | 2014 | 4.00 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Source: Allen \& Associates; Sponsor

| Amenites |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Site \＆Common Area Amenities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0}=\frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{\pi}{Z} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\bar{\sigma}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\text { D }} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 을 } \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \text { 우 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{\overline{1}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\cong}{\text { ® }} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | . | 믈 응 줌 | 응 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 尔 } \\ & \text { ָ̈n } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no |
| 054 | King＇s Ridge Apartments | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | some | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | no | no |


|  |  | Unit Amenities |  |  |  |  |  | Kitchen Amenities |  |  |  |  | Air Conditioning |  |  |  | Heat |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\text { ®े }}{\text { ® }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{+}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \frac{\pi}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & : \overline{\underline{0}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { 호 } \\ & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { 心 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Q} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { in } \\ & . \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \bar{\omega} \\ & \bar{N} \\ & \sum_{0}^{0} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 厄్ర } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\sum_{3}^{\overline{0}} \frac{0}{5}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { ¿ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\sum_{3}^{\overline{0}} \stackrel{n}{5}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | yes | some | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 054 | King＇s Ridge Apartments | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no |


|  |  | Parking |  |  |  |  | Laundry |  |  | Secuirty |  |  |  |  |  | Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 凶ิ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Q} \\ & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{Z}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\widetilde{\sigma}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{4} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{3} \frac{0}{5}$ | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{2}$ | $\overline{\overline{\mathrm{O}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{D} \\ & \overline{0} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { O} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{O} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | : |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tilde{n}}{\widetilde{\widetilde{ }}} \\ & \frac{\infty}{\sum} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| 054 | King＇s Ridge Apartments | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | some | no | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | yes | no | no | some | no | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |

[^0]Utilities

| Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tenant－Paid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Owner－Paid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { 㐅}}{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 으N } \\ & \text { 言 } \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \frac{0}{E} \\ & \hline \frac{U}{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 空 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \stackrel{u}{0} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | U总 | $\sum_{1}{ }_{1}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\vdots}{\stackrel{0}{0}} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ $\stackrel{y y y}{u}$ 0 |  |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |
| 054 | King＇s Ridge Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes |


| HUD Utility Schedule Model Output |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 Bedroom | 1 Bedroom | 2 Bedroom | 3 Bedroom | 4 Bedroom |
| Heat－Gas | 31 | 34 | 37 | 40 | 43 |
| Heat－Elec | 9 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Cooking－Gas | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 |
| Cooking－Elec | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 |
| Other Electric | 14 | 17 | 24 | 30 | 37 |
| Air Conditioning | 6 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 17 |
| Hot Water－Gas | 7 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| Hot Water－Elec | 9 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 20 |
| Water | 27 | 29 | 40 | 57 | 74 |
| Sewer | 53 | 56 | 76 | 105 | 134 |
| Trash | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 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 not 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. The developer did provide us with a description of the development's site features. A summary of these features is found below.

## Acres / Lot Shape / Frontage

The subject property is proposed to be constructed on a 6.84-acre portion of a larger irregular-shaped parcel with approximately 1100 feet of road frontage.

## Zoning

According to the sponsor, the subject property is currently zoned RMF. It is our understanding that the current zoning for the subject is a legal, conforming use.

## Parking / Streets / Curbs / Sidewalks

A total of 124 parking spaces are planned for this development (112 regular / 12 accessible / 2.07 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 found in the immediate area. In our opinion, the current parking appears adequate 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. 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 north. 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:


According to FEMA map number 51199C0106D dated January 16, 2015, 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 York County, 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 505.00 - an area that is not designated as a Qualified Census Tract. Consequently, the subject property does not 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 at 2801 Old Williamsburg Road in Yorktown, Virginia. Old Williamsburg Road is a moderately-traveled north-south road carrying approximately 8,500 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 Old Williamsburg Road with significant frontage 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 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\underset{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}}{ }$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ひ } \\ & \text { U } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ | 7 7 7 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ひ } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { U4 } \end{aligned}$ | 7 $i=2$ 7 |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | 2.50 | 2.50 | 7 | 5 |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3 | 3 |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 2.75 | 2.50 | 6 | 5 |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 3.00 | 3.25 | 3 | 1 |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 2.50 | 2.00 | 7 | 9 |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2.50 | 2.50 | 7 | 5 |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 3.50 | 3.25 | 1 | 1 |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 3.50 | 3.00 | 1 | 3 |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 3.00 | 2.50 | 3 | 5 |

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 Yorktown, Virginia. The subject property is surrounded by vacant land.

Surrounding property uses are summarized in the table found below:

| Surrounding Properties |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Direction | Use | Condition |
| North | Vacant Land | - |
| South | Vacant Land | - |
| East | Vacant Land | - |
| West | Vacant Land | - |

Source: Allen \& Associates

## Economic Characteristics

The subject property is located in an area with average household incomes of $\$ 28,895$ (in 2015 dollars); this is compared with $\$ 49,206$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with median cash rents of $\$ 729$ (in 2015 dollars); this is compared with $\$ 1,060$ 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 \$171,500 (in 2015 dollars); this is compared with $\$ 196,400$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

## Crime Rates

The subject property is located in an area with personal crime rates of $2.4 \%$. 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 $2.4 \%$.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with property crime rates of $1.8 \%$. 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 $2.6 \%$.

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 $87.6 \%$; this is compared with $92.9 \%$ for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with college graduation rates of $19.3 \%$; this is compared with $19.2 \%$ 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 29.2 minutes; this is compared with 26.1 minutes for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

In addition, the subject property is located in an area with an average of 1.16 vehicles per household; this is compared with 1.57 vehicles per household for the most comparable properties included in this analysis.

## Conclusion

In our opinion, the subject property has a fair 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 | Sonabank | 3.2 mi NE |
| Emergency Clinic | Food Lion | 3.7 mi NE |
| Pharmacy | Riverside Hayes Medical Center | 3.5 mi NE |
| Discount Store | Walgreens Pharmacy | 3.5 mi NE |
| Elementary School | Yorktown Elementary School | 3.5 mi NE |
| Middle School | JM Dozier Middle School | 3.1 mi SE |
| High School | York High School | 5.0 mi S |
| Bus Stop | Old Williamsburg Rd at Woods of Yorktown | 3.0 mi SE |

Source: Google Maps

Sonabank, Food Lion, Walgreens, and Dollar General are all located less than 4.0 miles away from the subject property. Riverside Hayes Medical Center is located 3.5 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 1 bank within 2.0 miles of the subject property. The subject is ranked 7 out of the 9 properties included in this analysis.
- A total of 0 grocery stores are in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 for the area.
- A total of 0 hospital are in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 6 for the area.
- A total of 0 pharmacies are in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 for the area.
- A total of 1 shopping center is in the vicinity of the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 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 0.83 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 5 out of the 9 properties included in this analysis.
- The nearest grocery store is 2.76 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 for the area.
- The nearest hospital is 6.32 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 for the area.
- The nearest pharmacy is 3.58 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 for the area.
- The nearest shopping center is 1.66 miles away from the subject property. The subject is ranked 9 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 |  | Commute |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { बे }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ते © } \\ & \text { D. © } \\ & \text { 은 U U } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | \$28,895 | \$729 | \$171,500 | 2.4\% | 1.8\% | 87.6\% | 19.3\% | 29.15 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 2.00 |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | \$50,884 | \$1,074 | \$198,900 | 3.4\% | 0.8\% | 95.1\% | 22.5\% | 22.73 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.90 |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | \$32,642 | \$794 | \$124,300 | 0.5\% | 1.1\% | 89.5\% | 12.3\% | 30.41 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 2.10 |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | \$41,014 | \$831 | \$213,900 | 5.5\% | 0.8\% | 89.9\% | 11.4\% | 27.66 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 2.30 |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | \$72,188 | \$1,351 | \$312,500 | 1.2\% | 2.1\% | 92.4\% | 34.8\% | 26.32 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 4.50 |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | \$52,292 | \$1,168 | \$153,100 | 1.0\% | 2.2\% | 93.8\% | 17.8\% | 25.68 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3.90 |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | \$70,769 | \$1,347 | \$225,700 | 1.0\% | 2.3\% | 94.1\% | 19.0\% | 25.59 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4.40 |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | \$52,292 | \$1,168 | \$153,100 | 1.0\% | 2.2\% | 93.8\% | 17.8\% | 25.68 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3.90 |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | \$41,875 | \$1,075 | \$214,600 | 5.5\% | 10.4\% | 100.0\% | 17.7\% | 21.40 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 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 |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त্} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 음 } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 등 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \stackrel{U}{0} \\ & \stackrel{O}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & 0.0 \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { 오 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 음 } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 읅 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & \ddot{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \overline{0} \\ & \text { NO } \\ & \text { 모 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Sub | Woods At Yorktown NC | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 6.3 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2.00 |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 1 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2.80 |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 10 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 64 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4.10 |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 8 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 57 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3.90 |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 2.10 |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 10 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 65 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 4.00 |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 4 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2.80 |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 10 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 66 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 4.50 |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 3 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 3.2 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 2.70 |

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

## 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 15-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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51095080101 | James City County | Virginia |
| 51095080102 | James City County | Virginia |
| 51199050303 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199050304 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199050306 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199050401 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199050402 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199050500 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199050900 | York County | Virginia |
| 51199051100 | York County | Virginia |
| 51700032123 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032124 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032131 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032132 | Newport News city | Virginia |


| 51700032211 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 51700032223 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032224 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032225 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032226 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032300 | Newport News city | Virginia |
| 51700032400 | Newport News city | Virginia |

The primary market area includes a population of 94,813 persons and covers a total of 132.2 square miles, making it 13.0 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


Drive Time


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 James City, Newport News, Williamsburg, and York County, 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 | 169 | $0.1 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Forestry, Fishing, Related Activities And Other Employment | 419 | $0.2 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Mining Employment | 150 | $0.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Utilities Employment | 434 | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Construction Employment | 9,474 | $4.0 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Manufacturing Employment | 31,943 | $13.5 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| Wholesale Trade Employment | 3,627 | $1.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Retail Trade Employment | 21,707 | $9.2 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| Transportation And Warehousing Employment | 5,981 | $2.5 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Information Employment | 2,019 | $0.9 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Finance And Insurance Employment | 6,371 | $2.7 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Real Estate And Rental And Lease Employment | 10,626 | $4.5 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| Professional And Technical Services Employment | 13,791 | $5.8 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |
| Management Of Companies And Enterprises Employment | 4,213 | $1.8 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Administrative And Waste Services Employment | 14,856 | $6.3 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Educational Services Employment | 3,423 | $1.4 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Health Care And Social Assistance Employment | 24,623 | $10.4 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ |
| Arts, Entertainment, And Recreation Employment | 8,715 | $3.7 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Accommodation And Food Services Employment | 21,071 | $8.9 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| Other Services, Except Public Administration Employment | 12,823 | $5.4 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Federal Civilian Government Employment | 7,062 | $3.0 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Federal Military Employment | 10,109 | $4.3 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| State And Local Government Employment | 23,558 | $9.9 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |
| Establishment Employment | 237,164 | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Regional establishment employment currently stands at 237,164. The data suggests that Manufacturing is the largest employment category accounting for $13.5 \%$ of total regional employment. Health Care and Social Assistance is the second largest category accounting for $10.4 \%$ of total employment. State and Local Government is the third largest category accounting for $9.9 \%$ of total employment. Retail Trade is the fourth largest category accounting for $9.2 \%$ of total employment. Accommodation and Food Services is the fifth largest category accounting for $8.9 \%$ 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 121,527 employees or about $51.2 \%$ 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 | $\$ 15,290$ | 22 |
| Forestry, Fishing, Related Activities And Other Employment | $\$ 33,215$ | 14 |
| Mining Employment | $\$ 4,347$ | 23 |
| Utilities Employment | $\$ 141,770$ | 1 |
| Construction Employment | $\$ 55,937$ | 10 |
| Manufacturing Employment | $\$ 85,521$ | 5 |
| Wholesale Trade Employment | $\$ 70,662$ | 6 |
| Retail Trade Employment | $\$ 26,962$ | 18 |
| Transportation And Warehousing Employment | $\$ 48,188$ | 12 |
| Information Employment | $\$ 49,325$ | 11 |
| Finance And Insurance Employment | $\$ 38,598$ | 13 |
| Real Estate And Rental And Lease Employment | $\$ 22,792$ | 20 |
| Professional And Technical Services Employment | $\$ 64,447$ | 7 |
| Management Of Companies And Enterprises Employment | $\$ 114,801$ | 2 |
| Administrative And Waste Services Employment | $\$ 32,273$ | 15 |
| Educational Services Employment | $\$ 29,427$ | 16 |
| Health Care And Social Assistance Employment | $\$ 56,941$ | 9 |
| Arts, Entertainment, And Recreation Employment | $\$ 20,833$ | 21 |
| Accommodation And Food Services Employment | $\$ 23,439$ | 19 |
| Other Services, Except Public Administration Employment | $\$ 28,823$ | 17 |
| Federal Civilian Government Employment | $\$ 96,676$ | 3 |
| Federal Military Employment | $\$ 92,489$ | 4 |
| State And Local Government Employment | $\$ 63,103$ | 8 |
| Establishment Employment | $\$ 52,967$ |  |

The data suggests that Utilities is the highest paid industry averaging $\$ 141,770$ per employee. Management of Companies is the second highest paid industry averaging $\$ 114,801$ per employee. Federal Civilian Government is the third highest paid profession averaging $\$ 96,676$ per employee. Federal Military is the fourth highest paid industry averaging $\$ 92,489$ per employee. Manufacturing is the fifth highest paid category averaging $\$ 85,521$ per employee. These figures are compared with regional Average Earnings of \$52,967 per employee.

The highlighted industries represent basic industries for the region. Average earnings for these basic industries comes to $\$ 66,142$ or $24.9 \%$ 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 |
| Huntington Ingalls Industries | 20,000 | $3731-01$ | Ship Builders \& Repairers (Mfrs) | - |
| Newport News Shipbuilding | 16,335 | $3731-01$ | Ship Builders \& Repairers (Mfrs) | - |
| College-William-Mary Student | 4,800 | $8221-13$ | University-College Dept/Facility/Office | - |
| Colonial Williamsburg Fndtn | 4,000 | $8733-03$ | Foundation-Educ Philanthropic Research | - |
| Colonial Williamsburg Human | 3,000 | $9999-77$ | Nonclassified Establishments | - |
| Ferguson Bath Kitchen \& Light | 2,000 | $5092-23$ | Wholesalers | - |
| William \& Mary Technology Dept | 2,000 | $8222-98$ | Junior-Community College-Tech Institutes | - |
| Riverside Regional Medical Ctr | 1,245 | $8062-02$ | Hospitals | Subsidiary |
| Canon Virginia Inc | 1,000 | $3579-08$ | Copying Machines \& Supplies-Mfrs | - |
| Eastern State Hospital | 1,000 | $8062-02$ | Hospitals | Branch |

The top employers include: (1) Huntington Ingalls Industries (20000 employees); (2) Newport News Shipbuilding (16335 employees) and; (3) College-William-Mary Student (4800 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 | 339,646 |  |
| 2011 | 340,298 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 341,930 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2013 | 344,578 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2014 | 346,698 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 348,400 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2016 | 348,807 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 2017 | 349,776 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2018 | 349,703 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2019 | 351,253 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 2020 | 352,627 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 2021 | 354,739 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2022 | 356,903 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2023 | 359,006 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2024 | 361,105 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Source: US Census; W\&P Economics |  |  |



Population increased from 339,646 in 2010 to 352,627 in 2020 and is anticipated to increase to 361,105 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 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yearecast | Est Emp | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 205,845 |  |
| 2011 | 206,163 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 206,735 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | 209,125 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 2014 | 210,933 | $0.9 \%$ |
| 2015 | 213,359 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 2016 | 214,583 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2017 | 218,273 | $1.7 \%$ |
| 2018 | 225,559 | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2019 | 229,463 | $1.7 \%$ |
| 2020 | 215,905 | $-5.9 \%$ |
| 2021 | 234,671 | $8.7 \%$ |
| 2022 | 237,164 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2023 | 239,606 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2024 | 242,081 | $1.0 \%$ |



Source: BLS; W\&P Economics
Establishment employment increased from 205,845 in 2010 to 215,905 in 2020 and is anticipated to increase to 242,081 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 | 161,697 |  |
| 2011 | 161,322 | $-0.2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 162,891 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2013 | 164,326 | $0.9 \%$ |
| 2014 | 162,381 | $-1.2 \%$ |
| 2015 | 162,719 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2016 | 164,910 | $1.3 \%$ |
| 2017 | 165,152 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 2018 | 167,070 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 2019 | 165,368 | $-1.0 \%$ |
| 2020 | 159,949 | $-3.3 \%$ |
| 2021 | 160,907 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2022 | 161,888 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2023 | 162,842 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2024 | 163,794 | $0.6 \%$ |



Source: BLS; W\&P Economics
Civilian employment decreased from 161,697 in 2010 to 159,949 in 2020 and is anticipated to increase to 163,794 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 | 161,697 | 11,894 | 149,803 | $7.4 \%$ |
| 2011 | 161,322 | 10,809 | 150,513 | $6.7 \%$ |
| 2012 | 162,891 | 9,923 | 152,968 | $6.1 \%$ |
| 2013 | 164,326 | 9,309 | 155,017 | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 162,381 | 8,025 | 154,356 | $4.9 \%$ |
| 2015 | 162,719 | 7,407 | 155,312 | $4.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 164,910 | 6,817 | 158,093 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 2017 | 165,152 | 5,416 | 159,736 | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2018 | 167,070 | 5,027 | 162,043 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2019 | 165,368 | 12,669 | 152,699 | $7.7 \%$ |
| 2020 | 159,949 | 7,829 | 152,120 | $4.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Unemployment decreased from 11,894 in 2010 to 7,829 in 2020. The unemployment rate decreased from $7.4 \%$ in 2010 to $4.9 \%$ 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 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Jan-21 | $6.8 \%$ |
| Feb-21 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Mar-21 | $6.2 \%$ |
| Apr-21 | $4.9 \%$ |
| May-21 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Jun-21 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Jul-21 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Aug-21 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Sep-21 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Oct-21 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Nov-21 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Dec-21 | $3.2 \%$ |



The Unemployment Rate for the Region came in at 6.7\% 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 | 1,916 | 50 | 477 | 2,443 |
| 2001 | 1,736 | 78 | 397 | 2,211 |
| 2002 | 1,683 | 52 | 1,285 | 3,020 |
| 2003 | 1,778 | 130 | 300 | 2,208 |
| 2004 | 1,922 | 52 | 463 | 2,437 |
| 2005 | 1,719 | 48 | 452 | 2,219 |
| 2006 | 1,699 | 27 | 276 | 2,002 |
| 2007 | 1,022 | 43 | 682 | 1,747 |
| 2008 | 777 | 0 | 455 | 1,232 |
| 2009 | 640 | 0 | 427 | 1,067 |
| 2010 | 793 | 26 | 59 | 878 |
| 2011 | 582 | 33 | 648 | 1,263 |
| 2012 | 627 | 83 | 197 | 907 |
| 2013 | 718 | 46 | 191 | 955 |
| 2014 | 672 | 41 | 1,016 | 1,729 |
| 2015 | 618 | 52 | 441 | 1,111 |
| 2016 | 620 | 61 | 143 | 824 |
| 2017 | 584 | 161 | 435 | 1,180 |
| 2018 | 726 | 72 | 502 | 1,300 |
| 2019 | 631 | 74 | 113 | 818 |
| 2020 | 755 | 54 | 39 | 848 |

Building permits for the region increased from 2,211 in 2001 to 3,020 in 2002, before decreasing to 824 in 2016 and increasing to 848 in 2020.

## Conclusion

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

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

## Population

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

| Population Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population | Growth \% |
| 2010 | 85,722 | - |
| 2011 | 87,205 | $1.7 \%$ |
| 2012 | 87,779 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 88,353 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 88,926 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2015 | 89,500 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 90,256 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2017 | 91,013 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2018 | 91,769 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2019 | 92,526 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2020 | 93,282 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2021 | 94,045 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2022 | 94,813 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2023 | 95,589 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 2024 | 96,370 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 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 | 17,841 | - |
| 2011 | 18,041 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2012 | 18,245 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2013 | 18,452 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | 18,663 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | 18,874 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2016 | 19,084 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2017 | 19,295 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2018 | 19,506 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2019 | 19,717 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2020 | 20,035 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2021 | 20,353 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2022 | 20,672 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2023 | 20,990 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2024 | 21,308 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 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 | 8,965 | - |
| 2011 | 9,204 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2012 | 9,450 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 9,702 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 9,961 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | 10,220 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 10,479 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 10,737 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | 10,996 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2019 | 11,255 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2020 | 11,631 | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2021 | 12,007 | $3.2 \%$ |
| 2022 | 12,383 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2023 | 12,759 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2024 | 13,135 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Source: Caliper; Allen \& Associates |  |  |



## Households

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

| Year | Households | Growth \% | 40,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 31,048 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 31,204 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 31,361 | 0.5\% | 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 31,518 | 0.5\% | 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 31,676 | 0.5\% | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 31,835 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 31,993 | 0.5\% | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 32,151 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 32,310 | 0.5\% | 15,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 32,468 | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 32,641 | 0.5\% | 10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 32,815 | 0.5\% | 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 32,988 | 0.5\% | 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2023 | 33,162 | 0.5\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2024 | 33,335 | 0.5\% | 2008 | $2010$ | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2026 |

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

| $55+$ Household Forecast |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Households | Growth $\%$ |
| 2010 | 11,939 | - |
| 2011 | 12,073 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2012 | 12,210 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2013 | 12,348 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2014 | 12,489 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2015 | 12,630 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2016 | 12,771 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2017 | 12,912 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2018 | 13,053 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2019 | 13,194 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 2020 | 13,407 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2021 | 13,621 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2022 | 13,834 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 2023 | 14,047 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2024 | 14,260 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 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 | 5,849 | - |
| 2011 | 6,005 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2012 | 6,166 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 6,330 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 6,499 | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | 6,668 | $2.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | 6,837 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 7,006 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | 7,175 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2019 | 7,344 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2020 | 7,589 | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2021 | 7,834 | $3.2 \%$ |
| 2022 | 8,079 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2023 | 8,324 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 2024 | 8,570 | $2.9 \%$ |
| 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 | 11,593 | - |
| 2011 | 11,674 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2012 | 11,755 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2013 | 11,837 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2014 | 11,919 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | 12,002 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2016 | 12,084 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2017 | 12,167 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2018 | 12,249 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2019 | 12,332 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 2020 | 12,408 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2021 | 12,485 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2022 | 12,562 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2023 | 12,638 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 2024 | 12,715 | $0.6 \%$ |



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 | 2,545 | - |
| 2011 | 2,533 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | 2,521 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2013 | 2,509 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2014 | 2,497 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2015 | 2,485 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2016 | 2,473 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | 2,461 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | 2,449 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2019 | 2,437 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2020 | 2,498 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2021 | 2,559 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2022 | 2,619 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 2023 | 2,680 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2024 | 2,741 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 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 | 902 | - |
| 2011 | 923 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2012 | 944 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2013 | 965 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2014 | 987 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 2015 | 1,009 | $2.2 \%$ |
| 2016 | 1,031 | $2.2 \%$ |
| 2017 | 1,053 | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2018 | 1,075 | $2.1 \%$ |
| 2019 | 1,097 | $2.0 \%$ |
| 2020 | 1,158 | $5.6 \%$ |
| 2021 | 1,220 | $5.3 \%$ |
| 2022 | 1,281 | $5.0 \%$ |
| 2023 | 1,342 | $4.8 \%$ |
| 2024 | 1,403 | $4.6 \%$ |
| 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 |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 9,999$ | 609 | 334 | 185 | 207 | 86 | 35 | 1,455 |
| $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 19,999$ | 965 | 630 | 342 | 112 | 90 | 31 | 2,170 |
| $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,178 | 993 | 501 | 381 | 197 | 102 | 3,352 |
| $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 39,999$ | 1,057 | 753 | 486 | 234 | 135 | 65 | 2,729 |
| $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 49,999$ | 975 | 909 | 483 | 335 | 170 | 84 | 2,956 |
| $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 59,999$ | 604 | 815 | 588 | 308 | 205 | 92 | 2,613 |
| $\$ 60,000$ | $\$ 74,999$ | 793 | 1,219 | 679 | 545 | 230 | 110 | 3,576 |
| $\$ 75,000$ | $\$ 99,999$ | 459 | 1,574 | 1,039 | 761 | 366 | 191 | 4,390 |
| $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 124,999$ | 394 | 1,062 | 815 | 977 | 193 | 86 | 3,527 |
| $\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 149,999$ | 345 | 828 | 507 | 301 | 232 | 105 | 2,319 |
| $\$ 150,000$ | $\$ 199,999$ | 180 | 759 | 490 | 297 | 151 | 60 | 1,937 |
| $\$ 200,000$ | more | 191 | 982 | 293 | 258 | 174 | 66 |  |
| Total | 7,751 | 10,859 | 6,408 | 4,716 | 2,228 | 1,026 | 3,964 |  |

The following table shows the current distribution of 55+ 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 | 282 | 118 | 46 | 13 | 20 | 7 | 487 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 630 | 351 | 91 | 27 | 31 | 8 | 1,138 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 720 | 395 | 95 | 19 | 43 | 19 | 1,292 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 438 | 462 | 73 | 23 | 23 | 9 | 1,028 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 402 | 544 | 108 | 78 | 58 | 23 | 1,212 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 351 | 500 | 133 | 47 | 46 | 16 | 1,094 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 451 | 684 | 182 | 80 | 63 | 23 | 1,485 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 343 | 896 | 210 | 102 | 86 | 38 | 1,675 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 289 | 735 | 173 | 66 | 36 | 12 | 1,311 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 282 | 405 | 196 | 86 | 40 | 17 | 1,027 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 113 | 598 | 104 | 63 | 54 | 21 | 952 |
| \$200,000 | more | 152 | 714 | 136 | 100 | 27 | 5 | 1,134 |
|  |  | 4,454 | 6,401 | 1,547 | 705 | 528 | 198 | 13,834 |

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 | 146 | 62 | 24 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 243 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 468 | 291 | 43 | 15 | 17 | 3 | 837 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 539 | 272 | 33 | 5 | 37 | 16 | 902 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 314 | 319 | 51 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 703 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 290 | 389 | 27 | 56 | 23 | 5 | 792 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 211 | 290 | 56 | 33 | 14 | 2 | 608 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 228 | 492 | 81 | 43 | 31 | 10 | 884 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 211 | 511 | 56 | 14 | 47 | 17 | 855 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 213 | 383 | 52 | 25 | 16 | 3 | 692 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 200 | 258 | 33 | 24 | 9 | 2 | 526 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 79 | 322 | 19 | 6 | 24 | 10 | 460 |
| \$200,000 | more | 87 | 463 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 578 |
|  |  | 2,987 | 4,051 | 486 | 242 | 241 | 73 | 8,079 |

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 |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 | 1,068 |
| $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 19,999$ | 559 | 317 | 180 | 63 | 18 | 6 | 1,144 |
| $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 29,999$ | 622 | 571 | 279 | 324 | 141 | 77 | 2,013 |
| $\$ 30,000$ | $\$ 39,999$ | 677 | 267 | 314 | 175 | 86 | 42 | 1,561 |
| $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 49,999$ | 565 | 321 | 281 | 147 | 94 | 46 | 1,455 |
| $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 59,999$ | 277 | 240 | 250 | 146 | 125 | 61 | 1,100 |
| $\$ 60,000$ | $\$ 74,999$ | 279 | 415 | 260 | 231 | 103 | 54 | 1,342 |
| $\$ 75,000$ | $\$ 99,999$ | 135 | 331 | 347 | 198 | 122 | 66 | 1,199 |
| $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 124,999$ | 121 | 112 | 177 | 186 | 53 | 24 | 674 |
| $\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 149,999$ | 145 | 138 | 36 | 50 | 50 | 19 | 438 |
| $\$ 150,000$ | $\$ 199,999$ | 56 | 59 | 108 | 34 | 55 | 21 | 333 |
| $\$ 200,000$ | more | 70 | 68 | 47 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 230 |
| Total |  | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 | 12,562 |

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 | 193 | 30 | 16 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 262 |
| \$10,000 | \$19,999 | 258 | 91 | 29 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 386 |
| \$20,000 | \$29,999 | 193 | 89 | 47 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 334 |
| \$30,000 | \$39,999 | 169 | 50 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 241 |
| \$40,000 | \$49,999 | 135 | 30 | 50 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 229 |
| \$50,000 | \$59,999 | 140 | 93 | 33 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 286 |
| \$60,000 | \$74,999 | 112 | 45 | 23 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 188 |
| \$75,000 | \$99,999 | 100 | 84 | 43 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 237 |
| \$100,000 | \$124,999 | 111 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 148 |
| \$125,000 | \$149,999 | 92 | 22 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 134 |
| \$150,000 | \$199,999 | 32 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 76 |
| \$200,000 | more | 47 | 32 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 100 |
| Total |  | 1,583 | 605 | 298 | 34 | 87 | 12 | 2,619 |

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

| 2022 \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65+ Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min |  | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |  |  |  |  | Total

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 | $33.3 \%$ |
| $25-29 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $15.2 \%$ |
| $30-34 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $9.0 \%$ |
| $>35 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $29.7 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 29.7 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 38.7 percent of the renter households are overburdened to 30 percent of income.

| $55+$ Overburdened Renter Households |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | \% of Total |
| $<20 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $29.5 \%$ |
| 20-24\% of Income Spent on Housing | $11.9 \%$ |
| 25-29\% of Income Spent on Housing | $13.3 \%$ |
| 30-34\% of Income Spent on Housing | $9.2 \%$ |
| $>35 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $36.0 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 36.0 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 45.3 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 | $25.8 \%$ |
| $20-24 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $12.6 \%$ |
| $25-29 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $13.3 \%$ |
| $30-34 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $9.8 \%$ |
| $>35 \%$ of Income Spent on Housing | $38.4 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 38.4 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 48.3 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 | $98.6 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $0.9 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.2 \%$ |
| Complete Plumbing | $99.7 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 1.00 persons per room or less | $0.3 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $0.0 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.0 \%$ |
| Lacking Complete Plumbing | $0.3 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Standard | $98.6 \%$ |
| Substandard | $1.4 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 1.4 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 | $93.5 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $3.6 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $2.3 \%$ |
| Complete Plumbing | $99.4 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 1.00 persons per room or less | $0.5 \%$ |
| 1.01 to 1.50 persons per room | $0.1 \%$ |
| 1.51 persons per room or more | $0.0 \%$ |
| Lacking Complete Plumbing | $0.6 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Standard | $93.5 \%$ |
| Substandard | $6.5 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau


Our research suggests that 6.5 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 |
|  | $3.0 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| Owner to Owner | $2.8 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
| Owner to Renter | $5.8 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ |
| Owner Movership Rate |  |  | $3.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census, American Housing Survey; Allen \& Associates
Our research suggests an owner movership rate of 8.5 percent.

Elderly Owner Movership, by Size

|  | AHS Survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 Person | 7+ Person | Total |
| Owner to Owner | $2.0 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |  |
| Owner to Renter | $1.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |  |  |
| Owner Movership Rate | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6 Person | 7+ Person | Total |
| Renter to Renter | 12.1\% | 26.9\% | 38.1\% | 45.7\% | 46.2\% | 50.1\% | 77.3\% | 27.3\% |
| Renter to Owner | 2.9\% | 11.0\% | 11.2\% | 14.3\% | 15.7\% | 12.1\% | 14.3\% | 8.6\% |
| Renter Movership Rate | 15.0\% | 38.0\% | 49.2\% | 60.0\% | 61.9\% | 62.2\% | 91.6\% | 35.9\% |

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

Our research suggests a renter movership rate of 35.9 percent.

| Elderly Renter Movership, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AHS Survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 11 Central Apartments | 37.1425 | -76.5169 | 1978 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 156 | 8 | 94.9\% |
| 002 | Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1615 | -76.5600 | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 118 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 003 | Arbors (The) at Towne Park | 37.3348 | -76.7311 | 2019 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Lease Up | Bond | 130 | 6 | 95.4\% |
| 004 | Arbors At Williamsburg | 37.2461 | -76.6567 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Construction | Conventional | 150 | 150 | 0.0\% |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1574 | -76.5583 | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 228 | 1 | 99.6\% |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 37.1339 | -76.5274 | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 274 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 007 | Aura At Quarterpath | 37.2509 | -76.6733 | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 228 | 14 | 93.9\% |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 37.1357 | -76.5473 | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 296 | 1 | 99.7\% |
| 009 | Avalon Housing | 37.2549 | -76.8201 | 1999 | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | Tax Credit | 6 | 2 | 66.7\% |
| 010 | Burnt Ordinary Phases 1 \& 2 | 37.3801 | -76.8042 | 1987 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 80 | 2 | 97.5\% |
| 011 | Burnt Ordinary Village Apartments | 37.3801 | -76.8042 | 1991 | 2012 | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 22 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 012 | Burton Woods Apartments | 37.2686 | -76.6682 | 1989 | na | Market Rate | Family | pemolished/Burr | Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 013 | Campbell Road Apartments | 37.1238 | -76.5256 | na | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 5 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 014 | Checed Warwick Apartments | 37.1463 | -76.5510 | 2005 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 015 | Chelsea Apartments | 37.1998 | -76.5753 | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | HUD | 223 | 14 | 93.7\% |
| 016 | Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 37.1998 | -76.5753 | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 223 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 017 | Chelsea Place A Partments | 37.1982 | -76.5725 | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 018 | City Lofts | 37.2862 | -76.7238 | 1988 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 90 | 1 | 98.9\% |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 37.1928 | -76.4923 | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 216 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 020 | Clinton Garden Apartments | 37.2832 | -76.7217 | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 80 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 021 | COKI Construction | 37.2821 | -76.6021 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 022 | Colonial Harbor Retirement | 37.1892 | -76.4900 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 80 | 4 | 95.0\% |
| 023 | Colonial Pines Apartments | 37.2829 | -76.6841 | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 132 | 3 | 97.7\% |
| 024 | Colonial Point Apartments | 37.2607 | -76.4910 | 1974 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 56 | 2 | 96.4\% |
| 025 | Colonial Towne Apartments | 37.2792 | -76.6824 | 1970 | 2010 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 148 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 026 | Commonwealth Senior Living | 37.2828 | -76.7161 | 2009 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 027 | Conway Gardens Apartments | 37.2511 | -76.7296 | 1968 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 200 | 10 | 95.0\% |
| 028 | Country Club Apartments | 37.2435 | -76.6513 | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 100 | 6 | 94.0\% |
| 029 | Courthouse Acres Apartments | 37.1263 | -76.5379 | 1983 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 030 | Cypress Terrace Apartments | 37.1531 | -76.5490 | 1981 | 2016 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 82 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 031 | Denbigh Trace Apartments | 37.1671 | -76.5436 | 1980 | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | HUD | 128 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 032 | Denbigh Village | 37.1294 | -76.5315 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 244 | 40 | 83.6\% |
| 033 | Elan Williamsburg | 37.2944 | -76.7204 | 2018 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 198 | 9 | 95.5\% |
| 034 | Forrest Pines Apartments | 37.1334 | -76.5415 | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 110 | 1 | 99.1\% |
| 035 | Forrest Pines Senior Apartments | 37.1348 | -76.5414 | 2014 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Bond | 123 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 036 | Founders Village Apartments | 37.2776 | -76.7560 | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 247 | 9 | 96.4\% |
| 037 | Grafton Station Apartments | 37.1582 | -76.4596 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 411 | 36 | 91.2\% |
| 038 | Grande Oak | 37.3381 | -76.7465 | 2021 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Construction | Tax Credit | 49 | 49 | 0.0\% |
| 039 | Grande Oak II | 37.3383 | -76.7463 | 2021 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Prop Const | Bond | 49 | 49 | 0.0\% |
| 040 | Grande Oak III | 37.3383 | -76.7463 | 2021 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Prop Const | Tax Credit | 49 | 49 | 0.0\% |
| 041 | Hanover Apartments | 37.1441 | -76.5244 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 64 | 3 | 95.3\% |
| 042 | Heatherwood Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5422 | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 043 | Heritage Commons | 37.2831 | -76.7174 | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 100 | 3 | 97.0\% |
| 044 | Hickory Point Apartments | 37.1554 | -76.5595 | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 175 | 1 | 99.4\% |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 96 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 046 | High Street View Luxury Apartments Phas | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Construction | Conventional | 102 | 4 | 96.1\% |
| 047 | High Street View Luxury Apartments Phas | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 102 | 4 | 96.1\% |
| 048 | Hoopes Place Apartments | 37.1266 | -76.5409 | 1972 | 1995 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 60 | 3 | 95.0\% |
| 049 | James River Flats | 37.1657 | -76.5437 | 1984 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 100 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 050 | Jordan Realty Inc | 37.2606 | -76.4971 | 1972 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 67 | 2 | 97.0\% |
| 051 | Julia Ann Apartments | 37.2833 | -76.7229 | 1963 | 1996 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 52 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 052 | Kate's Trace Apartments | 37.1711 | -76.5478 | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 108 | 0 | 100.0\% |

Rental Property Inventory

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 053 | King and Queen Apartments | 37.2739 | -76.7118 | 1964 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 26 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 37.1588 | -76.5326 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 182 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 055 | Lafayette Square Apartments | 37.3129 | -76.7542 | 1984 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 106 | 3 | 97.2\% |
| 056 | Lafayette Village Elderly Apartments | 37.3119 | -76.7556 | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 057 | Lafayette Village Family Apartments | 37.3119 | -76.7556 | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 112 | 4 | 96.4\% |
| 058 | Landmark Apartments | 37.1446 | -76.5226 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 112 | 21 | 81.3\% |
| 059 | Lee's Landing Apartments | 37.1866 | -76.5754 | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 136 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 060 | Lexington Commons Apartments | 37.1347 | -76.5392 | 1994 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 132 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 061 | Liberty Point Townhome | 37.1231 | -76.5335 | 1969 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 78 | 6 | 92.3\% |
| 062 | Longhill Grove Apartments | 37.3156 | -76.7900 | 2004 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 170 | 2 | 98.8\% |
| 063 | Ludwell Apartments | 37.2631 | -76.7187 | 1940 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Student Housing | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 064 | Manorhouse at Newport News | 37.1426 | -76.5164 | na | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 065 | Maple Point Apartments | 37.1622 | -76.5590 | 1971 | 2000 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 64 | 4 | 93.8\% |
| 066 | Mariners Landing Apartments | 37.1339 | -76.5274 | 1971 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 067 | Marlboro Apartments | 37.2496 | -76.7296 | 1968 | 1999 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 068 | Merrimac Crossing | 37.2836 | -76.6844 | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 252 | 7 | 97.2\% |
| 069 | Merrimac Springs Apartments | 37.1519 | -76.5322 | 1970 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 200 | 28 | 86.0\% |
| 070 | Monticello at Powhatan Apartments | 37.2728 | -76.7644 | 2001 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 267 | 11 | 95.9\% |
| 071 | New Phoenix Village Apartments | 37.1697 | -76.5664 | 1985 | 2014 | Subsidized | Elderly | Prop Rehab | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 072 | Newmoor Properties | 37.2534 | -76.5001 | 1979 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 130 | 6 | 95.4\% |
| 073 | North Jefferson Square | 37.1657 | -76.5437 | 1985 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Duplicate | Bond | 100 | 1 | 99.0\% |
| 074 | Olde Jamestowne Apartments | 37.2522 | -76.7307 | 1970 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 52 | 2 | 96.2\% |
| 075 | One Central Apartments | 37.1425 | -76.5169 | 1978 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 156 | 8 | 94.9\% |
| 076 | Oxford New Town Apartments | 37.2824 | -76.7379 | 2007 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 265 | 18 | 93.2\% |
| 077 | Parker View Apartments | 37.2826 | -76.7323 | 2008 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Stabilized | HUD | 67 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 078 | Parkway Apartments | 37.2761 | -76.6809 | 1974 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 148 | 8 | 94.6\% |
| 079 | Patriots Crossing | 37.1374 | -76.5430 | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 240 | 2 | 99.2\% |
| 080 | Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1292 | -76.5247 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 38 | 1 | 97.4\% |
| 081 | Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 2 | 37.1308 | -76.5263 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 38 | 1 | 97.4\% |
| 082 | Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 3 | 37.1308 | -76.5263 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 36 | 1 | 97.2\% |
| 083 | Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 4 | 37.1308 | -76.5263 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 33 | 1 | 97.0\% |
| 084 | Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 5 | 37.1292 | -76.5247 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 53 | 1 | 98.1\% |
| 085 | Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 6 | 37.1292 | -76.5247 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | HUD | 79 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 086 | Phoenix Village Apartments Phase 1 | 37.1698 | -76.5661 | 1985 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Duplicate | HUD | 17 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 087 | Phoenix Village Apartments Phase 2 | 37.1700 | -76.5668 | 1991 | na | Subsidized | Elderly | Duplicate | HUD | 28 | 1 | 96.4\% |
| 088 | Pointe At New Town | 37.2824 | -76.7379 | 2007 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 265 | 13 | 95.1\% |
| 089 | Powhatan Apartments | 37.3147 | -76.7883 | 1980 | 2001 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 47 | 1 | 97.9\% |
| 090 | Powhatan Terrace - 33 | 37.2356 | -76.7575 | 2019 | na | Restricted | Family | Prop Const | Tax Credit | 33 | 33 | 0.0\% |
| 091 | Powhatan Terrace - 36 | 37.2356 | -76.7575 | 2019 | na | Restricted | Family | Prop Const | Tax Credit | 36 | 36 | 0.0\% |
| 092 | Preferred Apartment Cmnty Inc | 37.2778 | -76.7562 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 093 | Quarterpath Place Apartments | 37.2682 | -76.6844 | 1966 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 54 | 3 | 94.4\% |
| 094 | Redwood Apartments | 37.1618 | -76.5571 | na | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 095 | Regency at Longhill Phases 1 \& 2 | 37.3014 | -76.7498 | 1985 | 2000 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 224 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 096 | Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5422 | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 097 | Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 37.1849 | -76.5729 | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 100 | 3 | 97.0\% |
| 098 | Residences at Forest Grove | 37.1519 | -76.5322 | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 200 | 1 | 99.5\% |
| 099 | River Mews Apartments | 37.1538 | -76.5591 | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 645 | 20 | 96.9\% |
| 100 | Rivermeade Phase 1 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 2 | 95.8\% |
| 101 | Rivermeade Phase 2 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 1 | 96.9\% |
| 102 | Rolling Meadows Apartments Phase 1 \& 2 | 37.2988 | -76.7398 | 1994 | 2014 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 200 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 103 | Saddler Road Group Home | 37.1380 | -76.5549 | 1995 | na | Subsidized | Family | Special Needs | HUD | 5 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 104 | Sea Pines Apartments | 37.1721 | -76.5498 | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 129 | 0 | 100.0\% |

Rental Property Inventory

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 105 | Sherwood Arms Apartments | 37.1236 | -76.5286 | 1967 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 127 | 14 | 89.0\% |
| 106 | SI Nufbaum Properties | 37.1425 | -76.5169 | 1978 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 156 | 8 | 94.9\% |
| 107 | Spotswood Commons Apartments | 37.3097 | -76.7550 | 2002 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 212 | 8 | 96.2\% |
| 108 | Spring Garden Apartments | 37.2814 | -76.7240 | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 20 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 109 | Spring House at Newport News | 37.1330 | -76.5207 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 432 | 17 | 96.1\% |
| 110 | Spring Road Apartments | 37.2843 | -76.7234 | 1965 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 114 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 111 | St. Andrews Apartments | 37.1371 | -76.5262 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 312 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 112 | Station at Norge Apartments | 37.3765 | -76.7765 | 2008 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 104 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 113 | Steeplechase Apartments | 37.2670 | -76.7633 | 1986 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 220 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 114 | Sterling Manor Apartments | 37.2894 | -76.7257 | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 191 | 10 | 94.8\% |
| 115 | Stonegate Apartments | 37.2622 | -76.6791 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 128 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 116 | Stratford at Williamsburg Apartments | 37.3097 | -76.7354 | 1977 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 156 | 14 | 91.0\% |
| 117 | Timberwood Condominiums | 37.1257 | -76.5224 | 1978 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Unstabilized | Conventional | 177 | 18 | 89.8\% |
| 118 | Timberwoods Mutual Townhomes | 37.1257 | -76.5224 | 1978 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | HUD | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 119 | Townes at Jones Run | 37.1697 | -76.5449 | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 300 | 3 | 99.0\% |
| 120 | Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5684 | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 176 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 121 | Turnberry Wells Apartments | 37.1348 | -76.5176 | 1974 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 186 | 2 | 98.9\% |
| 122 | Tyndall Point Townhouse | 37.2522 | -76.5025 | 1991 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 30 | 5 | 83.3\% |
| 123 | Village at Stoneybrook Apartments | 37.1514 | -76.5511 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 256 | 15 | 94.1\% |
| 124 | Village of Woodshire Apartments | 37.2836 | -76.6844 | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 252 | 7 | 97.2\% |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 37.1420 | -76.5189 | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 126 | Warwick Landing Apartments | 37.1615 | -76.5600 | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 127 | Waverton Ashton Green | 37.1574 | -76.5583 | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 228 | 11 | 95.2\% |
| 128 | Waverton Denbigh Village | 37.1294 | -76.5315 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 244 | 40 | 83.6\% |
| 129 | Waypoint at Uptown Apartments | 37.1245 | -76.5499 | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 140 | 8 | 94.3\% |
| 130 | Windsor Crossing Apartments | 37.1425 | -76.5169 | 1978 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Conventional | 156 | 8 | 94.9\% |
| 131 | Woodbridge Point Apartments | 37.1294 | -76.5315 | 1974 | 2004 | Market Rate | Family | pemolished/Burr | Conventional | 138 | 20 | 85.5\% |
| 132 | Woods At Yorktown (The) 2020 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 2021 | na | Restricted | Family | Non-Inventory | tax Credit | 60 | 60 | 0.0\% |
| 133 | Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 54 | 3 | 94.4\% |
| 134 | Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 64 | 3 | 95.3\% |
| 135 | Woods At Yorktown Rehab 2021 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Non-Inventory | Tax Credit | 54 | 3 | 94.4\% |
| 136 | Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 37.1723 | -76.5454 | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 108 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 137 | Woods of Williamsburg Apartments | 37.3134 | -76.7583 | 1975 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 125 | 6 | 95.2\% |
| 138 | Woodscape Apartments | 37.1532 | -76.5359 | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 296 | 6 | 98.0\% |
| 139 | Woodview Apartments | 37.1374 | -76.5430 | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Bond | 240 | 43 | 82.1\% |
| 140 | York Senior | 37.3348 | -76.7311 | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Duplicate | Bond | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 141 | Yorkshire Apartments | 37.2343 | -76.5386 | 1956 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Duplicate | Tax Credit | 117 | 33 | 71.8\% |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 37.1884 | -76.4869 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 89 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 143 | Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 56 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 144 | Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 1 | 98.3\% |
| 145 | Yorkview Apartments | 37.2774 | -76.5060 | 1987 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 104 | 2 | 98.1\% |
| 147 | Woods At Yorktown NC | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 2022 | na | Restricted | Family | Prop Const | Bonds | 60 | 60 | 0.0\% |



Rental Property Inventory, Unconfirmed

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 021 | COKI Construction | 37.2821 | -76.6021 | 2010 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 022 | Colonial Harbor Retirement | 37.1892 | -76.4900 | 2005 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 80 | 4 | 95.0\% |
| 025 | Colonial Towne Apartments | 37.2792 | -76.6824 | 1970 | 2010 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 148 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 026 | Commonwealth Senior Living | 37.2828 | -76.7161 | 2009 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 031 | Denbigh Trace Apartments | 37.1671 | -76.5436 | 1980 | na | Subsidized | Family | Unconfirmed | HUD | 128 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 033 | Elan Williamsburg | 37.2944 | -76.7204 | 2018 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 198 | 9 | 95.5\% |
| 041 | Hanover Apartments | 37.1441 | -76.5244 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 64 | 3 | 95.3\% |
| 043 | Heritage Commons | 37.2831 | -76.7174 | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 100 | 3 | 97.0\% |
| 058 | Landmark Apartments | 37.1446 | -76.5226 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 112 | 21 | 81.3\% |
| 064 | Manorhouse at Newport News | 37.1426 | -76.5164 | na | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 065 | Maple Point Apartments | 37.1622 | -76.5590 | 1971 | 2000 | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 64 | 4 | 93.8\% |
| 075 | One Central Apartments | 37.1425 | -76.5169 | 1978 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 156 | 8 | 94.9\% |
| 078 | Parkway Apartments | 37.2761 | -76.6809 | 1974 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 148 | 8 | 94.6\% |
| 094 | Redwood Apartments | 37.1618 | -76.5571 | na | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 105 | Sherwood Arms Apartments | 37.1236 | -76.5286 | 1967 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 127 | 14 | 89.0\% |
| 123 | Village at Stoneybrook Apartments | 37.1514 | -76.5511 | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 256 | 15 | 94.1\% |
| 129 | Waypoint at Uptown Apartments | 37.1245 | -76.5499 | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Unconfirmed | Conventional | 140 | 8 | 94.3\% |

Rental Property Inventory, Confirmed, Inside Market Area

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002 | Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1615 | -76.5600 | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 118 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 004 | Arbors At Williamsburg | 37.2461 | -76.6567 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Construction | Conventional | 150 | 150 | 0.0\% |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1574 | -76.5583 | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 228 | 1 | 99.6\% |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 37.1339 | -76.5274 | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 274 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 37.1357 | -76.5473 | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 296 | 1 | 99.7\% |
| 014 | Checed Warwick Apartments | 37.1463 | -76.5510 | 2005 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 016 | Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 37.1998 | -76.5753 | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 223 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 37.1928 | -76.4923 | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 216 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 028 | Country Club Apartments | 37.2435 | -76.6513 | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 100 | 6 | 94.0\% |
| 030 | Cypress Terrace Apartments | 37.1531 | -76.5490 | 1981 | 2016 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 82 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 034 | Forrest Pines Apartments | 37.1334 | -76.5415 | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 110 | 1 | 99.1\% |
| 035 | Forrest Pines Senior Apartments | 37.1348 | -76.5414 | 2014 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Bond | 123 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 037 | Grafton Station Apartments | 37.1582 | -76.4596 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 411 | 36 | 91.2\% |
| 044 | Hickory Point Apartments | 37.1554 | -76.5595 | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 175 | 1 | 99.4\% |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 96 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 046 | High Street View Luxury Apartments Phas | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Construction | Conventional | 102 | 4 | 96.1\% |
| 049 | James River Flats | 37.1657 | -76.5437 | 1984 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 100 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 052 | Kate's Trace Apartments | 37.1711 | -76.5478 | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 108 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 37.1588 | -76.5326 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 182 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 059 | Lee's Landing Apartments | 37.1866 | -76.5754 | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 136 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 060 | Lexington Commons Apartments | 37.1347 | -76.5392 | 1994 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 132 | 1 | 99.2\% |
| 071 | New Phoenix Village Apartments | 37.1697 | -76.5664 | 1985 | 2014 | Subsidized | Elderly | Prop Rehab | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 079 | Patriots Crossing | 37.1374 | -76.5430 | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 240 | 2 | 99.2\% |
| 096 | Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5422 | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 097 | Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 37.1849 | -76.5729 | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 100 | 3 | 97.0\% |
| 098 | Residences at Forest Grove | 37.1519 | -76.5322 | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 200 | 1 | 99.5\% |
| 099 | River Mews Apartments | 37.1538 | -76.5591 | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 645 | 20 | 96.9\% |
| 100 | Rivermeade Phase 1 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 2 | 95.8\% |
| 101 | Rivermeade Phase 2 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 1 | 96.9\% |
| 104 | Sea Pines Apartments | 37.1721 | -76.5498 | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 129 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 111 | St. Andrews Apartments | 37.1371 | -76.5262 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 312 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 119 | Townes at Jones Run | 37.1697 | -76.5449 | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 300 | 3 | 99.0\% |
| 120 | Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5684 | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 176 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 37.1420 | -76.5189 | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 133 | Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 54 | 3 | 94.4\% |
| 134 | Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 64 | 3 | 95.3\% |
| 136 | Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 37.1723 | -76.5454 | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 108 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 138 | Woodscape Apartments | 37.1532 | -76.5359 | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 296 | 6 | 98.0\% |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 37.1884 | -76.4869 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 89 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 143 | Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 56 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 144 | Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 1 | 98.3\% |

Master List of Market Rate Comparables

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 37.1928 | -76.4923 | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 216 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 96 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 37.1420 | -76.5189 | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 37.1884 | -76.4869 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 89 | 0 | 100.0\% |



Master List of Restricted Rent Comparables

| Key | Project | Latitude | Longitude | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Financing | Tot Units | Vac Units | Occupancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1574 | -76.5583 | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 228 | 1 | 99.6\% |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 37.1339 | -76.5274 | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 274 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 37.1357 | -76.5473 | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 296 | 1 | 99.7\% |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 37.1588 | -76.5326 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 182 | 0 | 100.0\% |



## 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 |  |
|  | 1 | 22 | 23 |  |
| Market Rate | 3 | 12 | 15 |  |
| Restricted | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Subsidized | 5 | 36 | 41 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Total Units

|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Rate | 150 | 4,506 | 4,656 |
| Restricted | 303 | 1,607 | 1,910 |
| Subsidized | 48 | 217 | 265 |
| Total | 501 | 6,330 | 6,831 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Market Rate | 150 | 81 | 231 |
| Restricted | 2 | 12 | 14 |
| Subsidized |  | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 152 | 95 | 247 |


| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Market Rate |  | $98 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Restricted | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Subsidized | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Total | $70 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $96 \%$ |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our analysis includes a total of 41 confirmed market area properties consisting of 6,831 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, Confirmed, Inside Market Area

| Elderly |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |$\quad$ Rehabilitation | Rehes |
| :--- |
| Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab <br> Unstabilized |
| Subtotal |
| Total |


| Family |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 2 | 12 | 21 | 35 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Rehabilitation <br> Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  | 1 |
| Subtotal |  | 12 | 22 | 36 |
| Total | 2 | 12 |  |  |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  | 303 |  | 303 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  | 150 | 150 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab <br> Unstabilized | 48 |  |  | 48 |
| Subtotal | 48 |  | 150 | 198 |
| Total | 48 | 303 | 150 | 501 |


| Total Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized | 217 | 1,607 | 4,404 | 6,228 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  | 102 | 102 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab <br> Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  | 102 | 102 |
| Total | 217 | 1,607 | 4,506 | 6,330 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |  |
| Lease Up |  |  |  | 2 |
| Construction |  |  | 150 | 150 |
| Rehabilitation <br> Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  | 150 | 150 |
| Total |  | 2 | 150 | 152 |


| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stabilized | 2 | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| Lease Up |  |  | 77 | 91 |
| Construction |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const <br> Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| Total | 2 | 12 | 81 | 95 |

Source: Allen \& Associates
Our survey includes a total of 38 stabilized market area properties consisting of 6,531 units standing at 99 percent occupancy.

Our survey also includes a total of 3 market area properties consisting of 300 units 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 |  | 99\% |  | 99\% | Stabilized | 99\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  | 0\% | 0\% | Construction |  |  | 96\% | 96\% |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab | 100\% |  |  | 100\% | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | 100\% |  | 0\% | 24\% | Subtotal |  |  | 96\% | 96\% |
| Total | 100\% | 99\% |  | 70\% | Total | 99\% | 99\% | 98\% | 98\% |

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 303 stabilized elderly units in this market area:

- Subsidized, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- Restricted, 99 percent (303 units in survey)
- Market Rate, not applicable (0 units in survey)

Our research suggests the following occupancy levels for the 6,228 stabilized family units in this market area:

- Subsidized, 99 percent (217 units in survey)
- Restricted, 99 percent (1607 units in survey)
- Market Rate, 98 percent (4404 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 303 stabilized elderly units in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 100 percent ( 90 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, 99 percent (213 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 6,228 stabilized family units in this market area:

> - 0-Bedroom, 100 percent (40 units in survey)
> - 1-Bedroom, 99 percent (1402 units in survey)
> - 2-Bedroom, 99 percent (3829 units in survey)
> - 3-Bedroom, 97 percent (941 units in survey)
> - 4-Bedroom, 88 percent (16 units in survey)

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

| Elderly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 40 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46 | 46 |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% |

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


| Elderly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  | 5 | Stabilized | 7 |  | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |  | 20 | 42 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 7 | Total | 7 |  | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |  | 21 | 43 |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  | 2 | 20 | 191 |  |  |  | 213 | Stabilized | 166 |  | 41 | 240 | 741 |  |  | 2,641 | 3,829 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 40 | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | 60 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 53 | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | 60 |
| Total | 13 |  | 2 | 20 | 191 |  |  | 40 | 266 | Total | 166 |  | 41 | 240 | 741 |  |  | 2,701 | 3,889 |
| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | Stabilized | 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 37 | 48 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 40 | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 40 | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 40 | 42 | Total | 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 40 | 51 |
| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  | 100\% | 100\% | 99\% |  |  |  | 99\% | Stabilized | 99\% |  | 95\% | 98\% | 100\% |  |  | 99\% | 99\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 0\% | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95\% | 95\% |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% | 25\% | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95\% | 95\% |
| Total | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 99\% |  |  | 0\% | 84\% | Total | 99\% |  | 95\% | 98\% | 100\% |  |  | 99\% | 99\% |


| Elderly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 4 |  | 1 | 4 | 5 |  |  | 14 | 28 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 4 |  | 1 | 4 | 5 |  |  | 14 | 28 |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized | 30 |  | 6 | 64 | 256 |  |  | 585 | 941 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 30 |  | 6 | 64 | 256 |  |  | 585 | 941 |
| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 | 31 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 | 31 |
| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | 95\% | 97\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | 95\% | 97\% |

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

| Elderly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized | 6 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 6 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vacant Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Occupancy Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt | Tot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stabilized | 100\% |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  | 88\% |
| Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lease Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Const |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Prop Rehab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unstabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 100\% |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  | 88\% |

## 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 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Properties |  |  |  |
| $<$ | Elderly | Family | Total |
| $<1960$ |  | 2 | 2 |
| $1960-1969$ |  | 2 | 2 |
| $1970-1979$ | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| $1980-1989$ | 1 | 13 | 14 |
| $1990-1999$ | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| $2000+$ | 7 | 10 |  |
| Unknown | 5 | 36 | 41 |
| Total |  |  |  |

Total Units

|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<1960$ |  | 118 | 118 |
| $1960-1969$ |  | 396 | 396 |
| $1970-1979$ | 48 | 1,857 | 1,857 |
| $1980-1989$ | 132 | 2,674 | 2,722 |
| $1990-1999$ | 321 | 214 | 346 |
| $2000+$ | 1,071 | 1,392 |  |
| Unknown |  |  |  |
| Total | 501 | 6,330 | 6,831 |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our research suggests that of the 41 confirmed market area properties ( 6831 units) included in this report, 2 properties (118 units) were constructed before 1960, 2 properties ( 396 units) were constructed between 1960 and 1969, 10 properties (1857 units) between 1970 and 1979, 14 properties ( 2722 units) between 1980 and 1989, 3 properties ( 346 units) between 1990 and 1999, and 10 properties ( 1392 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 | 1 | 22 | 23 |
| Tax Credit |  | 11 | 14 |
| Bond | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| USDA-RD |  |  |  |
| HUD |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Total | 5 | 36 | 41 |
| Total Units |  |  |  |
|  | Elderly | Family | Total |
| Conventional | 150 | 4,506 | 4,656 |
| Tax Credit | 228 | 1,188 | 1,416 |
| Bond | 123 | 636 | 759 |
| USDA-RD |  |  |  |
| HUD |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Total | 501 | 6,330 | 6,831 |

Source: Allen \& Associates

Distribution of Confirmed Market Area Units by Financing Source


Our research suggests that of the 41 confirmed properties in the market area, 23 properties (consisting of 4656 units) are conventionally financed, 14 properties (consisting of 1416 units) include tax credit financing, 4 properties (consisting of 759 units) are bond financed, 0 properties (consisting of 0 units) are exclusively USDARD financed, and 0 properties (consisting of 0 units) are exclusively HUD financed.

The average project size for this market area is 167 units. The smallest projects are tax credit financed, averaging 101 units in size. The largest projects are conventionally financed, averaging 202 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

| Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subsidized |  |  | Restricted |  |  | Market |  |  |
|  | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg |
| 0-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\$ 718$ | $\$ 1,445$ | $\$ 1,082$ |
| 1-Bedroom | $\$ 432$ | $\$ 615$ | $\$ 537$ | $\$ 495$ | $\$ 891$ | $\$ 747$ | $\$ 689$ | $\$ 1,595$ | $\$ 1,008$ |
| 2-Bedroom | $\$ 519$ | $\$ 914$ | $\$ 699$ | $\$ 561$ | $\$ 1,057$ | $\$ 826$ | $\$ 798$ | $\$ 1,929$ | $\$ 1,152$ |
| 3-Bedroom | $\$ 718$ | $\$ 1,117$ | $\$ 881$ | $\$ 679$ | $\$ 1,222$ | $\$ 989$ | $\$ 989$ | $\$ 2,170$ | $\$ 1,402$ |
| 4-Bedroom | $\$ 904$ | $\$ 908$ | $\$ 907$ | $\$ 908$ | $\$ 908$ | $\$ 908$ | - | - | - |

Unit Size

|  | Subsidized |  |  | Restricted |  |  | Market |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg |
| 0-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | 288 | 790 | 539 |
| 1-Bedroom | 458 | 675 | 577 | 604 | 850 | 745 | 556 | 975 | 727 |
| 2-Bedroom | 656 | 854 | 757 | 425 | 1,200 | 890 | 792 | 1,311 | 995 |
| 3-Bedroom | 936 | 1,114 | 1,027 | 1,087 | 1,500 | 1,188 | 1,000 | 1,561 | 1,274 |
| 4-Bedroom | 1,012 | 1,231 | 1,100 | 1,029 | 1,052 | 1,041 | - | - | - |

Rent per Square Foot

|  | Subsidized |  |  | Restricted |  |  | Market |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg | Min | Max | Avg |
| 0-Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\$ 1.83$ | $\$ 2.49$ | $\$ 2.01$ |
| 1-Bedroom | $\$ 0.91$ | $\$ 0.94$ | $\$ 0.93$ | $\$ 0.82$ | $\$ 1.05$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.24$ | $\$ 1.64$ | $\$ 1.39$ |
| 2-Bedroom | $\$ 0.79$ | $\$ 1.07$ | $\$ 0.92$ | $\$ 0.88$ | $\$ 1.32$ | $\$ 0.93$ | $\$ 1.01$ | $\$ 1.47$ | $\$ 1.16$ |
| 3-Bedroom | $\$ 0.77$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 0.86$ | $\$ 0.62$ | $\$ 0.81$ | $\$ 0.83$ | $\$ 0.99$ | $\$ 1.39$ | $\$ 1.10$ |
| 4-Bedroom | $\$ 0.74$ | $\$ 0.89$ | $\$ 0.82$ | $\$ 0.86$ | $\$ 0.88$ | $\$ 0.87$ | - | - | - |

Source: Allen \& Associates


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

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable
- 1-Bedroom, $\$ 1.0$ per square foot
- 2-Bedroom, $\$ 0.93$ per square foot
- 3-Bedroom, $\$ 0.83$ per square foot
- 4-Bedroom, \$0.87 per square foot

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

- 0-Bedroom, $\$ 2.01$ per square foot
- 1-Bedroom, \$1.39 per square foot
- 2-Bedroom, \$1.16 per square foot
- 3-Bedroom, \$1.10 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 |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | 35 | 90 | 110 | 235 |
| 2-Bedroom | 13 | 213 | 40 | 266 |
| 3-Bedroom <br> 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 48 | 303 | 150 | 501 |


| Family |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  | 46 | 46 |
| 1-Bedroom | 15 | 249 | 1,174 | 1,438 |
| 2-Bedroom | 166 | 1,022 | 2,701 | 3,889 |
| 3-Bedroom | 30 | 326 | 585 | 941 |
| 4-Bedroom | 6 | 10 |  | 16 |
| Total | 217 | 1,607 | 4,506 | 6,330 |


| Unit Mix |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Bedroom | $73 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| 2-Bedroom | $27 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| 3-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |


| Unit Mix |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | Res | Mkt | Tot |
| 0-Bedroom |  |  | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| 1-Bedroom | $7 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| 2-Bedroom | $76 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| 3-Bedroom | $14 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| 4-Bedroom | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Source: Allen \& Associates


Our research suggests the following unit mix for the 501 confirmed elderly units located in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, not applicable (0 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 47 percent (235 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, 53 percent (266 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 6,330 confirmed family units located in this market area:

- 0-Bedroom, 1 percent (46 units in survey)
- 1-Bedroom, 23 percent (1,438 units in survey)
- 2-Bedroom, 61 percent ( 3,889 units in survey)
- 3-Bedroom, 15 percent (941 units in survey)
- 4-Bedroom, percent (16 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 | $5 \%$ |  | Central | $98 \%$ |
| $2-4$ Story | $95 \%$ |  | Wall Units | $2 \%$ |
| $5-10$ Story | $0 \%$ |  | Window Units | $0 \%$ |
| $>10$ Story | $0 \%$ |  | None | $0 \%$ |


| Project Amenities |  |  |  | Heat |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Ball Field | $0 \%$ |  | Central | $100 \%$ |
| BBQ Area | $44 \%$ |  | Wall Units | $0 \%$ |
| Billiards | $7 \%$ |  | Baseboards | $0 \%$ |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | $29 \%$ |  | Radiators | $0 \%$ |
| Car Care Ctr | $5 \%$ |  | None | $0 \%$ |

Comm Center 63\%
Elevator 12\%
Fitness Center 46\%
Gazebo 17\%
Hot Tub/Jacuzzi 5\%

| Horseshoe Pit Open | $0 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Lake 0\%
None 2\%
Library 15\%
Movie Theatre 12\%
Picnic Area 51\%
Playground 66\%
Pool 61\%
Sauna 2\%
Sports Court 22\%
Walking Trail 5\%

| Unit Amenities |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Blinds | $100 \%$ |
| Ceiling Fans | $54 \%$ |


| Parking |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Garage | $2 \%$ |  |
| Covered |  | $0 \%$ |
| Assigned |  | $15 \%$ |
| Open | $85 \%$ |  |
| None | $2 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Laundry |
| Central |  | $63 \%$ |
| W/D Units | $34 \%$ |  |
| W/D Hookups |  |  |


| Security |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Call Buttons | $12 \%$ |
| Cont Access | $12 \%$ |
| Courtesy Officer | $20 \%$ |
| Monitoring | $5 \%$ |
| Security Alarms | $5 \%$ |
| Security Patrols | $12 \%$ |

Fireplace 2\%

Patio/Balcony 73\%
Storage 27\%

| Kitchen Amenities |  |  | After School | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stove |  | Concierge | $0 \%$ |  |
| Refrigerator | $100 \%$ |  | Hair Salon | $5 \%$ |
| Disposal | $100 \%$ |  | Health Care | $0 \%$ |
| Dishwasher | $63 \%$ | Linens | $0 \%$ |  |
| Microwave | $83 \%$ |  | Meals | $0 \%$ |
|  | $27 \%$ | Transportation | $0 \%$ |  |

Our research suggests that 5 percent of confirmed market area properties are 1 story in height, 95 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: 29 percent have a business/computer center, 63 percent have a community center, 46 percent have a fitness center, 66 percent have a playground, and 22 percent have a sports court.

Our research also suggests that the following unit amenities are present at surveyed properties: 100 percent have blinds, 98 percent have carpeting, 73 percent have patios/balconies, and 27 percent have outside storage. Surveyed properties also include the following kitchen amenities: 100 percent have a stove, 100 percent have a refrigerator, 63 percent have a disposal, 83 percent have a dishwasher, and 27 percent have a microwave.

In addition, 100 percent of confirmed market area properties have central heat while 98 percent have central air. Our research also suggests that 85 percent of surveyed properties have open parking. A total of 63 percent of area properties have central laundry facilities, while 37 percent have washer/dryer hookups, and 34 percent have washer/dryer units in each residential unit.

A total of 12 percent of confirmed market area properties have call buttons, 12 percent have controlled access, and 5 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002 | Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1615 | -76.5600 | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 118 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 004 | Arbors At Williamsburg | 37.2461 | -76.6567 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Elderly | Construction | Conventional | 150 | 150 | 0.0\% | - | 0\% | - | - |
| 005 | Ashton Green Apartments | 37.1574 | -76.5583 | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 228 | 1 | 99.6\% | 0\% | 48\% | - | no |
| 006 | Auburn Point Apartments | 37.1339 | -76.5274 | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 274 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 50\% | - | 7 people |
| 008 | Autumn Lakes Apartments | 37.1357 | -76.5473 | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 296 | 1 | 99.7\% | 0\% | 11\% | - | - |
| 014 | Checed Warwick Apartments | 37.1463 | -76.5510 | 2005 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 48\% | - | yes |
| 016 | Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 37.1998 | -76.5753 | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 223 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 3 months |
| 019 | Clairmont Apartments | 37.1928 | -76.4923 | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 216 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 028 | Country Club Apartments | 37.2435 | -76.6513 | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 100 | 6 | 94.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 030 | Cypress Terrace Apartments | 37.1531 | -76.5490 | 1981 | 2016 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 82 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 18 months |
| 034 | Forrest Pines Apartments | 37.1334 | -76.5415 | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 110 | 1 | 99.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 035 | Forrest Pines Senior Apartments | 37.1348 | -76.5414 | 2014 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Bond | 123 | 1 | 99.2\% | 0\% | 30\% | - | - |
| 037 | Grafton Station Apartments | 37.1582 | -76.4596 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 411 | 36 | 91.2\% | 6\% | 0\% | - | 0 people |
| 044 | Hickory Point Apartments | 37.1554 | -76.5595 | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 175 | 1 | 99.4\% | 0\% | 6\% | - | 50 people |
| 045 | High Street View Luxury Apartments | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 96 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 046 | High Street View Luxury Apartments Phas | 37.1433 | -76.5182 | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Construction | Conventional | 102 | 4 | 96.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 049 | James River Flats | 37.1657 | -76.5437 | 1984 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 100 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 1/2 years |
| 052 | Kate's Trace Apartments | 37.1711 | -76.5478 | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 108 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 28\% | 27.00 | 4-6 months |
| 054 | King's Ridge Apartments | 37.1588 | -76.5326 | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 182 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 60\% | - | no |
| 059 | Lee's Landing Apartments | 37.1866 | -76.5754 | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 136 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0 people |
| 060 | Lexington Commons Apartments | 37.1347 | -76.5392 | 1994 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 132 | 1 | 99.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 071 | New Phoenix Village Apartments | 37.1697 | -76.5664 | 1985 | 2014 | Subsidized | Elderly | Prop Rehab | Tax Credit | 48 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 88 families |
| 079 | Patriots Crossing | 37.1374 | -76.5430 | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Bond | 240 | 2 | 99.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 096 | Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5422 | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - |  |
| 097 | Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 37.1849 | -76.5729 | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 100 | 3 | 97.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 098 | Residences at Forest Grove | 37.1519 | -76.5322 | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 200 | 1 | 99.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 099 | River Mews Apartments | 37.1538 | -76.5591 | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 645 | 20 | 96.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 100 | Rivermeade Phase 1 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 48 | 2 | 95.8\% | 0\% | 27\% | - | no |
| 101 | Rivermeade Phase 2 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 32 | 1 | 96.9\% | 0\% | 28\% | - | no |
| 104 | Sea Pines Apartments | 37.1721 | -76.5498 | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 129 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 111 | St. Andrews Apartments | 37.1371 | -76.5262 | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 312 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 119 | Townes at Jones Run | 37.1697 | -76.5449 | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 300 | 3 | 99.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 120 | Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 37.1676 | -76.5684 | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 176 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 125 | Villages of Stoney Run | 37.1420 | -76.5189 | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 232 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | no |
| 133 | Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 54 | 3 | 94.4\% | 0\% | 15\% | - | no |
| 134 | Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 37.2351 | -76.5389 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 64 | 3 | 95.3\% | 0\% | 53\% | - | no |
| 136 | Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 37.1723 | -76.5454 | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 108 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0 people |
| 138 | Woodscape Apartments | 37.1532 | -76.5359 | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 296 | 6 | 98.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 142 | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 37.1884 | -76.4869 | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized | Conventional | 89 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| 143 | Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 56 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0\% | 21\% | - | no |
| 144 | Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 37.2268 | -76.5195 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | Tax Credit | 60 | 1 | 98.3\% | 0\% | 13\% | - | no |

## 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

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Property Name | Built | Renovated | Rent Type | Occ Type | Status | Sub | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | Mkt |
| 002 Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 007 Aura At Quarterpath | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,269 |
| 016 Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$795 |
| 018 City Lofts | 1988 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$960 |
| 019 Clairmont Apartments | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,295 |
| 020 Clinton Garden Apartments | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$805 |
| 023 Colonial Pines Apartments | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 024 Colonial Point Apartments | 1974 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 027 Conway Gardens Apartments | 1968 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$872 |
| 028 Country Club Apartments | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$689 |
| 034 Forrest Pines Apartments | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$776 |
| 036 Founders Village Apartments | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,199 |
| 037 Grafton Station Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$832 |
| 044 Hickory Point Apartments | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 045 High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,595 |
| 048 Hoopes Place Apartments | 1972 | 1995 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$558 |
| 050 Jordan Realty Inc | 1972 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 051 Julia Ann Apartments | 1963 | 1996 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 053 King and Queen Apartments | 1964 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,078 |
| 059 Lee's Landing Apartments | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 061 Liberty Point Townhome | 1969 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$680 |
| 067 Marlboro Apartments | 1968 | 1999 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$725 |
| 068 Merrimac Crossing | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$825 |
| 070 Monticello at Powhatan Apartments | 2001 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,166 |
| 072 Newmoor Properties | 1979 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$540 |
| 074 Olde Jamestowne Apartments | 1970 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$750 |
| 088 Pointe At New Town | 2007 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,081 |
| 093 Quarterpath Place Apartments | 1966 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 095 Regency at Longhill Phases 1 \& 2 | 1985 | 2000 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$886 |
| 096 Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$805 |
| 097 Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,005 |
| 098 Residences at Forest Grove | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$974 |
| 099 River Mews Apartments | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,150 |
| 104 Sea Pines Apartments | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$813 |
| 107 Spotswood Commons Apartments | 2002 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,075 |
| 108 Spring Garden Apartments | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 109 Spring House at Newport News | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$780 |
| 110 Spring Road Apartments | 1965 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$845 |
| 111 St. Andrews Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$705 |
| 113 Steeplechase Apartments | 1986 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,092 |
| 114 Sterling Manor Apartments | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,299 |
| 115 Stonegate Apartments | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$765 |
| 116 Stratford at Williamsburg Apartments | 1977 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$774 |
| 119 Townes at Jones Run | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 120 Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 |
| 121 Turnberry Wells Apartments | 1974 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 122 Tyndall Point Townhouse | 1991 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 124 Village of Woodshire Apartments | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$795 |
| 125 Villages of Stoney Run | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,225 |
| 128 Waverton Denbigh Village | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$899 |
| 136 Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,020 |
| 137 Woods of Williamsburg Apartments | 1975 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$812 |
| 138 Woodscape Apartments | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,008 |
| 142 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 145 Yorkview Apartments | 1987 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$555 |

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 Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,073 |
| 007 Aura At Quarterpath | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,467 |
| 016 Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,009 |
| 018 City Lofts | 1988 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,082 |
| 019 Clairmont Apartments | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,495 |
| 020 Clinton Garden Apartments | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$935 |
| 023 Colonial Pines Apartments | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,122 |
| 024 Colonial Point Apartments | 1974 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$766 |
| 027 Conway Gardens Apartments | 1968 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$985 |
| 028 Country Club Apartments | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$798 |
| 034 Forrest Pines Apartments | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$843 |
| 036 Founders Village Apartments | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,422 |
| 037 Grafton Station Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$999 |
| 044 Hickory Point Apartments | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$990 |
| 045 High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,929 |
| 048 Hoopes Place Apartments | 1972 | 1995 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$618 |
| 050 Jordan Realty Inc | 1972 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$750 |
| 051 Julia Ann Apartments | 1963 | 1996 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$940 |
| 053 King and Queen Apartments | 1964 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 059 Lee's Landing Apartments | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$849 |
| 061 Liberty Point Townhome | 1969 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$756 |
| 067 Marlboro Apartments | 1968 | 1999 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$833 |
| 068 Merrimac Crossing | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$987 |
| 070 Monticello at Powhatan Apartments | 2001 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,312 |
| 072 Newmoor Properties | 1979 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$755 |
| 074 Olde Jamestowne Apartments | 1970 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 088 Pointe At New Town | 2007 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,385 |
| 093 Quarterpath Place Apartments | 1966 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$925 |
| 095 Regency at Longhill Phases 1 \& 2 | 1985 | 2000 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,084 |
| 096 Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$919 |
| 097 Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,108 |
| 098 Residences at Forest Grove | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,174 |
| 099 River Mews Apartments | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,312 |
| 104 Sea Pines Apartments | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$991 |
| 107 Spotswood Commons Apartments | 2002 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,330 |
| 108 Spring Garden Apartments | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,033 |
| 109 Spring House at Newport News | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$933 |
| 110 Spring Road Apartments | 1965 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$858 |
| 111 St. Andrews Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$858 |
| 113 Steeplechase Apartments | 1986 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,297 |
| 114 Sterling Manor Apartments | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,510 |
| 115 Stonegate Apartments | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$810 |
| 116 Stratford at Williamsburg Apartments | 1977 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$845 |
| 119 Townes at Jones Run | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,371 |
| 120 Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$915 |

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 |
| 121 Turnberry Wells Apartments | 1974 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$863 |
| 122 Tyndall Point Townhouse | 1991 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$800 |
| 124 Village of Woodshire Apartments | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$972 |
| 125 Villages of Stoney Run | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,509 |
| 128 Waverton Denbigh Village | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,112 |
| 136 Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,125 |
| 137 Woods of Williamsburg Apartments | 1975 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$884 |
| 138 Woodscape Apartments | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,075 |
| 142 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 145 Yorkview Apartments | 1987 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$671 |

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 Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 007 Aura At Quarterpath | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,568 |
| 016 Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,380 |
| 018 City Lofts | 1988 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 019 Clairmont Apartments | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,695 |
| 020 Clinton Garden Apartments | 1985 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,085 |
| 023 Colonial Pines Apartments | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 024 Colonial Point Apartments | 1974 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 027 Conway Gardens Apartments | 1968 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,178 |
| 028 Country Club Apartments | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$989 |
| 034 Forrest Pines Apartments | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,039 |
| 036 Founders Village Apartments | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,904 |
| 037 Grafton Station Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,149 |
| 044 Hickory Point Apartments | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 045 High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,170 |
| 048 Hoopes Place Apartments | 1972 | 1995 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 050 Jordan Realty Inc | 1972 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 051 Julia Ann Apartments | 1963 | 1996 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 053 King and Queen Apartments | 1964 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 059 Lee's Landing Apartments | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 061 Liberty Point Townhome | 1969 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$956 |
| 067 Marlboro Apartments | 1968 | 1999 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$955 |
| 068 Merrimac Crossing | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,065 |
| 070 Monticello at Powhatan Apartments | 2001 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,607 |
| 072 Newmoor Properties | 1979 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 074 Olde Jamestowne Apartments | 1970 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 088 Pointe At New Town | 2007 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 093 Quarterpath Place Apartments | 1966 | 2013 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 095 Regency at Longhill Phases 1 \& 2 | 1985 | 2000 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 096 Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 097 Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,258 |
| 098 Residences at Forest Grove | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,311 |
| 099 River Mews Apartments | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,495 |
| 104 Sea Pines Apartments | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 107 Spotswood Commons Apartments | 2002 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,555 |
| 108 Spring Garden Apartments | 1968 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,153 |
| 109 Spring House at Newport News | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Spring Road Apartments | 1965 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,061 |
| 111 St. Andrews Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 113 Steeplechase Apartments | 1986 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,480 |
| 114 Sterling Manor Apartments | 2008 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 115 Stonegate Apartments | 1972 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$990 |
| 116 Stratford at Williamsburg Apartments | 1977 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 119 Townes at Jones Run | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 120 Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,145 |

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 |
| 121 Turnberry Wells Apartments | 1974 | 2011 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,100 |
| 122 Tyndall Point Townhouse | 1991 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 124 Village of Woodshire Apartments | 1973 | 2007 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,081 |
| 125 Villages of Stoney Run | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,735 |
| 128 Waverton Denbigh Village | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,312 |
| 136 Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,275 |
| 137 Woods of Williamsburg Apartments | 1975 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$983 |
| 138 Woodscape Apartments | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,354 |
| 142 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,635 |
| 145 Yorkview Apartments | 1987 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## 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 | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50$ | Concluded |
| Internet | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 0$ |

## 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 $\$ 20$ per bedroom.

| Bedrooms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Bedrooms | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 200$ | $\$ 20$ |  |

## 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 $\$ 0$ per bathroom.

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

## 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 $\$ 0.65$ per square foot.

| Square Feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Square Feet | $\$ 0.00 \quad \$ 2.00$ | $\$ 0.65$ |  |

## 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 $\$ 45$ per point for differences in visibility ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Visibility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 45$ |

## 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 $\$ 75$ per point for differences in neighborhood ratings between the subject and the comparables.

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

## 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 $\$ 30$ per point for differences in amenity ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Area Amenities |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |
| Rating | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 100$ | $\$ 30$ |

## 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 | $\$ 0.0000 \quad \$ 0.0100$ | $\$ 0.0000$ |

## 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 | $\$ 0.00 \quad \$ 20.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## 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 $\$ 50.00$ for publc transportation.

| Public Transportation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Public Trans | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 200.00$ | $\$ 50.00$ |

## 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 $\$ 040$ per 0.01 percentage points.

| Personal Crime |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Personal Crime | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 40$ |

## 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 |  |  |
| 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 | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Billiards | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Bus/Comp Ctrs | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 9$ |
| Car Care Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Elevator | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Fitness Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Gazebo | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Horseshoe Pit | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Lake | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Library | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Movie Theatre | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Picnic Area | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Playground | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Pool | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Sauna | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Sports Court | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| 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 | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 50$ |

## 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 $\$ 5$ per month for central laundries; washer/dryer units were valued at $\$ 50$; washer/dryer hookups were valued at $\$ 5$.

| Laundry |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Central | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 5$ |
| W/D Units | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 50$ |
| 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 | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Monitoring | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Security Alarms | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Security Patrols | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |

Rent Conclusion, 2BR-2BA-957sf
The development of our rent conclusion for the 2BR-2BA-957sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 14 unit types found at 4 properties. We selected the 14 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 14 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 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 05 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 듣 } \\ & \text { व్x } \end{aligned}$ |
| Sub-04 Woods At Yorktown NC | 2BR-2BA-957sf | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$1,005 | - | \$0 | \$1,005 | - |
| 019-01 Clairmont Apartments | 1BR-1BA-800sf | \$1,295 | \$0 | \$1,295 | \$521 | -\$151 | \$1,144 | 4 |
| 019-02 Clairmont Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1130sf | \$1,495 | \$0 | \$1,495 | \$525 | -\$338 | \$1,157 | 5 |
| 019-03 Clairmont Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1280sf | \$1,695 | \$0 | \$1,695 | \$703 | -\$394 | \$1,301 | 8 |
| 045-01 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 1BR-1BA-805sf | \$1,475 | \$0 | \$1,475 | \$478 | -\$208 | \$1,267 | 2 |
| 045-02 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 1BR-1BA-1018sf | \$1,625 | \$0 | \$1,625 | \$419 | -\$347 | \$1,278 | 1 |
| 045-03 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 2BR-1BA-1168sf | \$1,875 | \$0 | \$1,875 | \$510 | -\$416 | \$1,459 | 3 |
| 045-04 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 2BR-2BA-1568sf | \$2,025 | \$0 | \$2,025 | \$770 | -\$676 | \$1,349 | 11 |
| 045-05 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 3BR-2BA-1561sf | \$1,975 | \$0 | \$1,975 | \$847 | -\$631 | \$1,344 | 12 |
| 045-06 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 3BR-2BA-1561sf | \$2,625 | \$0 | \$2,625 | \$847 | -\$631 | \$1,994 | 12 |
| 125-01 Villages of Stoney Run | 1BR-1BA-670sf | \$1,225 | \$0 | \$1,225 | \$650 | -\$153 | \$1,072 | 7 |
| 125-02 Villages of Stoney Run | 2BR-2BA-1124sf | \$1,509 | \$0 | \$1,509 | \$600 | -\$420 | \$1,089 | 6 |
| 125-03 Villages of Stoney Run | 3BR-2BA-1438sf | \$1,735 | \$0 | \$1,735 | \$885 | -\$583 | \$1,152 | 14 |
| 142-01 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 3BR-2.5BA-1452sf | \$1,609 | \$0 | \$1,609 | \$739 | -\$461 | \$1,148 | 9 |
| 142-02 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 3BR-2.5BA-1464sf | \$1,689 | \$0 | \$1,689 | \$747 | -\$469 | \$1,220 | 10 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 1,072$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 1,994$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 1,284$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 1,242$ |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 1,240$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 1,240$ for the $2 B R-2 B A-957$ sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 2BR-1BA-1168sf units at High Street View Luxury Apartments (Property \# 045), the 2BR-2BA-1130sf units at Clairmont Apartments (Property \# 019), the 2BR-2BA-1124sf units at Villages of Stoney Run (Property \# 125), the 3BR-2.5BA-1452sf units at Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments (Property \# 142), and the 2BR-2BA-1568sf units at High Street View Luxury Apartments (Property \# 045) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.

| Comparable |  | Subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property-Unit Key |  | Sub-04 | 019-02 | 045-03 | 045-04 | 125-02 | 142-01 |
| Unit Type |  | 2BR-2BA-957sf | 2BR-2BA-1130sf | 2BR-1BA-1168sf | 2BR-2BA-1568sf | 2BR-2BA-1124sf | 3BR-2.5BA-1452sf |
| Property Name |  | Woods At Yorktown NC | Clairmont Apartments | High Street View Luxury Apartments | High Street View Luxury Apartments | Villages of Stoney Run | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments |
| Address |  | 2801 Old Williamsburg Road | 100 Arcadia Loop | 101 Kings Manor Drive | 101 Kings Manor Drive | 650 Stoney Creek Lane | 0 General's Way |
| City |  | Yorktown | Yorktown | Williamsburg | Williamsburg | Newport News | Yorktown |
| State |  | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia | Virginia |
| Zip |  | 23690 | 23672 | 23185 | 23185 | 23608 | 23692 |
| Latitude |  | 37.23512 | 37.19275 | 37.14333 | 37.14333 | 37.14196 | 37.18842 |
| Longitude |  | -76.53888 | -76.49229 | -76.51820 | -76.51820 | -76.51891 | -76.48694 |
| Miles to Subject |  | 0.00 | 3.57 | 5.33 | 5.33 | 5.40 | 3.96 |
| Year Built |  | 2022 | 2003 | 2019 | 2019 | 2006 | 2014 |
| Year Rehab |  | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Project Rent |  | Restricted | Market Rate | Market Rate | Market Rate | Market Rate | Market Rate |
| Project Type |  | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family | Family |
| Project Status |  | Prop Const | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized | Stabilized |
| Phone |  | (757) 888-2490 | (757) 988-8800 | (757) 525-5203 | (757) 525-5203 | (757) 988-0288 | (757) 605-3878 |
| Effective Date |  | 26-Feb-22 | 29-Oct-21 | 29-Oct-21 | 29-Oct-21 | 29-Oct-21 | 01-Nov-21 |
| Project Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 60 | 216 | 96 | 96 | 232 | 89 |
| Vacant Units |  | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Unit Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Units |  | 3 | 132 | 36 | 20 | 114 | 60 |
| Vacant Units |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vacancy Rate |  | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Street Rent |  | \$1,005 | \$1,495 | \$1,875 | \$2,025 | \$1,509 | \$1,609 |
| Concessions |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Net Rent |  | \$1,005 | \$1,495 | \$1,875 | \$2,025 | \$1,509 | \$1,609 |
|  | Adj | Data | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj | Data Adj |
| Tenant-Paid Utilities | TPU | \$153 | \$184 \$31 | \$184 \$31 | \$184 \$31 | \$209 \$56 | \$265 \$112 |
| Cable | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes \$0 | no \$0 |
| Internet | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bedrooms | \$20 | 2 | 2 \$0 | 2 \$0 | \$0 | 2 \$0 | 3 -\$20 |
| Bathrooms | \$0 | 2.00 | 2.00 \$0 | 1.00 \$0 | 2.00 \$0 | 2.00 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 |
| Square Feet | \$0.65 | 957 | 1130 -\$112 | 1168 -\$137 | 1568 -\$397 | 1124 -\$109 | 1452 -\$322 |
| Visibility | \$45 | 2.50 | 2.00 \$23 | 2.50 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 3.00 -\$23 | 2.50 \$0 |
| Access | \$0 | 2.50 | 2.50 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 2.50 \$0 | 3.50 \$0 | 3.00 \$0 |
| Neighborhood | \$75 | 2.00 | 4.50 -\$188 | 3.90 -\$143 | 3.90 -\$143 | 3.90 -\$143 | 3.30 -\$98 |
| Area Amenities | \$30 | 2.00 | 2.10 -\$3 | 4.00 -\$60 | 4.00 -\$60 | 4.50 -\$75 | 2.70 -\$21 |
| Median HH Income | \$0.0000 | \$28,895 | \$72,188 \$0 | \$52,292 \$0 | \$52,292 \$0 | \$52,292 \$0 | \$41,875 \$0 |
| Average Commute | \$0 | 29.15 | 26.32 \$0 | 25.68 \$0 | 25.68 \$0 | 25.68 \$0 | 21.40 \$0 |
| Public Transportation | \$50 | na | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 | na \$0 |
| Personal Crime | \$40 | 2.4\% | 1.2\% \$0 | 1.0\% -\$1 | 1.0\% -\$1 | 1.0\% -\$1 | 5.5\% \$1 |
| Condition | \$10 | 4.50 | 3.50 \$10 | 4.50 \$0 | 4.50 \$0 | 4.00 \$5 | 4.00 \$5 |
| Effective Age | \$1.00 | 2021 | 2005 \$16 | 2019 \$2 | 2019 \$2 | 2006 \$15 | 2014 \$7 |
| Ball Field | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| BBQ Area | \$10 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$10 | yes -\$10 | yes $\quad$-\$10 | yes -\$10 |
| Billiards | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Bus/Comp Center | \$9 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$9 | yes -\$9 | yes -\$9 | no \$0 |
| Car Care Center | \$2 | no | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Community Center | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | no \$2 |
| Elevator | \$10 | no | no \$0 | yes -\$10 | yes -\$10 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Fitness Center | \$10 | no | yes $\quad$-\$10 | yes $\quad$ - 10 | yes -\$10 | yes $\quad$ - $\$ 10$ | no \$0 |
| Gazebo | \$10 | no | no \$0 | yes $\quad$ - 10 | yes -\$10 | no \$0 | yes -\$10 |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | \$2 | no | no \$0 | yes $\quad$ - 2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Horseshoe Pit | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 |
| Lake | \$2 | no | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | some \$0 |
| Library | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Movie Theatre | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes $\quad$-\$10 | no \$0 |
| Picnic Area | \$10 | no | yes $\quad$ - 10 | yes -\$10 | yes -\$10 | yes $\quad$ - 10 | yes $\quad$ - 10 |
| Playground | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | no \$2 | no \$2 | no \$2 | yes \$0 |
| Pool | \$2 | no | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | no \$0 |
| Sauna | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Sports Court | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | \$0 | no \$0 |
| Walking Trail | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Blinds | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Ceiling Fans | \$2 | no | some $\quad \$ 0$ | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes $\quad$-\$2 | yes $\quad$-\$2 |
| Carpeting / LVT | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Fireplace | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Patio/Balcony | \$2 | no | yes -\$2 | yes $\quad$ \$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes $\quad$-\$2 |
| Storage | \$50 | no | yes -\$50 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$50 | 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 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 |
| Dishwasher | \$2 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 |
| Microwave | \$2 | no | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 | yes -\$2 |
| Garage | \$50 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | some \$0 | yes -\$50 |
| Covered | \$20 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Assigned | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Open | \$0 | yes | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | yes \$0 | some \$0 |
| None | \$0 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Central | \$5 | yes | no \$5 | no \$5 | no \$5 | no \$5 | no \$5 |
| W/D Units | \$50 | no | yes $\quad$-\$50 | yes -\$50 | yes -\$50 | yes $\quad$ - 50 | yes $\quad$-\$50 |
| W/D Hookups | \$5 | yes | no \$5 | no \$5 | no \$5 | no \$5 | no \$5 |
| Call Buttons | \$2 | no | 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 | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Monitoring | \$2 | yes | no \$2 | no \$2 | no \$2 | no \$2 | no \$2 |
| Security Alarms | \$10 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 |
| Security Patrols | \$2 | no | no \$0 | no \$0 | no \$0 | yes -\$2 | yes $\quad$-\$2 |
| Indicated Rent |  | \$1,240 | \$1,157 | \$1,459 | \$1,349 | \$1,089 | \$1,148 |

Rent Conclusion, 3BR-2BA-1120sf
The development of our rent conclusion for the 3BR-2BA-1120sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 14 unit types found at 4 properties. We selected the 14 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 14 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 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{y}{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & .0 \\ & \text { Wh } \\ & 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dddot{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-09 Woods At Yorktown NC | 3BR-2BA-1120sf | \$1,140 | \$0 | \$1,140 | - | \$0 | \$1,140 | - |
| 019-01 Clairmont Apartments | 1BR-1BA-800sf | \$1,295 | \$0 | \$1,295 | \$675 | -\$54 | \$1,241 | 10 |
| 019-02 Clairmont Apartments | 2BR-2BA-1130sf | \$1,495 | \$0 | \$1,495 | \$410 | -\$241 | \$1,254 | 2 |
| 019-03 Clairmont Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1280sf | \$1,695 | \$0 | \$1,695 | \$548 | -\$297 | \$1,398 | 5 |
| 045-01 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 1BR-1BA-805sf | \$1,475 | \$0 | \$1,475 | \$633 | -\$111 | \$1,364 | 8 |
| 045-02 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 1BR-1BA-1018sf | \$1,625 | \$0 | \$1,625 | \$494 | -\$250 | \$1,375 | 4 |
| 045-03 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 2BR-1BA-1168sf | \$1,875 | \$0 | \$1,875 | \$395 | -\$319 | \$1,556 | 1 |
| 045-04 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 2BR-2BA-1568sf | \$2,025 | \$0 | \$2,025 | \$655 | -\$579 | \$1,446 | 9 |
| 045-05 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 3BR-2BA-1561sf | \$1,975 | \$0 | \$1,975 | \$692 | -\$534 | \$1,441 | 11 |
| 045-06 High Street View Luxury Apartment | 3BR-2BA-1561sf | \$2,625 | \$0 | \$2,625 | \$692 | -\$534 | \$2,091 | 11 |
| 125-01 Villages of Stoney Run | 1BR-1BA-670sf | \$1,225 | \$0 | \$1,225 | \$789 | -\$56 | \$1,169 | 14 |
| 125-02 Villages of Stoney Run | 2BR-2BA-1124sf | \$1,509 | \$0 | \$1,509 | \$485 | -\$323 | \$1,186 | 3 |
| 125-03 Villages of Stoney Run | 3BR-2BA-1438sf | \$1,735 | \$0 | \$1,735 | \$730 | -\$486 | \$1,249 | 13 |
| 142-01 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 3BR-2.5BA-1452sf | \$1,609 | \$0 | \$1,609 | \$585 | -\$364 | \$1,245 | 6 |
| 142-02 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 3BR-2.5BA-1464sf | \$1,689 | \$0 | \$1,689 | \$592 | -\$372 | \$1,317 | 7 |

Adjusted Rent, Minimum \$1,169

Adjusted Rent, Maximum \$2,091
Adjusted Rent, Average \$1,381
Adjusted Rent, Modified Average \$1,339

Rent, Concluded
\$1,340
Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 1,340$ for the 3BR-2BA-1120sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 3BR-2BA-1280sf units at Clairmont Apartments (Property \# 019), the 3BR-2.5BA-1452sf units at Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments (Property \# 142), the 3BR-2.5BA-1464sf units at Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments (Property \# 142), the 3BR-2BA-1561sf units at High Street View Luxury Apartments (Property \# 045), and the 3BR-2BA-1438sf units at Villages of Stoney Run (Property \# 125) are the best comparables for the 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 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,240 | \$900 | 27.4\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,240 | \$900 | 27.4\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$1,240 | \$788 | 36.5\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$1,240 | \$1,005 | 19.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,340 | \$1,100 | 17.9\% |
| $3 \mathrm{BR}-2 \mathrm{BA}-1120 \mathrm{sf} / 50 \%$ of $\mathrm{AMI} / 50 \%$ of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,340 | \$1,100 | 17.9\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | \$1,340 | \$905 | 32.5\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 12 | \$1,340 | \$1,125 | 16.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | \$1,340 | \$1,140 | 14.9\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | \$1,320 | \$1,004 | 24.0\% |

Our analysis suggests an average unrestricted market rent of $\$ 1,320$ for the subject property. This is compared with an average proposed rent of $\$ 1,004$, yielding an unrestricted market rent advantage of 24 percent. Overall, the subject property appears to be priced at or below unrestricted market rents for the area.

We selected a total of 4 properties as comparables for purposes of our analysis. The average occupancy at the select rent comparables currently stands at 100 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| 3-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| 1-Bedroom | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | 99\% |
| 2-Bedroom | 99\% |  | 95\% | 98\% | 99\% |  |  | 99\% |
| 3-Bedroom | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | 95\% |
| 4-Bedroom | 100\% |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 99\% |  | 96\% | 99\% | 100\% |  |  | 98\% |

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 $\$ 934$ to $\$ 1147$ since 2010. This represents an average $2.1 \%$ 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 | 3BR | 1 1BR | 2BR | 3BR |
| 2008 | $\$ 787$ | $\$ 904$ | $\$ 1,247$ | - | - | - |
| 2009 | $\$ 781$ | $\$ 904$ | $\$ 1,236$ | $-0.8 \%$ |  | $-0.9 \%$ |
| 2010 | $\$ 807$ | $\$ 934$ | $\$ 1,277$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 834$ | $\$ 965$ | $\$ 1,319$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 919$ | $\$ 1,064$ | $\$ 1,454$ | $10.2 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 944$ | $\$ 1,136$ | $\$ 1,570$ | $2.7 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 939$ | $\$ 1,130$ | $\$ 1,562$ | $-0.5 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 920$ | $\$ 1,107$ | $\$ 1,530$ | $-2.0 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 953$ | $\$ 1,150$ | $\$ 1,601$ | $3.6 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 939$ | $\$ 1,130$ | $\$ 1,577$ | $-1.5 \%$ | $-1.7 \%$ | $-1.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 912$ | $\$ 1,095$ | $\$ 1,533$ | $-2.9 \%$ | $-3.1 \%$ | $-2.8 \%$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 925$ | $\$ 1,104$ | $\$ 1,553$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 958$ | $\$ 1,136$ | $\$ 1,603$ | $3.6 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 972$ | $\$ 1,147$ | $\$ 1,618$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |

Source: HUD

## 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 |
| 005 Ashton Green Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 006 Auburn Point Apartments | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$690 | \$809 |  |  |  |
| 008 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$885 |  |  |  |
| 010 Burnt Ordinary Phases 1 \& 2 | 1987 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$607 |  |  | \$772 |  |  |  |  |
| 014 Checed Warwick Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  | \$495 | \$677 |  |  |  |  |
| 035 Forrest Pines Senior Apartments | 2014 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$813 |  |  |  |
| 052 Kate's Trace Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 054 King's Ridge Apartments | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$884 |  |  |  |
| 055 Lafayette Square Apartments | 1984 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$468 |  | \$578 | \$763 | \$650 |  |  |  |
| 056 Lafayette Village Elderly Apartments | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized | \$535 |  |  | \$535 |  |  |  |  |
| 057 Lafayette Village Family Apartments | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$596 |  |  | \$500 | \$788 |  |  |  |
| 060 Lexington Commons Apartments | 1994 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$891 |  |  |  |
| 062 Longhill Grove Apartments | 2004 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 079 Patriots Crossing | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$775 |  |  |  |
| 080 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 1 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 081 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 2 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 082 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 3 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 083 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 4 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 084 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 5 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 085 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 6 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 089 Powhatan Apartments | 1980 | 2001 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 Rivermeade Phase 1 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$615 |  |  | \$759 |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Rivermeade Phase 2 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102 Rolling Meadows Apartments Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2014 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 112 Station at Norge Apartments | 2008 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 133 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 134 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143 Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$679 |  |  |  |  |
| 144 Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$605 |  |  | \$605 |  |  |  |  |

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 |
| 005 Ashton Green Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,003 |  |  |  |
| 006 Auburn Point Apartments | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$855 |  |  |  |
| 008 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,057 |  |  |  |
| 010 Burnt Ordinary Phases 1 \& 2 | 1987 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$652 |  |  | \$724 |  |  |  |  |
| 014 Checed Warwick Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  | \$561 | \$700 | \$755 |  |  |  |
| 035 Forrest Pines Senior Apartments | 2014 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$966 |  |  |  |
| 052 Kate's Trace Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$841 |  |  |  |  |
| 054 King's Ridge Apartments | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,055 |  |  |  |
| 055 Lafayette Square Apartments | 1984 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$657 |  | \$828 | \$840 | \$735 |  |  |  |
| 056 Lafayette Village Elderly Apartments | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 057 Lafayette Village Family Apartments | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$691 |  | \$868 | \$868 | \$765 |  |  |  |
| 060 Lexington Commons Apartments | 1994 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,053 |  |  |  |
| 062 Longhill Grove Apartments | 2004 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$874 |  |  |  |
| 079 Patriots Crossing | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$875 |  |  |  |
| 080 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 1 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$836 |  |  |  | \$836 |  |  |  |
| 081 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 2 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$836 |  |  |  | \$836 |  |  |  |
| 082 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 3 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$836 |  |  |  | \$836 |  |  |  |
| 083 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 4 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$836 |  |  |  | \$836 |  |  |  |
| 084 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 5 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$836 |  |  |  | \$836 |  |  |  |
| 085 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 6 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$836 |  |  |  | \$836 |  |  |  |
| 089 Powhatan Apartments | 1980 | 2001 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$632 |  |  | \$759 |  |  |  |  |
| 100 Rivermeade Phase 1 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$570 |  | \$705 | \$849 |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Rivermeade Phase 2 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$745 |  | \$885 | \$890 |  |  |  |  |
| 102 Rolling Meadows Apartments Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2014 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,009 |  |  |  |
| 112 Station at Norge Apartments | 2008 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$749 | \$918 |  |  |  |
| 133 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$744 |  |  | \$718 |  |  |  |  |
| 134 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$744 |  |  | \$725 |  |  |  |  |
| 143 Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$791 |  |  |  |  |
| 144 Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$642 |  | \$572 | \$660 |  |  |  |  |

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 |
| 005 Ashton Green Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,162 |  |  |  |
| 006 Auburn Point Apartments | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,085 |  |  |  |
| 008 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,180 |  |  |  |
| 010 Burnt Ordinary Phases 1 \& 2 | 1987 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 014 Checed Warwick Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 035 Forrest Pines Senior Apartments | 2014 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 052 Kate's Trace Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$984 |  |  |  |  |
| 054 King's Ridge Apartments | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,222 |  |  |  |
| 055 Lafayette Square Apartments | 1984 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$748 |  | \$660 | \$1,005 | \$900 |  |  |  |
| 056 Lafayette Village Elderly Apartments | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 057 Lafayette Village Family Apartments | 1989 | 2008 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 060 Lexington Commons Apartments | 1994 | na | Restricted | Elderly | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 062 Longhill Grove Apartments | 2004 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$979 |  |  |  |
| 079 Patriots Crossing | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$999 |  |  |  |
| 080 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 1 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$866 |  |  |  | \$866 |  |  |  |
| 081 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 2 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$866 |  |  |  | \$866 |  |  |  |
| 082 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 3 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$866 |  |  |  | \$866 |  |  |  |
| 083 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 4 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$866 |  |  |  | \$866 |  |  |  |
| 084 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 5 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$866 |  |  |  | \$866 |  |  |  |
| 085 Pear Tree Park Apartments Phase 6 | 1972 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$866 |  |  |  | \$866 |  |  |  |
| 089 Powhatan Apartments | 1980 | 2001 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 Rivermeade Phase 1 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Rivermeade Phase 2 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102 Rolling Meadows Apartments Phase 1 \& 2 | 1994 | 2014 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | \$1,159 |  |  |  |
| 112 Station at Norge Apartments | 2008 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | \$874 | \$1,065 |  |  |  |
| 133 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$844 |  |  | \$844 |  |  |  |  |
| 134 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | \$844 |  |  | \$844 |  |  |  |  |
| 143 Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  | \$679 | \$895 |  |  |  |  |
| 144 Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## 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 | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50$ | Concluded |
| Internet | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 0$ |

## 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 $\$ 80$ per bedroom.

| Bedrooms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Bedrooms | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 200$ | $\$ 80$ |  |

## 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 $\$ 10$ per bathroom.

| Bathrooms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  | Concluded |
| Bathrooms | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 100$ | $\$ 10$ |  |

## 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 $\$ 0.15$ per square foot.

| Square Feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Square Feet | $\$ 0.00 \quad \$ 2.00$ | $\$ 0.15$ |  |

## 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 |  |  |
| Rating | $\$ 0 \quad \$ 100$ | Concluded |  |

## 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 | $\$ 0.0000 \quad \$ 0.0100$ | $\$ 0.0000$ |

## 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 | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 20.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## 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 | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 200.00$ | $\$ 0.00$ |

## 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 | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 0$ |

## 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 $\$ 20$ per point for differences in condition ratings between the subject and the comparables.

| Condition |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Rating | $\$ 10 \quad \$ 50$ | $\$ 20$ |  |

## 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 $\$ 2.00$ per year for differences in effective age between the subject and the comparables.

| Effective Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range | Concluded |  |
| Rating | $\$ 1.00 \quad \$ 5.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ |  |

## 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 | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Car Care Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Community Center | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 9$ |
| 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 | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 2$ |
| Pool | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 7$ |
| 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 | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |
| Storage | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 50$ | $\$ 12$ |

## 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 $\$ 25$ per month for central laundries; washer/dryer units were valued at $\$ 10$; washer/dryer hookups were valued at $\$ 5$.

| Laundry |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment | Survey Range |  |  |
| Central | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 25$ |
| 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 | $\$ 2$ | $\$ 10$ | $\$ 10$ |

## Rent Conclusion, 2BR-2BA-957sf

The development of our rent conclusion for the 2BR-2BA-957sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 13 unit types found at 4 properties. We selected the 13 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 13 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 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\vdots}{\vdots} \\ & \hline \bar{j} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 䓂 |
| Sub-04 Woods At Yorktown NC | 2BR-2BA-957sf | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$1,005 |  | \$0 | \$1,005 |  |
| 005-01 Ashton Green Apartments | 2BR-2BA-932sf | \$1,003 | \$0 | \$1,003 | \$139 | \$67 | \$1,070 | 1 |
| 005-02 Ashton Green Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1204sf | \$1,162 | \$0 | \$1,162 | \$240 | -\$36 | \$1,126 | 7 |
| 006-02 Auburn Point Apartments | 1BR-1BA-850sf | \$809 | \$0 | \$809 | \$267 | \$73 | \$882 | 9 |
| 006-03 Auburn Point Apartments | 2BR-1.5BA-1200sf | \$855 | \$0 | \$855 | \$187 | -\$49 | \$806 | 5 |
| 006-04 Auburn Point Apartments | 2BR-1.5BA-1200sf | \$855 | \$0 | \$855 | \$187 | -\$49 | \$806 | 5 |
| 006-05 Auburn Point Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1500sf | \$1,085 | \$0 | \$1,085 | \$280 | -\$152 | \$933 | 11 |
| 008-01 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1BR-1BA-725sf | \$885 | \$0 | \$885 | \$318 | \$88 | \$973 | 13 |
| 008-02 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 2BR-1BA-900sf | \$1,054 | \$0 | \$1,054 | \$182 | \$12 | \$1,066 | 4 |
| 008-03 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 2BR-1BA-950sf | \$1,060 | \$0 | \$1,060 | \$174 | \$4 | \$1,064 | 3 |
| 008-04 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 3BR-1BA-1100sf | \$1,180 | \$0 | \$1,180 | \$244 | -\$68 | \$1,112 | 8 |
| 054-01 King's Ridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-750sf | \$884 | \$0 | \$884 | \$309 | \$111 | \$995 | 12 |
| 054-02 King's Ridge Apartments | 2BR-2BA-950sf | \$1,055 | \$0 | \$1,055 | \$170 | \$10 | \$1,065 | 2 |
| 054-03 King's Ridge Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1156sf | \$1,222 | \$0 | \$1,222 | \$269 | -\$91 | \$1,131 | 10 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 806$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 1,131$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 1,002$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 1,028$ |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 1,015$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 1,015$ for the 2BR-2BA-957sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 2BR-2BA-932sf units at Ashton Green Apartments (Property \# 005), the 2BR-2BA-950sf units at King's Ridge Apartments (Property \# 054), the 2BR-1BA-950sf units at Autumn Lakes Apartments (Property \# 008), the 2BR-1BA900sf units at Autumn Lakes Apartments (Property \# 008), and the 2BR-1.5BA-1200sf units at Auburn Point Apartments (Property \# 006) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.


## Rent Conclusion, 3BR-2BA-1120sf

The development of our rent conclusion for the 3BR-2BA-1120sf units is found below.
Our analysis included the evaluation of a total of 13 unit types found at 4 properties. We selected the 13 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 13 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 |  |  |  |
|  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\overline{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dddot{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\otimes} \\ & \stackrel{\Xi}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { W } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\dddot{N}} \\ & \underline{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-09 Woods At Yorktown NC | 3BR-2BA-1120sf | \$1,140 | \$0 | \$1,140 |  | \$0 | \$1,140 |  |
| 005-01 Ashton Green Apartments | 2BR-2BA-932sf | \$1,003 | \$0 | \$1,003 | \$272 | \$142 | \$1,145 | 7 |
| 005-02 Ashton Green Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1204sf | \$1,162 | \$0 | \$1,162 | \$159 | \$39 | \$1,201 | 1 |
| 006-02 Auburn Point Apartments | 1BR-1BA-850sf | \$809 | \$0 | \$809 | \$401 | \$149 | \$958 | 11 |
| 006-03 Auburn Point Apartments | 2BR-1.5BA-1200sf | \$855 | \$0 | \$855 | \$272 | \$26 | \$881 | 5 |
| 006-04 Auburn Point Apartments | 2BR-1.5BA-1200sf | \$855 | \$0 | \$855 | \$272 | \$26 | \$881 | 5 |
| 006-05 Auburn Point Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1500sf | \$1,085 | \$0 | \$1,085 | \$205 | -\$77 | \$1,008 | 4 |
| 008-01 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1BR-1BA-725sf | \$885 | \$0 | \$885 | \$451 | \$163 | \$1,048 | 13 |
| 008-02 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 2BR-1BA-900sf | \$1,054 | \$0 | \$1,054 | \$315 | \$87 | \$1,141 | 10 |
| 008-03 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 2BR-1BA-950sf | \$1,060 | \$0 | \$1,060 | \$308 | \$80 | \$1,140 | 9 |
| 008-04 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 3BR-1BA-1100sf | \$1,180 | \$0 | \$1,180 | \$175 | \$7 | \$1,187 | 2 |
| 054-01 King's Ridge Apartments | 1BR-1BA-750sf | \$884 | \$0 | \$884 | \$443 | \$187 | \$1,071 | 12 |
| 054-02 King's Ridge Apartments | 2BR-2BA-950sf | \$1,055 | \$0 | \$1,055 | \$304 | \$86 | \$1,141 | 8 |
| 054-03 King's Ridge Apartments | 3BR-2BA-1156sf | \$1,222 | \$0 | \$1,222 | \$193 | -\$15 | \$1,207 | 3 |


| Adjusted Rent, Minimum | $\$ 881$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Adjusted Rent, Maximum | $\$ 1,207$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Average | $\$ 1,077$ |
| Adjusted Rent, Modified Average | $\$ 1,104$ |
|  |  |
| Rent, Concluded | $\$ 1,150$ |

Our analysis suggests a rent of $\$ 1,150$ for the 3BR-2BA-1120sf units at the subject property.
In our opinion, the 3BR-2BA-1204sf units at Ashton Green Apartments (Property \# 005), the 3BR-1BA-1100sf units at Autumn Lakes Apartments (Property \# 008), the 3BR-2BA-1156sf units at King's Ridge Apartments (Property \# 054), the 3BR-2BA1500sf units at Auburn Point Apartments (Property \# 006), and the 2BR-2BA-950sf units at King's Ridge Apartments (Property \# 054) are the best comparables for the units at the subject property.


## 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 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 1,015$ |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | $\$ 1,015$ |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | $\$ 1,015$ |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | $\$ 1,015$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 1,150$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | $\$ 1,150$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | $\$ 1,150$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 12 | $\$ 1,150$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | $\$ 1,150$ |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | $\$ 1,123$ |

Our analysis suggests an average restricted market rent of $\$ 1,123$ for the subject property.
We selected a total of 4 properties as comparables for purposes of our analysis. The average occupancy at the select rent comparables currently stands at 100 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 |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 2-Bedroom |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 3-Bedroom |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  |
| 4-Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |  |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| 1-Bedroom | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | 99\% |
| 2-Bedroom | 99\% |  | 95\% | 98\% | 99\% |  |  | 99\% |
| 3-Bedroom | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  | 95\% |
| 4-Bedroom | 100\% |  |  | 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 99\% |  | 96\% | 99\% | 100\% |  |  | 98\% |

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 $\$ 921$ to $\$ 1141$ since 2010. This represents an average 2.2\% annual increase over this period.

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

| Maximum Tax Credit Rents, 60\% of AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | 1 BR | $2 B R$ | $3 B R$ |  | Change |  |
| 2008 | $\$ 732$ | $\$ 879$ | $\$ 1,016$ | - | - | $2 B R$ |
| 2009 | $\$ 764$ | $\$ 917$ | $\$ 1,059$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | - |
| 2010 | $\$ 767$ | $\$ 921$ | $\$ 1,064$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 786$ | $\$ 944$ | $\$ 1,090$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 798$ | $\$ 957$ | $\$ 1,106$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 825$ | $\$ 990$ | $\$ 1,143$ | $3.4 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 794$ | $\$ 953$ | $\$ 1,101$ | $-3.8 \%$ | $-3.7 \%$ | $-3.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 798$ | $\$ 957$ | $\$ 1,106$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 793$ | $\$ 952$ | $\$ 1,100$ | $-0.6 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 821$ | $\$ 986$ | $\$ 1,139$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 844$ | $\$ 1,013$ | $\$ 1,170$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 892$ | $\$ 1,071$ | $\$ 1,237$ | $5.7 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 928$ | $\$ 1,114$ | $\$ 1,287$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 951$ | $\$ 1,141$ | $\$ 1,318$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |

Source: HUD

## 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 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$761 | \$153 | \$608 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / $50 \%$ of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$951 | \$153 | \$798 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$951 | \$153 | \$798 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$1,522 | \$153 | \$1,369 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$879 | \$182 | \$697 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,098 | \$182 | \$916 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | \$1,098 | \$182 | \$916 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 12 | \$1,318 | \$182 | \$1,136 |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | \$1,758 | \$182 | \$1,576 |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | \$1,220 | \$176 | \$1,044 |

Our analysis suggests an average net LIHTC rent limit of $\$ 1,044$ for 60 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 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% 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:

| Unit Type / Income Limit / Rent Limit | HOME | Subsidized | Units | LIHTC | FMR | Market | Program |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 608$ | - | $\$ 1,240$ | $\$ 1,240$ |
| 2BR-2BA-957st / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | $\$ 798$ | - | $\$ 1,240$ | $\$ 1,240$ |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | $\$ 798$ | - | - | $\$ 798$ |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | $\$ 1,369$ | - | - | $\$ 1,369$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | $\$ 697$ | - | $\$ 1,340$ | $\$ 1,340$ |


| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | $\$ 916$ | - | $\$ 1,340$ | $\$ 1,340$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | $\$ 916$ | - | - | $\$ 916$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / $60 \%$ of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 12 | $\$ 1,136$ | - | - | $\$ 1,136$ |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | $\$ 1,576$ | - | - | $\$ 1,576$ |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | $\$ 1,044$ | - | $\$ 1,298$ | $\$ 1,150$ |

Our analysis suggests an average program rent limit of $\$ 1,150$ for 60 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 |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,240 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$1,240 | \$900 | 27.4\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 2 | \$1,240 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$1,240 | \$900 | 27.4\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$798 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$798 | \$788 | 1.3\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$1,369 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$1,015 | \$1,005 | 1.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | Yes | 3 | \$1,340 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$1,340 | \$1,100 | 17.9\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | Yes | 4 | \$1,340 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$1,340 | \$1,100 | 17.9\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | \$916 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$916 | \$905 | 1.2\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / 60\% of AMI | No | No | 12 | \$1,136 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$1,136 | \$1,125 | 1.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | \$1,576 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$1,150 | \$1,140 | 0.9\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | \$1,150 | \$1,320 | \$1,123 | \$1,069 | \$1,004 | 6.1\% |

Our analysis suggests an average achievable rent of $\$ 1,069$ for the subject property. This is compared with an average proposed rent of $\$ 1,004$, yielding an achievable rent advantage of 6.1 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$608 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$608 | \$900 | -48.0\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 2 | \$798 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$798 | \$900 | -12.8\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$798 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$798 | \$788 | 1.3\% |
| 2BR-2BA-957sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$1,369 | \$1,240 | \$1,015 | \$1,015 | \$1,005 | 1.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 40\% of AMI / 40\% of AMI | No | No | 3 | \$697 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$697 | \$1,100 | -57.8\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 4 | \$916 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$916 | \$1,100 | -20.1\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 50\% of AMI / 50\% of AMI | No | No | 20 | \$916 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$916 | \$905 | 1.2\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 60\% of AMI / $60 \%$ of AMI | No | No | 12 | \$1,136 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$1,136 | \$1,125 | 1.0\% |
| 3BR-2BA-1120sf / 80\% of AMI / 80\% of AMI | No | No | 9 | \$1,576 | \$1,340 | \$1,150 | \$1,150 | \$1,140 | 0.9\% |
| Total / Average |  |  | 60 | \$1,044 | \$1,320 | \$1,123 | \$962 | \$1,004 | -4.4\% |

## 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2022 ~ \$ ~$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min |  | Max | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person | Total |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 | 1,075 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 | 2,226 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 | 4,251 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 | 5,822 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 | 7,286 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 | 8,392 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 | 9,742 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 | 10,948 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 | 11,626 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 | 12,067 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 | 12,402 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 | 12,638 |

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, 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 |
| 002 Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 118 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 005 Ashton Green Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 006 Auburn Point Apartments | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 177 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 008 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 016 Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 019 Clairmont Apartments | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 132 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 028 Country Club Apartments | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 030 Cypress Terrace Apartments | 1981 | 2016 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 034 Forrest Pines Apartments | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 037 Grafton Station Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 168 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| 044 Hickory Point Apartments | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 175 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 045 High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 046 High Street View Luxury Apartments Phası | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 049 James River Flats | 1984 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 052 Kate's Trace Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 054 King's Ridge Apartments | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 059 Lee's Landing Apartments | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 136 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 079 Patriots Crossing | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 134 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 096 Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 176 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 097 Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 098 Residences at Forest Grove | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 099 River Mews Apartments | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 452 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| 100 Rivermeade Phase 1 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 1 |  | 34 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Rivermeade Phase 2 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 1 |  | 4 | 27 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 104 Sea Pines Apartments | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 111 St. Andrews Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 119 Townes at Jones Run | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 120 Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 148 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 125 Villages of Stoney Run | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 133 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 5 |  |  | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 134 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 2 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 136 Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 138 Woodscape Apartments | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 176 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 142 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143 Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 144 Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 15 |  | 3 | 26 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 166 |  | 41 | 240 | 741 |  |  | 2,701 | 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 40 |

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 |
| 002 Apex at Ashton Green Apartments | 1985 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 005 Ashton Green Apartments | 2000 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 006 Auburn Point Apartments | 1971 | 2019 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 008 Autumn Lakes Apartments | 1969 | 2021 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 016 Chelsea at Lee Hall Apartments | 1974 | 2001 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 019 Clairmont Apartments | 2003 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 028 Country Club Apartments | 1968 | 1998 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 030 Cypress Terrace Apartments | 1981 | 2016 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 034 Forrest Pines Apartments | 1983 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 037 Grafton Station Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |
| 044 Hickory Point Apartments | 1982 | 2006 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 045 High Street View Luxury Apartments | 2019 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 046 High Street View Luxury Apartments Phası | 2021 | na | Market Rate | Family | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 049 James River Flats | 1984 | 2014 | Subsidized | Family | Stabilized | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 052 Kate's Trace Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 054 King's Ridge Apartments | 1996 | na | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 059 Lee's Landing Apartments | 1984 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 079 Patriots Crossing | 1971 | 2009 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 096 Reserve at Deer Run Apartments | 1979 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 097 Residences at Cedar Hill (The) | 1973 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 098 Residences at Forest Grove | 1975 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 099 River Mews Apartments | 1987 | 2018 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 100 Rivermeade Phase 1 | 1987 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 Rivermeade Phase 2 | 1990 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 104 Sea Pines Apartments | 1987 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 111 St. Andrews Apartments | 1986 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 119 Townes at Jones Run | 1986 | 2008 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 120 Trellis at Lee's Mill Apartments | 1973 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 125 Villages of Stoney Run | 2006 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 133 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 1 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 134 Woods At Yorktown (The) Phase 2 | 1940 | 2002 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 136 Woods of Jefferson Apartments | 1985 | 2019 | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 138 Woodscape Apartments | 1976 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 142 Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143 Yorktown Square Phase 1 | 1972 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 144 Yorktown Square Phase 2 | 1979 | 2006 | Restricted | Family | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |  | 6 | 64 | 256 |  |  | 585 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Subsidized, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Subsidized / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 5 units, 5 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 5 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 5 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 153$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 437$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 5,246$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 39,240$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 1,236 | 911 | 612 | 635 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 228 | 95 | 75 | 92 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 1,009 | 816 | 537 | 543 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 2,904
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,904 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 4 units, 4 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 4 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 788$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 941$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,689$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 32,263$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 49,050$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 1,177 | 865 | 779 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 1,137 | 675 | 608 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 40 | 190 | 170 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
400
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 400 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 3 units, 3 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 3 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,005$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,158$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,309$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 39,703$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | $\$ 78,480$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 2,722 | 1,772 | 1,471 | 1,160 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 2,290 | 1,339 | 912 | 740 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 432 | 433 | 559 | 420 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,844
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,844 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, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Subsidized / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 7 units, 7 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 7 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 7 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 182$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 520$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 6,240$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 39,240$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 1,236 | 911 | 612 | 635 | 282 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 273 | 114 | 90 | 110 | 39 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 963 | 797 | 522 | 524 | 243 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 3,049
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 3,049 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 20 units, 20 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | 20 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 20 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 905$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,087$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,106$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 37,269$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 49,050$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 865 | 779 | 364 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 833 | 696 | 286 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 32 | 82 | 78 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
192
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 192 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 12 units, 12 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | 12 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 12 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,125$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,307$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,734$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 44,811$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 35,520$ | $\$ 40,560$ | $\$ 45,660$ | $\$ 50,700$ | $\$ 54,780$ | $\$ 58,860$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 1,084 | 904 | 463 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 1,055 | 816 | 355 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 28 | 89 | 109 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 226

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 226 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 9 units, 9 of which are anticipated to be vacant on market entry in 2024. 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 | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 9 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 9 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,140$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,322$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,777$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 45,326$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | $\$ 78,480$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 2,722 | 1,772 | 1,471 | 1,160 | 622 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 2,609 | 1,514 | 1,070 | 823 | 360 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 114 | 258 | 401 | 337 | 263 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,373
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,373 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.

| 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | \$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| \$0 | to | \$9,999 | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| \$0 | to | \$19,999 | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| \$0 | to | \$29,999 | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| \$0 | to | \$39,999 | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| \$0 | to | \$49,999 | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| \$0 | to | \$59,999 | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| \$0 | to | \$74,999 | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| \$0 | to | \$99,999 | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| \$0 | to | \$124,999 | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| \$0 | to | \$149,999 | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| \$0 | to | \$199,999 | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| \$0 | or | more | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |
| Demand Estimate, Subsidized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| Maximum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR |  |  | \$23,680 | \$27,040 | \$30,440 | \$33,800 | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR |  |  | \$23,680 | \$27,040 | \$30,440 | \$33,800 | \$36,520 | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income |  |  | \$23,680 | \$27,040 | \$30,440 | \$33,800 | \$36,520 | - |
| Minimum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR |  |  | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR |  |  | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |  | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$6,240 | - |
| HH Below Upper Income |  |  | 1,236 | 911 | 612 | 635 | 282 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income |  |  | 228 | 95 | 75 | 92 | 39 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 1,009 | 816 | 537 | 543 | 243 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 3,147 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.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 479 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | \$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| \$0 | to | \$9,999 | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |
| \$0 | to | \$19,999 | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |
| \$0 | to | \$29,999 | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |
| \$0 | to | \$39,999 | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |
| \$0 | to | \$49,999 | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |
| \$0 | to | \$59,999 | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |
| \$0 | to | \$74,999 | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |
| \$0 | to | \$99,999 | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |
| \$0 | to | \$124,999 | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |
| \$0 | to | \$149,999 | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |
| \$0 | to | \$199,999 | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |
| \$0 | or | more | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |
| Demand Estimate, Restricted, 60\% of AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| Maximum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR |  |  | - | - | \$45,660 | \$50,700 | \$54,780 | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income |  |  | - | - | \$45,660 | \$50,700 | \$54,780 | - |
| Minimum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR |  |  | - | - | \$44,811 | \$44,811 | \$44,811 | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |  | - | - | \$44,811 | \$44,811 | \$44,811 | - |
| HH Below Upper Income |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1,084 | 904 | 463 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1,055 | 816 | 355 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 0 | 0 | 28 | 89 | 109 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 226 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to 80\% of AMI at the subject property.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,107 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.

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

| Renter Households, by Income, by Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 455 | 190 | 150 | 184 | 65 | 31 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,017 | 509 | 331 | 247 | 84 | 37 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,643 | 1,083 | 612 | 573 | 225 | 115 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,324 | 1,352 | 928 | 749 | 312 | 157 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,893 | 1,675 | 1,211 | 897 | 407 | 204 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,172 | 1,917 | 1,462 | 1,044 | 532 | 265 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,452 | 2,334 | 1,723 | 1,276 | 636 | 320 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,588 | 2,667 | 2,073 | 1,475 | 759 | 386 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,710 | 2,780 | 2,251 | 1,663 | 812 | 410 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,857 | 2,918 | 2,287 | 1,713 | 862 | 430 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,913 | 2,977 | 2,395 | 1,747 | 918 | 451 |  |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 3,984 | 3,046 | 2,443 | 1,767 | 943 | 456 |  |

Demand Estimate, Project-Level

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Income, Subsidized | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | - |
| Maximum Income, $30 \%$ of AMI | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, $40 \%$ of AMI | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, $50 \%$ of AMI | - | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | - |
| Maximum Income, $60 \%$ of AMI | - | - | $\$ 45,660$ | $\$ 50,700$ | $\$ 54,780$ | - |
| Maximum Income, $70 \%$ of AMI | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, $80 \%$ of AMI | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | - |
| Maximum Income, Market Rate | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | - |
| Minimum Income, Subsidized | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 6,240$ | - |
| Minimum Income, 30\% of AMI | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 40\% of AMI | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 50\% of AMI | - | $\$ 32,263$ | $\$ 32,263$ | $\$ 32,263$ | $\$ 37,269$ | - |
| Minimum Income, $60 \%$ of AMI | - | - | $\$ 44,811$ | $\$ 44,811$ | $\$ 44,811$ | - |
| Minimum Income, $70 \%$ of AMI | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, $80 \%$ of AMI | $\$ 39,703$ | $\$ 39,703$ | $\$ 39,703$ | $\$ 39,703$ | $\$ 45,326$ | - |
| Minimum Income, Market Rate | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 5,246$ | $\$ 6,240$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HH Below Upper Income | 2,722 | 1,772 | 1,471 | 1,160 | 622 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income | 228 | 95 | 75 | 92 | 39 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 2,495 | 1,677 | 1,396 | 1,068 | 583 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
7,218

Our analysis suggests project-level demand for a total of 7,218 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  | 12 |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 20 | 12 |  | 9 |  | 48 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 12 |  |  | 24 | 12 |  | 12 |  | 60 |


| Subject Property Units (Vacant at Market Entry) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  | 12 |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 20 | 12 |  | 9 |  | 48 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 12 |  |  | 24 | 12 |  | 12 |  | 60 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 2,904 |  |  | 400 |  |  | 1,844 |  | 5,148 |
| 3BR | 3,049 |  |  | 192 | 226 |  | 1,373 |  | 4,840 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 3,147 |  |  | 479 | 226 |  | 2,107 |  | 7,218 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $0.2 \%$ |  |  | $1.0 \%$ |  |  | $0.2 \%$ |  | $0.2 \%$ |
| 3BR | $0.2 \%$ |  |  | $10.4 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |  | $0.7 \%$ |  | $1.0 \%$ |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | $0.4 \%$ |  |  | $5.0 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |  | $0.6 \%$ |  | $0.8 \%$ |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 3BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 6 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 2,902 |  |  | 396 |  |  | 1,844 |  | 5,142 |
| 3BR | 3,049 |  |  | 192 | 226 |  | 1,373 |  | 4,840 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 3,145 |  |  | 475 | 226 |  | 2,107 |  | 7,212 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $0.2 \%$ |  |  | $1.0 \%$ |  |  | $0.2 \%$ |  | $0.2 \%$ |
| 3BR | $0.2 \%$ |  |  | $10.4 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |  | $0.7 \%$ |  | $1.0 \%$ |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | $0.4 \%$ |  |  | $5.1 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |  | $0.6 \%$ |  | $0.8 \%$ |

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.
Subject Property Units (Total)

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  | 12 |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 20 | 12 |  | 9 |  | 48 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 12 |  |  | 24 | 12 |  | 12 |  | 60 |


| Subject Property Units (Vacant at Market Entry) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt | Tot |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  | 12 |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 20 | 12 |  | 9 |  | 48 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 12 |  |  | 24 | 12 |  | 12 |  | 60 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 2,904 |  |  | 400 |  |  | 1,844 |  | 5,148 |
| 3BR | 3,049 |  |  | 192 | 226 |  | 1,373 |  | 4,840 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 3,147 |  |  | 479 | 226 |  | 2,107 |  | 7,218 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 166 |  |  | 240 |  |  |  |  | 406 |
| 3BR | 30 |  |  | 64 | 256 |  |  |  | 350 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 196 |  |  | 304 | 256 |  |  |  | 756 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 171 |  |  | 244 |  |  | 3 |  | 418 |
| 3BR | 37 |  |  | 84 | 268 |  | 9 |  | 398 |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 208 |  |  | 328 | 268 |  | 12 |  | 816 |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $5.9 \%$ |  |  | $61.0 \%$ |  |  | $0.2 \%$ |  | $8.1 \%$ |
| 3BR | $1.2 \%$ |  |  | $43.8 \%$ | $118.6 \%$ |  | $0.7 \%$ |  | $8.2 \%$ |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | $6.6 \%$ |  |  | $68.5 \%$ | $118.6 \%$ |  | $0.6 \%$ |  | $11.3 \%$ |

In our opinion, the estimated project-level penetration rate suggest an appropriate number of units for the subject property. The elevated 3BR/60\% of AMI penetration rates suggest a competitive marketplace for these units. The sponsor should monitor these units closely during lease up.

## 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 20 | 12 |  | 9 |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Property Units (Vacant at Market Entry)

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 20 | 12 |  | 9 |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 2,904 |  |  | 400 |  |  | 1,844 |  |
| 3BR | 3,049 |  |  | 192 | 226 |  | 1,373 |  |
| 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 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Movership | $35.9 \%$ |
| Total | $36.5 \%$ |


| Growth \& Movership Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 1,061 |  |  | 146 |  |  |  |  |
| 3BR | 1,114 |  |  | 70 | 83 |  | 502 |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 1,327 |  |  | 183 |  |  | 842 |  |
| 3BR | 1,393 |  |  | 88 | 103 |  | 627 |  |
| 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 |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 1BR | 3 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | 16 |
| 2BR | 7 |  | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |  | 21 |
| 3BR | 4 |  | 1 | 4 | 5 |  |  | 14 |
| 4BR | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |


| Fair Share |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $30.0 \%$ |  |  | $40.0 \%$ |  |  | $50.0 \%$ |  |
| 3BR | $30.0 \%$ |  |  | $40.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |  | $50.0 \%$ |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 33.2 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 35.1 |  |
| 3BR | 34.8 |  |  | 2.9 | 3.4 |  | 26.1 |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ |
| 1BR | $100 \%$ |  |  | $100 \%$ | $99 \%$ |  |  | $99 \%$ |
| 2BR | $99 \%$ |  | $95 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |  | $99 \%$ |
| 3BR | $100 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |  | $95 \%$ |
| 4BR | $100 \%$ |  |  | $80 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

Occupancy Rate, Select Comparables

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |  | $100 \%$ |
| 2BR |  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ |  |  | $100 \%$ |
| 3BR |  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ |  |  | $100 \%$ |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Concluded Stabilized Occupancy Rate

|  | Sub | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | Mkt |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $97 \%$ |  |  | $97 \%$ |  |  | $97 \%$ |  |
| 3BR | $97 \%$ |  |  | $97 \%$ | $97 \%$ |  | $97 \%$ |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  |
| 3BR | 7 |  |  | 19 | 12 |  | 9 |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR | $<1$ |  |  | $<1$ |  |  | $<1$ |  |
| 3BR | $<1$ |  |  | 7 | 3 |  | $<1$ |  |
| 4BR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Our analysis suggests that the subject property will stabilize at 97 percent occupancy. We estimate 7 months of absorption and an average absorption rate of 8.8 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 | Ab Rte |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 003 | Arbors (The) at Towne Park | 2019 | na | Restricted | Elderly | 130 | 19.7 |
| 036 | Founders Village Apartments | 2015 | na | Market Rate | Family | 247 |  |
| 052 | Kate's Trace Apartments | 2005 | na | Restricted | Family | 11.8 |  |
| 112 | Station at Norge Apartments | 2008 | na | Restricted | Family | 104 |  |
| 128 | Waverton Denbigh Village | 2014 | na | Market Rate | Family | 24.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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.

Projected Lease Up


Our analysis suggests that the subject property will achieve 70 percent occupancy in 2 months, 80 percent occupancy in 3 months, and 90 percent occupancy in 5 months. We anticipate that the subject property will stabilize at 97 percent occupancy in 7 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.

## Sensitivity Analysis

We also explored the relationship between rent level, capture rates, penetration rates, and absorption period. For purposes of this analysis, we forecasted demand and fill rates at 75\%, 80\%, 85\%, 90\%, 95\% and 100\% of achievable rent (derived earlier in this report). Our analysis is summarized below:


Our analysis suggests the following relationship between rent levels and fill rates: At the developer's proposed rent we anticipate a 7-month absorption period; at 100\% of achievable rent we anticipate a 8-month absorption period; at $75 \%$ of achievable rent we anticipate a 2-month absorption period.

## 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

| $2022 ~ \$ ~$ |  |  | Max |  |  |  |  |  | 1 Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min |  | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person | Total |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 | 1,068 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 | 2,212 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 | 4,225 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 | 5,786 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 | 7,241 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 | 8,341 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 | 9,683 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 | 10,882 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 | 11,556 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 | 11,994 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 | 12,326 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 | 12,562 |

Source: ESRI \& Ribbon Demographics

## Demand Estimate, 2-Bedroom, Subsidized, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Subsidized / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 5 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 | Subsidized |
| Income Limit | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 5 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 5 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 153$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 437$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 5,246$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 39,240$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 1,229 | 906 | 608 | 630 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 227 | 95 | 75 | 92 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 1,002 | 811 | 534 | 539 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 2,886
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,886 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 4 units, 4 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 | 4 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 4 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 788$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 941$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,689$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 32,263$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 49,050$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 1,170 | 859 | 773 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 1,130 | 671 | 604 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 40 | 188 | 169 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 398
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 398 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 3 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 | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 3 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,005$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,158$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,309$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 39,703$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | $\$ 78,480$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 2,706 | 1,761 | 1,462 | 1,154 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 2,276 | 1,331 | 906 | 735 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 429 | 430 | 555 | 418 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,833
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,833 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, 40\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Subsidized / 40\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 7 units, 7 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 | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 7 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 7 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 0$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 182$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 520$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 6,240$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 39,240$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 1,229 | 906 | 608 | 630 | 280 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 272 | 113 | 89 | 110 | 39 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 957 | 792 | 519 | 520 | 241 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
3,029
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 3,029 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 20 units, 20 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 | 20 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 20 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 905$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,087$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,106$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 37,269$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 49,050$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 859 | 773 | 362 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 828 | 692 | 284 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 31 | 82 | 77 | 0 |

Demand Estimate

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 191 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 12 units, 12 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 | 12 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 12 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,125$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,307$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,734$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 44,811$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 35,520$ | $\$ 40,560$ | $\$ 45,660$ | $\$ 50,700$ | $\$ 54,780$ | $\$ 58,860$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 1,077 | 898 | 460 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 1,049 | 810 | 352 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 28 | 88 | 108 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
224

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 224 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 9 units, 9 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 | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 9 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 9 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,140$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,322$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,777$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 45,326$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | $\$ 78,480$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 2,706 | 1,761 | 1,462 | 1,154 | 618 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 2,593 | 1,505 | 1,063 | 818 | 357 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 113 | 257 | 399 | 336 | 261 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,365
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,365 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 | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| \$0 | to | \$19,999 | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| \$0 | to | \$29,999 | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| \$0 | to | \$39,999 | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| \$0 | to | \$49,999 | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| \$0 | to | \$59,999 | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| \$0 | to | \$74,999 | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| \$0 | to | \$99,999 | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| \$0 | to | \$124,999 | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| \$0 | to | \$149,999 | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| \$0 | to | \$199,999 | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| \$0 | or | more | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |
| Demand Estimate, Subsidized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| Maximum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 1BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 2BR |  |  | \$23,680 | \$27,040 | \$30,440 | \$33,800 | - | - |
| Maximum Income, 3BR |  |  | \$23,680 | \$27,040 | \$30,440 | \$33,800 | \$36,520 | - |
| Maximum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum Allowable Income |  |  | \$23,680 | \$27,040 | \$30,440 | \$33,800 | \$36,520 | - |
| Minimum Income, OBR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 1BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 2BR |  |  | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | - | - |
| Minimum Income, 3BR |  |  | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | \$6,240 | - |
| Minimum Income, 4BR |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |  | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$5,246 | \$6,240 | - |
| HH Below Upper Income |  |  | 1,229 | 906 | 608 | 630 | 280 | 0 |
| HH Below Lower Income |  |  | 227 | 95 | 75 | 92 | 39 | 0 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 1,002 | 811 | 534 | 539 | 241 | 0 |

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 3,127 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.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 475 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.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 224 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to 80\% of AMI at the subject property.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,095 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 | 3,127 |  |  | 475 | 224 |  | 2,095 |  |

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 | 12 |  |  | 24 | 12 |  | 12 |  |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 | 1,169 |  |  | 178 | 84 |  | 783 |  |

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 | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |

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 | 1,167 |  |  | 174 | 84 |  | 783 |  |

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 | $1.0 \%$ |  |  | $13.8 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |  | $1.5 \%$ |  |

Our findings are summarized below.

| Project-Wide Capture Rate - LIHTC Units | $2.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - Market Units |  |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - All Units | $2.7 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period (Months) | 7 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min |  | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person | Total |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 | 1,068 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 | 2,212 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 | 4,225 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 | 5,786 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 | 7,241 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 | 8,341 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 | 9,683 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 | 10,882 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 | 11,556 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 | 11,994 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 | 12,326 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | more | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 | 12,562 |

Source: ESRI \& Ribbon Demographics

## 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 3 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 | $40 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 3 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 608$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 761$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,174$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 26,091$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 39,240$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 906 | 608 | 630 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 849 | 496 | 440 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 57 | 112 | 190 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
359
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 359 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 6 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 | $50 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 6 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 6 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 788$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 941$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,689$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 32,263$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 49,050$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 1,170 | 859 | 773 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 1,130 | 671 | 604 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 40 | 188 | 169 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 398
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 398 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 2-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 3 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 | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 3 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,005$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 153$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,158$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,309$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 39,703$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | $\$ 78,480$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 2,706 | 1,761 | 1,462 | 1,154 | 0 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 2,276 | 1,331 | 906 | 735 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 429 | 430 | 555 | 418 | 0 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,833
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,833 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 3 units, 3 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 | 3 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 3 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 697$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 879$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 2,511$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 30,137$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 23,680$ | $\$ 27,040$ | $\$ 30,440$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 36,520$ | $\$ 39,240$ |


| 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 | 608 | 630 | 280 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 56 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
117
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 117 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 24 units, 24 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 | 24 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 24 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 905$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,087$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,106$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 37,269$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 29,600$ | $\$ 33,800$ | $\$ 38,050$ | $\$ 42,250$ | $\$ 45,650$ | $\$ 49,050$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 859 | 773 | 362 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 828 | 692 | 284 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 31 | 82 | 77 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
191

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 191 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 12 units, 12 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 | 12 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 12 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,125$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,307$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,734$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 44,811$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 35,520$ | $\$ 40,560$ | $\$ 45,660$ | $\$ 50,700$ | $\$ 54,780$ | $\$ 58,860$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 0 | 0 | 1,077 | 898 | 460 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 0 | 0 | 1,049 | 810 | 352 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 28 | 88 | 108 | 0 |

Demand Estimate
224

Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 224 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we estimate demand for the 3-Bedroom / Restricted / 80\% of AMI units at the subject property. Our analysis assumes a total of 9 units, 9 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 | $80 \%$ of AMI |
| Total Units | 9 |
| Vacant Units at Market Entry | 9 |
|  |  |
| Minimum Qualified Income |  |
| Net Rent | $\$ 1,140$ |
| Utilities | $\$ 182$ |
| Gross Rent | $\$ 1,322$ |
| Income Qualification Ratio | $35 \%$ |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 3,777$ |
| Months/Year | 12 |
| Minimum Qualified Income | $\$ 45,326$ |

Renter Households, by Income, by Size

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | $\$$ | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 9,999$ | 453 | 189 | 149 | 183 | 65 | 31 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 19,999$ | 1,011 | 506 | 329 | 246 | 83 | 37 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 29,999$ | 1,633 | 1,077 | 608 | 569 | 224 | 114 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 39,999$ | 2,310 | 1,344 | 922 | 744 | 310 | 156 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 49,999$ | 2,875 | 1,665 | 1,204 | 891 | 404 | 202 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 59,999$ | 3,153 | 1,905 | 1,453 | 1,038 | 529 | 263 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 74,999$ | 3,432 | 2,320 | 1,713 | 1,269 | 632 | 318 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 99,999$ | 3,567 | 2,651 | 2,060 | 1,466 | 754 | 384 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 124,999$ | 3,688 | 2,763 | 2,237 | 1,653 | 807 | 408 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 149,999$ | 3,833 | 2,900 | 2,273 | 1,703 | 857 | 427 |
| $\$ 0$ | to | $\$ 199,999$ | 3,890 | 2,959 | 2,381 | 1,737 | 913 | 448 |
| $\$ 0$ | or | $m o r e$ | 3,960 | 3,027 | 2,428 | 1,757 | 937 | 453 |

Maximum Allowable Income

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | $6+$ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Allowable Income | $\$ 47,360$ | $\$ 54,080$ | $\$ 60,880$ | $\$ 67,600$ | $\$ 73,040$ | $\$ 78,480$ |


| Size Qualified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size Qualified | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |  |  |

Demand Estimate

|  | 1 Person | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person | 6+ Person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HH Below Maximum Income | 2,706 | 1,761 | 1,462 | 1,154 | 618 | 0 |
| HH Below Minimum Income | 2,593 | 1,505 | 1,063 | 818 | 357 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 113 | 257 | 399 | 336 | 261 | 0 |

Demand Estimate 1,365
Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 1,365 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.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 415 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.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 475 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.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 224 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, 80\% of AMI

In this section we account for income-band overlap and develop a demand estimate for the units restricted to 80\% of AMI at the subject property.


Our analysis suggests demand for a total of 2,095 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 |  |  | 415 | 475 | 224 |  | 2,095 |  |

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 |  |  | 6 | 30 | 12 |  | 12 |  |

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 |  |  | 155 | 178 | 84 |  | 783 |  |

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 |  |  | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |

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 |  |  | 153 | 174 | 84 |  | 783 |  |

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 |  |  | $3.9 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |  | $1.5 \%$ |  |

Our findings are summarized below.

| Project-Wide Capture Rate - LIHTC Units | $5.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - Market Units |  |
| Project-Wide Capture Rate - All Units | $5.0 \%$ |
| Project-Wide Absorption Period (Months) | 7 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 | Clairmont Apartments |
| Street Number | 100 |
| Street Name | Arcadia |
| Street Type | Loop |
| City | Yorktown |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23672 |
| Phone Number | (757) $988-8800$ |
| Year Built | 2003 |
| Year Renovated | na |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 150$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 50$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Conventional |
| Vouchers |  |
| Latitude | 37.1928 |
| Longitude | -76.4923 |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |
| AAC Code | 019 |

Stabilized
37.1928

AAC Code
22-016
019


Location Map

634

718

Person Interviewed
Ms. Jenny, Leasing Agent Phone Number (757) 988-8800 Interview Date 29-Oct-21
Interviewed By nterview Notes

There are no new apartments or businesses nearby.

Unit Coniıyuıauvı ©2015 CALIPER; ©2014 HERE


| 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 | yes |
| Comp vs Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.00 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 4.50 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 2.10 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.50 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2021 |
| 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 | 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 | no | 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 | some | no |
| 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 |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | na |
| Concierge | no | na |
| Hair Salon | no | na |
| Health Care | no | na |
| Housekeeping | no | na |
| Meals | no | na |
| Transportation | no | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Clairmont Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 100 Arcadia Loop in Yorktown, Virginia. The property, which consists of 216 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2003 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

|  | Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | High Street View Luxury Apartments |  |
| Street Number | 101 |  |
| Street Name | Kings Manor |  |
| Street Type | Drive |  |
| City | Williamsburg |  |
| State | Virginia |  |
| Zip | 23185 |  |
| Phone Number | (757) $525-5203$ |  |
| Year Built | 2019 |  |
| Year Renovated | na |  |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |  |
| Min. Security Dep. |  |  |
| Other Fees | $\$ 450$ |  |
| Waiting List | no |  |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |  |
| Project Type | Family |  |
| Project Status | Stabilized |  |
| Financing | Conventional |  |
| Vouchers |  |  |
| Latitude | 37.1433 |  |
| Longitude | -76.5182 |  |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |  |
| AAC Code | 045 |  |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Mr. Devin, Leasing Agent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 525-5203 |
| Interview Date | $29-$ Oct-21 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

Phase \#2 to open Winter 2022. Property will have Amphitheater with Fire Pit and Outdoor Kitchen. Contact gave rent range for each unit size. There are no new apartments or businesses nearby.

| 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 | yes |
| Comp vs Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 3.90 | 2.00 |
| 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 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2019 | 2021 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Site \& Common Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Ball Field | no | no |
| BBQ Area | yes | no |
| Billiard/Game | yes | no |
| Bus/Comp Ctr | yes | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | no |
| Comm Center | yes | yes |
| Elevator | yes | no |
| Fitness Ctr | yes | no |
| Gazebo/Patio | yes | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | yes | 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 | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | yes | no |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | no | 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 | no | yes |
| W/D Units | yes | no |
| W/D Hookups | no | yes |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | na | na |
| Concierge | na | na |
| Hair Salon | na | na |
| Health Care | na | na |
| Housekeeping | na | na |
| Meals | na | na |
| Transportation | na | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

High Street View Luxury Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 101 Kings Manor Drive in Williamsburg, Virginia. The property, which consists of 96 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2019 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

|  | Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | Villages of Stoney Run |  |
| Street Number | 650 |  |
| Street Name | Stoney Creek |  |
| Street Type | Lane |  |
| City | Newport News |  |
| State | Virginia |  |
| Zip | 23608 |  |
| Phone Number | (757) $988-0288$ |  |
| Year Built | 2006 |  |
| Year Renovated | na |  |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |  |
| Min. Security Dep. |  |  |
| Other Fees | $\$ 350$ |  |
| Waiting List | no |  |
| Project Rent | Market Rate |  |
| Project Type | Family |  |
| Project Status | Stabilized |  |
| Financing | Conventional |  |
| Vouchers |  |  |
| Latitude | 37.1420 |  |
| Longitude | -76.5189 |  |
| Nearest Crossroads | na |  |
| AAC Code | 125 |  |
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| 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 | yes | no |

Comp vs. Subject Inferior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | no | yes |
| Internet | no | yes |
| Comp vs Subject | Superior |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.00 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.50 | 2.50 |
| Colp |  |  |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 3.90 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| 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 | 4.00 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2006 | 2021 |
| 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 | yes | no |
| Car Care Ctr | no | 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 | yes | no |
| Picnic Area | yes | no |
| Playground | no | 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 | no |
| 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 |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | na |
| Concierge | no | na |
| Hair Salon | no | na |
| Health Care | no | na |
| Housekeeping | no | na |
| Meals | no | na |
| Transportation | no | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Villages of Stoney Run is an existing multifamily development located at 650 Stoney Creek Lane in Newport News, Virginia. The property, which consists of 232 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2006 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

|  | Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments |  |
| Street Number | General's |  |
| Street Name | Way |  |
| Street Type | Yorktown |  |
| City | Virginia |  |
| State | 23692 |  |
| Zip | (757) $605-3878$ |  |
| Phone Number | 2014 |  |
| Year Built | na |  |
| Year Renovated | 12 |  |
| Minimum Lease |  |  |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 350$ |  |
| Other Fees | na |  |
| Waiting List | Market Rate |  |
| Project Rent | Family |  |
| Project Type | Stabilized |  |
| Project Status | Conventional |  |
| Financing |  |  |
| Vouchers | 37.1884 |  |
| Latitude | -76.4869 |  |
| Longitude | near Ellis Drive. |  |
| Nearest Crossroads | 142 |  |
| AAC Code | $22-016$ |  |



Unit Coniryuıauvı ©2015 CALIPER; ©2014 HERE


| 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 | yes |
| Comp vs Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.00 | 2.50 |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 3.30 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 2.70 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 4.00 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2014 | 2021 |
| 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 | yes | no |
| Hot Tub/Jacuzzi | no | no |
| Herb Garden | no | no |
| Horseshoes | no | no |
| Lake | some | 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 | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | yes | no |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | no | 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 | yes | no |
| Covered Pkg | no | no |
| Assigned Pkg | no | no |
| Open | some | yes |
| None | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Laundry |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Central | no | yes |
| W/D Units | yes | no |
| W/D Hookups | no | yes |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | yes | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | na | na |
| Concierge | na | na |
| Hair Salon | na | na |
| Health Care | na | na |
| Housekeeping | na | na |
| Meals | na | na |
| Transportation | na | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Yorktown Arch Luxury Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 0 General's Way in Yorktown, Virginia. The property, which consists of 89 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2014 with conventional financing. All units are set aside as market rate units. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

RENT COMPARABLES, RESTRICTED RENT

Project Information

| Property Name | Ashton Green Apartments |
| :--- | ---: |
| Street Number | 100 |
| Street Name | Marshview |
| Street Type | Drive |
| City | Newport News |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23608 |
| Phone Number | (757) $246-6666$ |
| Year Built | 2000 |
| Year Renovated | na |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 650$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 11$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Restricted |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Tax Credit |
| Vouchers | 110 |
| Latitude | 1988 |
| Longitude |  |
| Nearest Crossroads | -76.5583 |
| AAC Code | na |

Interview Notes

| Person Interviewed | Ms. Jeanepta, Management |
| :--- | ---: |
| Phone Number | (757) 246-6666 |
| Interview Date | 29-Oct-21 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

1988 TC's awarded for construction of this property without project based rental assistance. Renovations started in June, 2021 include replacing carpet with plank flooring. There are washer/dryers in the units of one building at this property. There are no new apartments or businesses nearby


Location Map
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| 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 | yes |
| Comp vs Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.00 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.00 | 2.50 |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 3.90 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 2.80 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.00 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2000 | 2021 |
| 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 | 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 | no | 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 | no |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | yes | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| 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 | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | yes | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | na |
| Concierge | no | na |
| Hair Salon | no | na |
| Health Care | no | na |
| Housekeeping | no | na |
| Meals | no | na |
| Transportation | no | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Ashton Green Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 100 Marshview Drive in Newport News, Virginia. The property, which consists of 228 apartment units, was originally constructed in 2000 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

| Project Information | Auburn Point Apartments |
| :--- | ---: |
| Property Name | 496 |
| Street Number | Catina |
| Street Name | Way |
| Street Type | Newport News |
| City | Virginia |
| State | 23608 |
| Zip | (757) $877-8880$ |
| Phone Number | 1971 |
| Year Built | 2019 |
| Year Renovated | 12 |
| Minimum Lease | $\$ 300$ |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 11$ |
| Other Fees | 7 people |
| Waiting List | Restricted |
| Project Rent | Family |
| Project Type | Stabilized |
| Project Status | Tax Credit |
| Financing | 136 |
| Vouchers | 1996 |
| Latitude |  |
| Longitude |  |
| Nearest Crossroads |  |
| AAC Code |  |




| 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 | yes |  |
| Comp vs | Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 2.75 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs Subject | Superior |  |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.10 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 4.10 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.00 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2021 |
| 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 | 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 | no |
| 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 | yes | no |
| Dishwasher | yes | yes |
| Microwave | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | yes | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | na |
| Concierge | no | na |
| Hair Salon | no | na |
| Health Care | no | na |
| Housekeeping | no | na |
| Meals | no | na |
| Transportation | no | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Auburn Point Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 496 Catina Way in Newport News, Virginia. The property, which consists of 274 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1971 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

|  | Project Information | Autumn Lakes Apartments |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Property Name | 360 |  |
| Street Number | Roseman |  |
| Street Name | Court |  |
| Street Type | Newport News |  |
| City | Virginia |  |
| State | 23608 |  |
| Zip | (757) $877-4920$ |  |
| Phone Number | 1969 |  |
| Year Built | 2021 |  |
| Year Renovated | 12 |  |
| Minimum Lease | $\$ 499$ |  |
| Min. Security Dep. |  |  |
| Other Fees | na |  |
| Waiting List | Restricted |  |
| Project Rent | Family |  |
| Project Type | Stabilized |  |
| Project Status | Bond |  |
| Financing | 32 |  |
| Vouchers | 2000 | 37.1357 |
| Latitude | -76.5473 |  |
| Longitude | na |  |
| Nearest Crossroads |  | 008 |
| AAC Code |  |  |


| Interview Notes |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Person Interviewed | Mr. Daryl, Asst. Manager |
| Phone Number | (757) 877-4920 |
| Interview Date | 29-Oct-21 |
| Interviewed By | PL |

2000 Bond awarded for rehabilitation of this property without project based rental assistance. 2021 renovations include new flooring, black appliances, painting, pool, playground, and laundry room. There are no new apartments or businesses nearby.



| 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 | yes | no |

Comp vs. Subject Inferior

| Tenant-Paid Technology |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Technology | Comp | Subj |
| Cable | yes | yes |
| Internet | yes | yes |
| Comp vs Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.25 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.00 | 2.50 |
| Conp |  |  |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 2.30 | 2.00 |
| 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 | 3.00 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2021 |
| 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 | yes | no |
| Sauna | no | no |
| Sports Court | no | no |
| Walking Trail | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Unit Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Blinds | yes | yes |
| Ceiling Fans | no | no |
| 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 | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Security |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| Call Buttons | no | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | yes | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | na |
| Concierge | no | na |
| Hair Salon | no | na |
| Health Care | no | na |
| Housekeeping | no | na |
| Meals | no | na |
| Transportation | no | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

Autumn Lakes Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 360 Roseman Court in Newport News, Virginia. The property, which consists of 296 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1969 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 100 percent occupancy.

| Project Information |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Property Name | King's Ridge Apartments |
| Street Number | 401 |
| Street Name | Jester |
| Street Type | Court |
| City | Newport News |
| State | Virginia |
| Zip | 23608 |
| Phone Number | (757) $989-0978$ |
| Year Built | 1996 |
| Year Renovated | na |
| Minimum Lease | 12 |
| Min. Security Dep. | $\$ 200$ |
| Other Fees | $\$ 40$ |
| Waiting List | no |
| Project Rent | Restricted |
| Project Type | Family |
| Project Status | Stabilized |
| Financing | Tax Credit |
| Vouchers | 109 |
| Latitude | 37.1588 |
| Longitude |  |
| Nearest Crossroads |  |
| AAC Code |  |




| 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 | yes |  |
| Comp vs | Subject | Similar |  |


| Visibility |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Visibility | 3.25 | 2.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Access |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Access | 3.50 | 2.50 |

Comp vs. Subject Superior

| Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Neighborhood | 4.40 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| Proximity to Area Amenities |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Area Amenities | 2.80 | 2.00 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |

Condition

| Condition |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Condition | 3.00 | 4.50 |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Effective Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rating (1-5 Scale) | Comp | Subj |
| Effective Age | 2005 | 2021 |
| 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 | 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 | no |
| Carpeting | yes | yes |
| Fireplace | no | no |
| Patio/Balcony | no | no |
| Storage | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Superior |  |


| 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 | no |
| Cont Access | no | no |
| Courtesy Officer | no | no |
| Monitoring | no | yes |
| Security Alarms | no | no |
| Security Patrols | no | no |
| Comp vs. Subject | Inferior |  |


| Services |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amenity | Comp | Subj |
| After School | no | na |
| Concierge | no | na |
| Hair Salon | no | na |
| Health Care | no | na |
| Housekeeping | no | na |
| Meals | no | na |
| Transportation | no | na |
| Comp vs. Subject | Similar |  |

King's Ridge Apartments is an existing multifamily development located at 401 Jester Court in Newport News, Virginia. The property, which consists of 182 apartment units, was originally constructed in 1996 . This property is currently operated as a rent restricted property. The property currently stands at 100 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 have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
- I performed a preliminary market study for the subject property in 2021.
- 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

## VIRGINIA HOUSING 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 Virginia Housing.
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 Virginia Housing or in any way acting for, at the request of, or on behalf of Virginia Housing.
6) Compensation for my services is not contingent upon this development receiving a LIHTC reservation or allocation.

March 9, 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；Sponsor

