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## Executive Summary

This paper will be a development evaluation of a 1.86 acre site located in Arlington, VA (Rosslyn-Ballston corridor). The site is bounded by Clarendon Blvd., Wilson Blvd., N. Danville St., and N. Cleveland St., and is located directly east of the Whole Foods in Clarendon.

Despite being surrounding by retail, multi-family, condominium, and office development (much of which has occurred in the past 10 to 15 years), this site remains underdeveloped. The block currently is a variety of parcels with different ownerships. Current uses of the various parcels include a bank branch, used car dealership, parking lots.

The goal of this paper is to assess if an office building with first floor retail use, or a wholly retail property, would be feasible development projects on the site. If both are feasible, this paper will determine which of the two would be more financial advantageous for the developer. This paper addresses zoning, construction, financing, leasing, asset management, and disposition. Any constraints or extraordinary conditions will be addressed in the paper. The subject parcels are assumed to have common ownership. Assemblage will not be part of the analysis.

Based on the analysis herein, neither the office nor the retail development is feasible. Neither property reaches the return goals expected by the development community. High land costs and the inability to create a critical mass of development due to restrictive zoning hamper returns. These are likely the reasons why the site remains undeveloped.

## Site Description

## Overview

The site is located in Arlington County, Virginia. Arlington is an urban county of approximately 26 square miles in the Washington, DC metropolitan area (Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development a).

The above-referenced site is flat and rectangular in shape. The dimensions of the site are approximately 273' along Wilson and Clarendon Boulevards and 287' along North Danville and North Cleveland Streets. It has frontage on all four of the aforementioned streets.

The site to be analyzed is as follows. All parcels are zoned C-2.

Table 1
Site Parcels

| Parcel | Address | Size (sf) | Size (acreage) | Zoning | Current use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18008008 | 2600 Wilson Blvd. | 8,362 | 0.1920 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Auto sales / <br> paved |
| 18008013 | 2614 Wilson Blvd. | 2,702 | 0.0620 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008007 | 2618 Wilson Blvd. | 3,565 | 0.0818 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008015 | 2622 Wilson Blvd. | 2,357 | 0.0541 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008006 | 2636 Wilson Blvd. | 13,979 | 0.3209 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008005 | 1415 N. Danville St. | 9,811 | 0.2252 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18007006 | N. Cleveland St. | 12,346 | 0.2834 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008004 | N. Danville St. | 4,440 | 0.1019 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008002 | 2615 Fairfax Dr. | 4,179 | 0.0959 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008016 | N. Danville St. | 757 | 0.0174 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008017 | N. Cleveland St. | 856 | 0.0197 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Paved |
| 18008011 | 2601 Clarendon Blvd. | 5,839 | 0.1340 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Bank branch |
| 18008009 | N. Cleveland St. | 6,010 | 0.1380 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Bank branch |
| 18008010 | 1410 N. Cleveland St. | 6,000 | 0.1377 | $\mathrm{C}-2$ | Bank branch |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{8 1 , 2 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8 6 4}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 1: Site Parcels (Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011b, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011c, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011d, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011e, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011f, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011g, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011h, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011i, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011j, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011k, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011I, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011m, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011n)

The County's tax parcels are shown below, outlined in red.


Figure 1: Assemblage of subject tax parcels (Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011a)

## Current Use

The current uses on the site include:

- A PNC bank branch located on the southeast parcels of the assemblage on Parcels 18008009, 18008010, 18008010, and 18008011 (Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011h, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011i, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011j, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011k).
- A used car sales office, Airport Motors, with paved lot on Parcel 18008008 (Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011b).
- Paved lots in various states of disrepair (Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011c, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011d, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011e, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011f, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011g, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011I, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011m, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011n).


Figure 2: Intersection of North Danville Street and Clarendon Boulevard, facing northeast (Google Maps, 2011a).


Figure 3: On North Danville Street facing east (Google Maps, 2011a).


Figure 4: Intersection of North Danville Street and Wilson Boulevard, facing southeast (Google Maps, 2011a).


Figure 5: On Wilson Boulevard, facing south (Google Maps, 2011a).


Figure 6: Intersection of North Cleveland and Wilson Boulevard, facing northwest with Airport Motors (Google Maps, 2011a).


Figure 7: Intersection of North Cleveland and Clarendon Boulevard, facing northwest with PNC bank branch (Google Maps, 2011a).


Figure 8: On Clarendon Boulevard, facing south with PNC bank branch drive-through (Google Maps, 2011a).

## Neighborhood and Adjacent Parcel Characteristics

The subject is located in the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor in northern Arlington County, Virginia (Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development, 2010). The Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor is approximately 0.75 miles wide and 3 miles long, extending along Wilson Boulevard between the Potomac River in the east and North Glebe Road in the west.

As part of its General Land Use Plan, Arlington County has decided to concentrate the highest density uses within walking distance of Metro stations; densities, heights, and uses are planned to taper down to existing single-family uses (Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development, 2010).

The site is located in the westernmost section of the Courthouse neighborhood and is adjacent to the easternmost portion of the Clarendon neighborhood. Although the site is technically within the Courthouse district, the site's proximity to Clarendon and its defining
features make a compelling case that the property is heavily influenced by the dynamics of the Clarendon submarket.

The lot is approximately 0.3 miles east from the Clarendon and approximately 0.3 miles west of the Courthouse Metro stations, both of which are on the Orange Line (Google Maps, 2011b; Google Maps, 2011c). The property is located adjacent to the Clarendon Special Coordinated Mixed-Use District, which eventually became the Market Common at Clarendon, a mixed-use development consisting of 300,000 square feet of retail, anchored by Crate \& Barrel, Container Store, Barnes \& Noble, Cheesecake Factory, the Apple Store, and Pottery Barn; 100,000 square feet of office; 300 multi-family units; a 1,200-space parking garage built in 2003 (Google Maps, 2011d; CBRE; Urban Land Institute, 2008; Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development b); and Whole Foods Market (Google Maps, 2011a). Whole Foods is directly west of the subject. To the south are townhouses and to the north, low-rise retail (Google Maps, 2011d). To the east is a mid-rise office building (Google Maps, 2011d).

Arlington's General Land Use Plan states determines that commercial activity in the Courthouse district should be centered around the Arlington County government complex, which is the nexus of "a balanced mix of high-density and residential and office uses" (Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development, 2010). The county has determined that development in Clarendon, in particular, should evoke an "Urban Village" concept characterized by a "high-quality public environment, accessible and connected spaces, and a rich mix of uses" (Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development, 2010). The surrounding parcels reflect the plans outlined by the county.


Figure 9: Aerial view of subject property and surrounding area (Google Maps, 2011d)


Figure 10: Aerial view of subject property (in red) with Clarendon area (in yellow), Market Common at Clarendon (in blue), and Courthouse area outlined (in purple) (Google Maps, 2011d, Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development b, Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development c, Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development d)

## Site Analysis

Visibility.
The site has good visibility from all surrounding roads, although it is best from Wilson Boulevard and Clarendon Boulevard. There are no visual barriers.

## Accessibility.

The site is within walking distance of the Clarendon Metro station. As previously mentioned, the lot is approximately 0.3 miles east from the Clarendon Metro station, on the Orange Line (Google Maps, 2011b). Average daily boardings at the Clarendon stop are over 4,400 (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, 2011). There is significant pedestrian traffic in the immediate vicinity, arising from its proximity to Metro as well as the surrounding retail, residential (both owner-occupied and renter-occupied), and office uses.

North Danville Street and North Cleveland Street are two lane (one in each direction), two-way, north-south streets. Wilson Boulevard and Clarendon Boulevard are both one-way streets, each with several lanes in each direction. The former heads southwest and the latter, northeast.

Wilson Boulevard and Clarendon Boulevard are high traffic thoroughfares, ensuring exposure to passersby. At North Danville Street, Wilson Boulevard has a daily traffic count of approximately 16,000 and Clarendon Boulevard has a daily traffic count of over 14,600 (Arlington County Department of Environmental Services, 2004).

## Zoning.

The area is zoned C-2, or "Service Commercial--Community Business Districts." Arlington County has determined the purpose of C-2 is to encourage "commercial development where the variety in retail, service and office uses is intended to serve a broad-based community" (Arlington County Planning Division).

Per the area's zoning, permissible uses include office and a wide variety of retail uses, including medical office, commercial development where the variety in retail, service and office uses (Arlington County Planning Division).

Although portions of the zoning code allow for discrete development of office and retail uses (Arlington County Planning Division a), other portions of the code indicate that the County may incorporate mixed commercial uses at the approval stage (Arlington County Planning Division b), such as retail on the first floor of an office building. The subject site is not located in an area where incorporation of retail on the first floor of other uses is mandated, such as in a county-designated Special Revitalization District (Arlington County Planning Division a), but the County has the discretion and the ability to incorporate such mixed uses (Arlington County Planning Division b) into projects. Such projects are called Unified Commercial/Mixed Use Developments. Adam Peters, Vice President of Development at Vornado Realty Trust, says that based on his experience, the County will likely require incorporation of first-floor retail into other commercial uses (November 10, 2011).

The chart below compares discrete office, retail, and mixed uses. Therefore, the author suggests anticipating incorporation retail into the first floor of an office building, if chosen. A summary of the chart is below. However, the addition of retail at the subject site does not afford the subject property, by right, any additional building height or FAR (Arlington County Planning Division b), as it would with certain county-defined areas such as the aforementioned Special Revitalization Districts (Arlington County Planning Division a). This lack of additional advantages has likely hindered development of the site.
OFFICE AND RETAIL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201
Table 2
C-2 Zoning Requirements

|  | Office | Retail | Unified Commercial/Mixed Use Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Height maximum | 45 feet |  | Same as previous, with the first floor height of at least 12 feet clear. |
| Density maximum | 1.5 FAR |  |  |
| Landscaping minimum | - $10 \%$ of total site area <br> - 1 deciduous tree for every 35 feet along the property line abutting public right of way <br> - No landscaped area will be less than 5 ft . by 8 ft . <br> - $25 \%$ of the landscaped area will be covered by mature shrubs |  | - If the site is 20,000 square feet or less, landscaping will be $10 \%$ of the total site area. <br> - If greater than 20,000 square feet, the landscaping will be a minimum area of 2,000 square feet plus $20 \%$ of the land area in excess of 20,000 square feet. |
| Setbacks | - Front: The greater of 1) $50 \%$ the height of the building from the center of the street or 2) 40 feet <br> - Rear and side yards: none. |  | - Same as previous, with a minimum setback of 20 feet from any adjacent parcel zoned Residential. |
| Parking | - 1 parking space for each 250 sf of floor area on the first floor, 1 space for each 300 sf of floor area located in the basement or on the second through fifth floors, and 1 space per 400 sf of floor area located above the fifth floor. | - 1 space for each 250 sf of floor area on the first floor in a building, plus 1 space for each 300 sf of floor area located elsewhere in the building. | - Same as previous. |
| Loading | - 6,000 sf. 1 dedicated loading space for office use. | - 3,000 sf. Minimum 1 loading space; 1 additional space for more than 15,000 sf of floor area, 1 additional space for more than 50,000 sf of floor area, and one 1 additional space for each 100,000 sf of floor area. | - Same as previous, with a wall four feet high shielding surface parking and loading areas from residential areas. |

[^0]
## Office With First Floor Retail: Site Layout And Composition

As stated previously, this paper assumes that the County will require the first floor of this property will consist of retail. The dimensions of the site are 273 feet east to west and 287 feet north to south, with a square acreage of 1.86 and square footage of approximately 78,271 square feet. Because the square footage of the site exceeds 20,000 square feet, landscaping must be 2,000 square feet plus 20 percent times the size of the site over 20,000 square feet. The total landscaping necessary is 13,654 square feet, leaving an allowable site footprint of 64,617 square feet.

With a maximum FAR of 1.50, the largest building that can be constructed is approximately 117,407 square feet. Standard building codes require that ceilings have a minimum height of nine feet clear plus an additional one foot for concrete slab and two for plena (Rosenberg, July 25, 2010). Assuming the first floor is 12 feet clear and each of the subsequent floors are at least nine feet clear, and each floor has a combined three feet of slab and plena, the maximum height of 45 feet accommodates three floors with soaring ceilings with a floor plan of 39,136 square feet each. To utilize the maximum ceiling height of 45 feet, the first floor can have a ceiling height of 14 feet clear (plus the slab and plena), and the second and third floors can have ceiling heights of 11 feet clear plus (plus the slab and plena).

The building footprint outlined above is well within mandated setbacks. As stated in the chart, the property must have a setback the greater of 40 feet from the center of the surrounding streets, or 50 percent of the height of the building. The width of Danville and Cleveland Streets, are 20 and 30 feet, respectively, and Clarendon and Wilson Boulevards are both 40 feet wide. The setbacks are therefore as follows. Therefore, the boundaries of the maximum footprint are 257 feet along Danville Street, 262 feet along Cleveland Street, and 253 feet along both Clarendon and Wilson. The approximate area of the bounded area is approximately 65,580 square feet. The footprint is well within these boundaries.

Per the parking regulations outlined above, zoning mandates 380 parking spaces. Additionally, there must be 6,000 square feet for a loading area. The site can accommodate a limited number of surface parking spaces, with the remaining required spaces to be placed in an underground parking lot.

As discussed previously, the site is 78,271 square feet, from which the footprint of the site of 39,136 square feet and 6,000 square feet of loading space are deducted. This leaves 19,481 square feet for surface parking. Assuming that the parking rows run parallel with Wilson Boulevard and Clarendon Boulevard and run the length of the site (which creates longer parking rows than if parallel with N. Danville and N. Cleveland Streets), the length of each row is 273 feet. In accordance with architectural standards, each parking space is assumed to be 9 feet by 18 feet ( 162 square feet total) with an aisle of 24 feet between two rows of spaces (Rosenberg, July 25,2010 ). Each set of a middle aisle flanked by two rows of spaces is 16,275 square feet total with 60 spaces ( 30 on each side). With 19,481 square feet remaining on the surface for parking and full set of an aisle and two rows of spaces comprising 16,275 square feet, the surface can accommodate one such set. That leaves 320 spaces which must be placed in underground parking.

Underground, the parking garage may extend further, to the borders of the site. With a site size of 78,721 square feet and 60 spaces for every 16,275 square feet, to meet the total amount of spaces required by zoning, there must be two levels of underground parking. As each level can have a maximum of 300 spaces, the garage can be one full level and one partial level. The first floor will hold 300 spaces, with the remaining 20 on the second level.

## Retail: Site Layout And Composition

A similar analysis is now performed for a proposed building composed entirely of retail uses. Despite the fact that a developer may construct a retail building with the same height and FAR as an office building, a multi-story retail project is likely unfeasible. According to Marvin

Muldrew, an REO asset manager at special servicer CW Capital Asset Management and a former retail asset manager at The Mills Company (November 8, 2011), second-floor retailers are typically unappealing to consumers. Their limited visibility and access leads to lower foot traffic. Consequently, their viability is limited. As such, a development that consists entirely of retail will not maximize the allowable FAR or building height on the site.

Under the zoning regulations presented above, a retail site requires only 10 percent of landscaping, leading to a theoretical maximum footprint of 70,444 square feet. This is further reduced because of the 3,000 square feet needed for loading, resulting in a building size of 67,444 square feet. Because the subject retail property will only be one floor, the total building will be of that same square footage.

Assuming the same first floor height as with the office and retail building, the retail building will consist of one story of 14 feet clear with one foot of slab and two feet of plena (17 feet total).

Required parking will be 282 spaces. After deducting landscaping, the building itself, and the required extra 3,000 square feet for loading, there are only 10,827 square feet left. This is insufficient for any surface parking. Therefore, all 282 spaces must be located in an underground garage. Because each garage level can accommodate 300 spaces, the garage need only be one level.

## Improvements Summary

Below is a chart of the proposed improvements for each asset class.
Table 3
Improvements Summary

|  | Office with First Floor Retail | Retail |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Size (sf) | 117,407 | 67,444 |
| FAR | 1.5 | 0.86 |
| Building Height (feet) | 45 | 17 |
| Floors | Three. Floor-to-slab: First level: 17 <br> feet, second and third levels: 14 feet | One |
| Parking Spaces | 380. Surface: 60. Underground <br> garage: 320. | 270. Underground garage: <br> 270. |

## Economic and Market Fundamentals Analysis

## Washington, DC Metropolitan Area Economic Analysis

The subject site is located in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, which includes the District of Columbia; 15 counties and cities including northern Virginia, including Arlington County; three counties in Maryland; and Jefferson County, West Virginia (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010 May).

The Washington, DC metro area is the most affluent and one of the highly educated areas in the nation (Hughes, 2011). As the seat of the federal government, the area enjoys reduced exposure to economic downturns. Arlington County itself ranked as having the fifthhighest median household income according to the 2010 U.S. Census (Hughes, 2011). Six other Virginia and Maryland Counties were among in the top 20 wealthiest counties in the nation (Hughes, 2011). Although the federal government is the driving economic force, in the foreseeable future, the private sector, particularly in Professional Business Services industries, will be leading growth. Between January and August 2011, the private sector added 9,000 jobs (Cassidy Turley, 2011).

Table 4
2010 U.S. Census: Selected Demographic and Economic Data

|  | Arlington County | Washington, DC MSA | United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total population | 207,627 | $5,582,170$ | $308,745,538$ |
| Total households | 92,982 | $2,074,730$ | $114,596,927$ |
| Median household income | $\$ 94,986$ | $\$ 84,523$ | $\$ 50,046$ |
| Per capita income | $\$ 55,403$ | $\$ 40,528$ | $\$ 26,059$ |
| Unemployment rate | $3.3 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ |
| Population aged $25+$ with <br> at least a college degree | $70 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $28 \%$ |

Table 4: 2010 U.S. Census: Selected Demographic and Economic Data (Census Bureau 2010)

## Washington DC, MSA And Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor Office Market

The DC metro area is a prime office location given its high educational attainment and the presence of the federal government. With a total inventory of nearly 456 million square feet of space, it enjoys an average vacancy rate of $13 \%$ and average asking rental rate of $\$ 34.05$ per square foot. Over 5.2 million square feet of office is under construction (CoStar, 2011i). Below are office market statistics for each of the region's submarkets.

As outlined below, the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor has a total inventory of approximately 28.6 million square feet, $10 \%$ vacancy, and asking rents of $\$ 40.87$ per square foot, performing better than the market area as a whole (CoStar, 2011i). However, the submarket has experienced over $(682,000)$ square feet in negative net absorption, meaning fewer tenants are taking occupancy than are leaving. Already 144,000 sf of new deliveries have been added to inventory this year, with another 1.3 million forthcoming (CoStar, 2011i).

Table 5
Washington, DC Total Office Market

| Market | Jurisdiction | Total Inventory |  | Vacancy | YTD Net Absorption | YTD Deliveries | UnderConstruction SF | Quoted Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Buildings | Total RBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexandria / I-395 | Virginia | 878 | 39,425,932 | 11.2\% | $(317,446)$ | - | 15,000 | \$ | 34.36 |
| Bethesda / Chevy Chase | Maryland | 258 | 11,937,622 | 11.4\% | $(223,503)$ | - | - | \$ | 34.69 |
| Capitol Hill | District of Columbia | 458 | 33,938,332 | 14.5\% | 1,020,355 | 414,029 | - | \$ | 49.05 |
| Downtown DC | District of Columbia | 852 | 95,448,856 | 10.0\% | $(33,696)$ | 432,900 | 1,133,807 | \$ | 50.62 |
| Dulles Corridor | Virginia | 745 | 54,812,107 | 16.1\% | 585,955 | 120,000 | 100,000 | \$ | 26.29 |
| E Prince George's County | Maryland | 108 | 2,378,715 | 12.0\% | 31,703 | - | - | \$ | 20.85 |
| East Falls Church | Virginia | 51 | 913,734 | 7.2\% | (665) | - | - | \$ | 31.70 |
| Frederick | Maryland | 616 | 8,256,955 | 16.7\% | $(171,996)$ | 25,000 | 26,100 | \$ | 22.92 |
| Georgetown / Uptown | District of Columbia | 823 | 16,373,314 | 8.6\% | 60,204 | 140,000 | 161,107 | \$ | 38.56 |
| Greater Fairfax County | Virginia | 1,163 | 60,825,410 | 14.1\% | 687,649 | - | 720,873 | \$ | 30.40 |
| 1-270 Corridor | Maryland | 766 | 42,471,496 | 15.0\% | 408,523 | 115,000 | 750,560 | \$ | 27.95 |
| Leesburg / Route 7 Corridor | Virginia | 368 | 7,404,681 | 16.4\% | 219,840 | 100,539 | 11,303 | \$ | 25.78 |
| Manassas / Route 29 / I-66 | Virginia | 350 | 5,895,506 | 13.1\% | 47,784 | - | 45,000 | \$ | 21.77 |
| N Prince George's County | Maryland | 680 | 19,302,035 | 18.7\% | $(59,716)$ | - | 268,762 | \$ | 20.33 |
| Northeast / Southeast | District of Columbia | 214 | 2,525,724 | 15.4\% | $(35,373)$ | - | - | \$ | 23.29 |
| R-B Corridor | Virginia | 178 | 23,585,821 | 10.4\% | $(582,156)$ | 144,000 | 1,329,086 | \$ | 40.67 |
| S Prince George's County | Maryland | 296 | 4,658,089 | 15.2\% | $(23,794)$ | - | - | \$ | 22.43 |
| SE Fairfax County | Virginia | 270 | 7,548,956 | 10.8\% | 136,367 | 95,000 | 641,147 | \$ | 28.16 |
| SE Montgomery County | Maryland | 374 | 12,891,565 | 12.9\% | $(123,905)$ | - | - | \$ | 26.18 |
| Winchester City | Virginia | 127 | 1,873,297 | 10.1\% | 35,623 | 4,800 | - | \$ | 17.38 |
| Woodbridge / l-95 Corridor | Virginia | 259 | 3,499,128 | 14.6\% | 76,536 | 50,032 | - | \$ | 21.28 |
| Total |  | 9,834 | 455,967,275 | 13.0\% | 1,738,289 | 1,641,300 | 5,202,745 | \$ | 34.05 |

Table 5: Washington, DC Total Office Market (CoStar, 2011i)

Because the property is new, it is considered a Class A property. Class A properties generally enjoy higher absorption, and higher rents than average, as demonstrated below. The Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor's Class A office inventory is 15.7 million square feet (two-thirds of total submarket inventory), and slightly negative net absorption of approximately $(63,000)$ square feet (CoStar, 2011i).

Table 6
Washington, DC Class A Office Market

| Market | Jurisdiction | Total Inventory |  | Vacancy | YTD Net Absorption | YTD Deliveries | Under Construction SF | Quoted Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Buildings | Total RBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexandria / 1-395 | Virginia | 97 | 19,034,852 | 15.4\% | $(197,868)$ | - | - | \$ | 36.28 |
| Bethesda / Chevy Chase | Maryland | 25 | 5,680,686 | 12.7\% | $(204,117)$ | - | - | \$ | 37.76 |
| Capitol Hill | District of Columbia | 69 | 23,459,561 | 16.8\% | 1,127,583 | 414,029 | - | \$ | 50.91 |
| Downtown DC | District of Columbia | 224 | 57,389,315 | 11.6\% | 174,130 | 432,900 | 1,133,807 | \$ | 54.70 |
| Dulles Corridor | Virginia | 269 | 38,423,414 | 15.7\% | 794,671 | 120,000 | 100,000 | \$ | 28.43 |
| E Prince George's County | Maryland | 9 | 872,392 | 22.3\% | 23,000 | - | - | \$ | 22.19 |
| East Falls Church | Virginia | 1 | 300,000 | 0.8\% | - | - | - | \$ | 37.99 |
| Frederick | Maryland | 18 | 2,201,323 | 15.3\% | 8,634 | - | - | \$ | 25.75 |
| Georgetown / Uptown | District of Columbia | 22 | 4,117,244 | 15.4\% | 20,366 | 140,000 | 161,107 | \$ | 44.28 |
| Greater Fairfax County | Virginia | 179 | 33,030,947 | 13.4\% | 911,834 | - | 720,873 | \$ | 34.46 |
| 1-270 Corridor | Maryland | 135 | 20,141,092 | 16.8\% | 392,503 | 115,000 | 750,560 | \$ | 31.57 |
| Leesburg / Route 7 Corridor | Virginia | 36 | 3,358,841 | 23.3\% | 149,684 | 93,539 | - | \$ | 27.19 |
| Manassas / Route 29 / I-66 | Virginia | 13 | 893,125 | 20.8\% | 29,236 | - | 45,000 | \$ | 25.05 |
| N Prince George's County | Maryland | 49 | 6,900,568 | 20.4\% | 21,728 | - | 268,762 | \$ | 20.88 |
| Northeast / Southeast | District of Columbia | 1 | 63,000 | 2.2\% | - | - | - | \$ | - |
| R-B Corridor | Virginia | 68 | 15,732,709 | 8.9\% | $(52,939)$ | 144,000 | 1,329,086 | \$ | 41.78 |
| S Prince George's County | Maryland | 7 | 793,137 | 31.4\% | 20,447 | - | - | \$ | 24.50 |
| SE Fairfax County | Virginia | 15 | 1,729,418 | 10.2\% | 6,567 | 95,000 | 641,147 | \$ | 37.33 |
| SE Montgomery County | Maryland | 28 | 5,621,441 | 9.2\% | $(32,157)$ | - | - | \$ | 30.96 |
| Winchester City | Virginia | - | - | 0.0\% | - | - | - | \$ | - |
| Woodbridge / l-95 Corridor | Virginia | 5 | 323,172 | 8.2\% | 49,770 | - | - | \$ | 27.26 |
| Total |  | 1,270 | 240,066,237 | 14.2\% | 3,243,072 | 1,554,468 | 5,150,342 | \$ | 38.46 |

Table 6: Washington, DC Class A Office Market (CoStar, 2011i)
Within the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor, the picture for Class A properties in the Clarendon /
Courthouse area is even better. Clarendon and Courthouse are the only submarkets with
positive YTD net absorption and no upcoming competition (CoStar, 2011i).

Table 7
Rosslyn-Ballston Class A Office Submarkets

| Submarket | Total Inventory |  | Vacancy | YTD Net Absorption | YTD Deliveries | UnderConstruction SF | Quoted Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# Buildings | Total RBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ballston | 27 | 6,298,477 | 8.7\% | (169,355) | 144,000 | 653,315 | \$ | 43.47 |
| Clarendon / Courthouse | 20 | 3,565,950 | 8.9\% | 353,577 | - | - | \$ | 40.01 |
| Rosslyn | 15 | 4,869,911 | 9.8\% | (204,588) | - | 675,771 | \$ | 39.55 |
| Virginia Square | 6 | 998,371 | 6.0\% | $(32,573)$ | - | - | \$ | 43.89 |
| Total | 68 | 15,732,709 | 8.9\% | $(52,939)$ | 144,000 | 1,329,086 | \$ | 47.78 |

Table 7: Rosslyn-Ballston Class A Office Submarkets (CoStar, 2011i)
The above rate of $\$ 40 /$ sf gross is somewhat low for new space. According Peters
(November 10, 2011) and Jennifer Ralph, a Team Lead at CBRE for tenant leasing (November 10, 2011), office rents for new leases in the Clarendon area are typically $\$ 45$ per square foot with a base stop expense reimbursement structure. The office comps below confirm that office rents for new and renovated properties in the Clarendon and Courthouse areas are indeed in the mid-\$40s per sf.

## Office Lease Comps

The office rent comps outlined below are for recently constructed or renovated properties, Class A properties located in the Clarendon and Courthouse areas. The comps support rent rates of $\$ 45 /$ sf with base stop expense reimbursements.

Table 8
Comparable Property \#1: Clarendon Center North


Table 8: Clarendon Center North (CoStar 2011c), Saul Centers (2006).

Table 9
Comparable Property \#2: Clarendon Center South

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

Table 9: Clarendon Center South (CoStar 2011d), Saul Centers (2006).

Table 10
Comparable Property \#3: Arlington Plaza

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Table 10: Arlington Plaza (CoStar 2011b).

Table 11
Comparable Property \#4: Courthouse Tower

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Table 11: Courthouse Tower (CoStar 2011f).

Table 12
Comparable Property \#5: Clarendon Square Building

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

Table 12: Clarendon Square Building (CoStar 2011e).

Table 13
Comparable Property \#6: Hartford Square Building


Table 13: Hartford Square Building (CoStar 2011g).

## Washington DC, MSA And Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor Retail Market

With its strong employment and average income levels, the Washington, DC
metropolitan area is a prime retail market. Below are retail market statistics for all retail properties, including regional malls, community centers, neighborhood centers, strip centers, power centers, freestanding retail buildings, and specialty centers (CoStar, 2011j).

The market appears robust. Of over 223 million square feet of retail inventory in the DC metro area, only $4.8 \%$ is vacant. Absorption through the third quarter of 2011 was nearly 1.2 million square feet and deliveries have been 1.1 million square feet. Approximately 480,000 square feet are under construction and rent rates are approximately $\$ 23.27$ per square foot NNN.

Table 14
Washington, DC Total Retail Market

| Market | Jurisdiction | Total Inventory |  | Vacancy | YTD Net Absorption | YTD Deliveries | Under Construction SF | Quoted Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Buildings | Total RBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexandria / I-395 | Virginia | 922 | 13,829,138 | 3.0\% | $(26,877)$ | 2,427 | 2,425 | \$ | 30.94 |
| Bethesda / Chevy Chase | Maryland | 310 | 4,374,492 | 2.8\% | 21,321 | - | 22,737 | \$ | 31.63 |
| Capitol Hill | District of Columbia | 641 | 3,040,303 | 5.0\% | $(5,920)$ | 3,000 | - | \$ | 29.69 |
| Downtown DC | District of Columbia | 287 | 1,955,680 | 4.6\% | 13,445 | - |  | \$ | 45.90 |
| Dulles Corridor | Virginia | 719 | 17,630,272 | 3.9\% | 30,602 | 68,256 | - | \$ | 26.36 |
| E Prince George's County | Maryland | 296 | 7,484,326 | 6.2\% | 55,601 | 137,149 | 57,582 | \$ | 19.40 |
| East Falls Church | Virginia | 132 | 1,325,621 | 1.5\% | 4,001 | - | - | \$ | 36.63 |
| Frederick | Maryland | 1,010 | 12,562,398 | 4.7\% | 580,888 | 518,679 | 3,117 | \$ | 17.12 |
| Georgetown / Uptown | District of Columbia | 1,964 | 10,793,792 | 4.4\% | 114,768 | - | 18,000 | \$ | 43.12 |
| Greater Fairfax County | Virginia | 1,156 | 23,964,339 | 3.2\% | 160,945 | 24,194 | 83,593 | \$ | 30.30 |
| 1-270 Corridor | Maryland | 905 | 23,241,973 | 4.9\% | 148,736 | 121,185 | 3,867 | \$ | 23.86 |
| Leesburg / Route 7 Corridor | Virginia | 486 | 7,583,516 | 9.1\% | $(5,498)$ | 101,436 | 30,607 | \$ | 26.03 |
| Manassas / Route 29 / I-66 | Virginia | 646 | 11,595,845 | 6.9\% | $(12,642)$ | 5,350 | 101,670 | \$ | 20.95 |
| N Prince George's County | Maryland | 1,573 | 20,697,327 | 5.5\% | 111,372 | 44,540 | - | \$ | 18.09 |
| Northeast / Southeast | District of Columbia | 837 | 4,714,246 | 5.0\% | 7,420 | - | 73,000 | \$ | 17.88 |
| R-B Corridor | Virginia | 151 | 2,733,830 | 2.0\% | 15,008 | 8,000 | - | \$ | 28.65 |
| S Prince George's County | Maryland | 884 | 12,437,710 | 5.9\% | $(36,048)$ | 19,620 | 79,371 | \$ | 15.59 |
| SE Fairfax County | Virginia | 575 | 12,476,917 | 3.5\% | $(36,938)$ | 6,500 | 4,321 | \$ | 25.16 |
| SE Montgomery County | Maryland | 838 | 13,408,845 | 3.8\% | $(42,900)$ | 25,742 | - | \$ | 22.97 |
| Winchester City | Virginia | 320 | 4,933,807 | 6.8\% | 146,432 | - | - | \$ | 11.40 |
| Woodbridge / l-95 Corridor | Virginia | 562 | 12,630,521 | 6.7\% | $(43,860)$ | 16,303 | - | \$ | 15.29 |
| Total |  | 15,214 | 223,414,898 | 4.8\% | 1,199,856 | 1,102,381 | 480,290 | \$ | 23.27 |

Table 14: Washington, DC Total Retail Market (CoStar, 2011j)
The freestanding, neighborhood, and strip retail markets mostly closely reflect the retail type contemplated in this proposal. Below are the market statistics for these retail types. There is a regional inventory of 164 million square feet (CoStar, 2011j). The market fundamentals are healthy; vacancy is $6.6 \%$, net absorption is approximately 627,000 square feet through the third
quarter of 2011 despite year to date deliveries of nearly 352,000 square feet (CoStar, 2011j).
Another 377,000 square feet is under construction (CoStar, 2011j).

Table 15
Washington, DC Freestanding, Neighborhood, and Strip Retail Statistics

| Market | Jurisdiction | Total Inventory |  | Vacancy | YTD Net Absorption | YTD Deliveries | UnderConstruction SF | Quoted Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Buildings | Total RBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexandria / I-395 | Virginia | 857 | 9,142,013 | 4.0\% | $(52,938)$ | 2,427 | 2,426 | \$ | 30.94 |
| Bethesda / Chevy Chase | Maryland | 295 | 3,943,780 | 2.9\% | 20,243 | - | 22,737 | \$ | 31.68 |
| Capitol Hill | District of Columbia | 640 | 3,000,203 | 5.0\% | $(5,920)$ | 3,000 | - | \$ | 31.25 |
| Downtown DC | District of Columbia | 287 | 1,955,680 | 4.6\% | 13,445 | - | - | \$ | 46.23 |
| Dulles Corridor | Virginia | 465 | 11,944,836 | 4.9\% | 54,106 | 68,256 | - | \$ | 26.76 |
| E Prince George's County | Maryland | 209 | 4,143,916 | 10.7\% | $(76,848)$ | - | 57,582 | \$ | 18.15 |
| East Falls Church | Virginia | 129 | 1,325,621 | 1.5\% | 4,001 | - | - | \$ | 37.30 |
| Frederick | Maryland | 890 | 9,545,753 | 5.7\% | 71,124 | 6,711 | 3,117 | \$ | 14.96 |
| Georgetown / Uptown | District of Columbia | 1,940 | 9,288,694 | 4.0\% | 110,923 | - | 18,000 | \$ | 38.92 |
| Greater Fairfax County | Virginia | 964 | 15,984,336 | 4.4\% | 158,954 | 24,194 | 83,593 | \$ | 31.38 |
| 1-270 Corridor | Maryland | 702 | 15,920,637 | 5.8\% | 242,084 | 121,185 | 3,867 | \$ | 24.35 |
| Leesburg / Route 7 Corridor | Virginia | 361 | 5,138,516 | 8.4\% | $(25,207)$ | - | 30,607 | \$ | 25.78 |
| Manassas / Route 29 / I-66 | Virginia | 486 | 7,693,953 | 6.6\% | $(15,318)$ | 5,350 | 61,000 | \$ | 20.42 |
| N Prince George's County | Maryland | 1,371 | 15,458,602 | 5.8\% | 107,656 | 44,540 | - | \$ | 18.29 |
| Northeast / Southeast | District of Columbia | 813 | 4,714,246 | 5.0\% | 7,420 | - | 10,000 | \$ | 17.49 |
| R-B Corridor | Virginia | 145 | 1,785,100 | 2.3\% | 15,008 | 8,000 | - | \$ | 32.11 |
| S Prince George's County | Maryland | 752 | 9,913,507 | 6.6\% | $(38,925)$ | 19,620 | 79,371 | \$ | 15.05 |
| SE Fairfax County | Virginia | 448 | 10,292,204 | 4.0\% | $(45,020)$ | 6,500 | 4,321 | \$ | 24.60 |
| SE Montgomery County | Maryland | 735 | 10,152,211 | 5.0\% | $(39,403)$ | 25,742 | - | \$ | 22.47 |
| Winchester City | Virginia | 285 | 4,070,236 | 8.0\% | 149,282 | - | - | \$ | 10.83 |
| Woodbridge / I-95 Corridor | Virginia | 424 | 8,703,604 | 8.2\% | $(28,018)$ | 16,303 | - | \$ | 16.39 |
| Total |  | 13,198 | 164,117,648 | 5.5\% | 626,649 | 351,828 | 376,621 | \$ | 23.11 |

Table 15: Washington, DC Freestanding, Neighborhood, and Strip Retail Statistics
(CoStar, 2011j)
Below are statistics for freestanding retail sites, and retail space in neighborhood centers and inline spaces in the Rosslyn Ballston corridor. The Clarendon / Courthouse area is the second largest submarket of properties of this type. Retail rents vary from the high $\$ 20$ s per square foot to the mid-\$40s per square foot.

Table 16
Rosslyn-Ballston Freestanding, Neighborhood, and Strip Retail Submarket Statistics

| Submarket | Total Inventory |  | Vacancy | YTD Net Absorption | YTD Deliveries | Under Construction SF | Quoted Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# Buildings | Total RBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ballston | 37 | 961,448 | 0.2\% | 10,000 | 8,000 | - | \$ | 45.00 |
| Clarendon / Courthouse | 65 | 474,832 | 7.8\% | 5,008 | - | - |  | 44.17 |
| Rosslyn | 8 | 108,429 | 0.0\% | - | - | - |  |  |
| Virginia Square | 35 | 240,391 | 1.0\% | - | - | - | \$ | 39.98 |
| Total | 145 | 1,785,100 | 2.2\% | 15,008 | 8,000 | - | \$ | 47.78 |

Table 16: Rosslyn-Ballston Freestanding, Neighborhood, and Strip Retail Submarket Statistics
(CoStar, 2011j)

Jarett Parker, Assistant Director of Real Estate at Kimco Realty Corporation, confirms that inline rent rates would be in the upper $\$ 30$ s per square foot to the low $\$ 40$ s per square foot (November 10, 2011). He adds that a variety of tenants ranging from small inline shop tenants up to 40,000 square feet would be interested in the site (Parker, November 10, 2011). Peters of Vornado states that in his experience, retail rates are typically $\$ 35 /$ sf NNN (November 10, 2011).

## Retail Rent Comps

The retail rent comps outlined below are for retail properties located in the Clarendon / Courthouse and Ballston areas. The comps range from $\$ 30 /$ sf to $\$ 42 /$ sf with triple net expense reimbursements. These comps support a retail rent of $\$ 35 / \mathrm{sf}$ NNN. This is slightly more conservative than Parker's estimate, but still within a reasonable margin.

Table 17
Comparable Property \#1: K\&M Properties Site


Table 17: K\&M Properties Site (CoStar 2011h)

Table 18
Comparable Property \#2: 2150 Clarendon Blvd.


Location Data

| Property | 2150 Clarendon Blvd. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Address | 2150 Clarendon Blvd. |  |
| County | Arlington |  |
| State | VA |  |
| Zip | 22201 |  |
| Main Road | $15^{\text {th }}$ St. NW |  |
| Physical Data |  |  |
| Type | Retail |  |
| Building Size (sf) | 35,635 |  |
| Year Built | NA |  |
| Parking | On street and surface lot. |  |
| Visibility | Good |  |
| Access | Good |  |
| Condition | Good |  |
| Lease Data |  |  |
| Lease Type | NNN |  |
| Rent rate/SF per Year | \$30 |  |
| Source | CoStar |  |
| Adjustments |  |  |
| Location | Comparable to Subject |  |
| Year Built/Condition | Inferior to Subject |  |
| Lease Type | Comparable to Subject |  |
| Parking | Comparable to Subject |  |
| Visibility/Access | Inferior to Subject |  |
| Comments: | Metro/Subway. |  |

[^1]Table 19
Comparable Property \#3: The Phoenix Condominium at The Clarendon Metro

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location Data |  |
| Property | The Phoenix Condominium at The Clarendon Metro |
| Address | 3105 N. 10th Street |
| County | Arlington |
| State | VA |
| Zip | 22201 |
| Main Road | $10^{\text {th }}$ St. NW |
| Physical Data |  |
| Type | Retail with residential condominium above |
| Building Size (sf) | 13,650 |
| Year Built | 2007 |
| Parking | On street. |
| Visibility | Good |
| Access | Good |
| Condition | Good |
| Lease Data |  |
| Lease Type | NNN |
| Rent rate/SF per Year | \$42 |
| Source | LoopNet |
| Adjustments |  |
| Location | Inferior to Subject |
| Year Built/Condition | Comparable to Subject |
| Lease Type | Comparable to Subject |
| Parking | Inferior to Subject |
| Visibility/Access | Inferior to Subject |
| Comments: | Metro/Subway. |

Table 19: The Phoenix Condominium at The Clarendon Metro (LoopNet 2012)

## Land Rent Comps

Because the proposed developer does not currently own the land, the value of the land must be determined to determine its price. As stated in the introduction of this paper, assemblage of the parcels from different owners is not part of this analysis. This analysis works from the assumption that the developer is purchasing all parcels at once. Nevertheless, land value analysis is helpful in determining the value, in aggregate, of the land on the block. Land value also figures prominently in the development costs of the project and financing.

Based on the comps below, the cost of land per FAR sf is $\$ 145$ to $\$ 252$. These comps are in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor with the same zoning as the subject, C-2. The sales comps that are most recent and have the least level of development (similar to the subject, which is undeveloped) are between $\$ 145$ and $\$ 208$ per FAR sf. The price per FAR sf is determined to be closer to the lower end of the range due to for the above-mentioned reason. Therefore, the price per FAR sf is determined to be $\$ 150$. With a site size of 1.86 acres $(81,203$ land sf) and a FAR sf capacity of 1.50 , the subject property's land price is $\$ 18,270,000$.

Because the office property has more square feet than the retail property, the retail property will have a higher per FAR sf land cost than the office project (\$271 versus \$156). A retail developer should be prepared to pay the same aggregate price as an office developer, as an office developer would presumably be prepared to pay $\$ 18,270,000$ based on the increased development capacity.

Table 20
Comparable Land Sale \#1: 900 N. Kansas St.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location Data |  |
| Property | 900 N. Kansas St. |
| Address | 900 N. Kansas St. |
| County | Arlington |
| State | VA |
| Zip | 22201 |
| Main Road | Wilson Blvd. |
| Physical Data |  |
| Size acres / sf | 0.18 / 7,841 |
| Zoning | C-2 |
| By Right FAR | 1.5 |
| Improvement | 3\% |
| Visibility | Fair |
| Access | Fair |
| Sale Data |  |
| Date | 12/18/09 |
| Price (total) | \$2,450,000 |
| Price / FAR sf | \$208 |
| Source | CoStar |
| Adjustments |  |
| Location | Inferior to Subject |
| Time of Sale | Inferior to Subject |
| Condition of Improvements | Comparable to Subj |
| Visibility/Access | Inferior to Subject |
| Comments: | NA |

Table 20: 900 N. Kansas St. (CoStar, 2012c)

Table 21
Comparable Land Sale \#2: 3440 N. Fairfax Dr.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

Table 21: 3440 N. Fairfax Dr. (CoStar, 2012b)

Table 22
Comparable Land Sale \#3: 1716 Wilson Blvd.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location Data |  |
| Property | 1716 Wilson Blvd. |
| Address | 1716 Wilson Blvd. |
| County | Arlington |
| State | VA |
| Zip | 22209 |
| Main Road | Clarendon Blvd. and Wilson Blvd. |
| Physical Data |  |
| Size acres / sf | 1.05 / 45,738 |
| Zoning | C-2 |
| By Right FAR | 1.5 |
| Improvement | 0\% |
| Visibility | Good |
| Access | Good |
| Sale Data |  |
| Date | 5/20/10 |
| Price (total) | \$10,000,000 |
| Price / FAR sf | \$146 |
| Source | CoStar |
| Adjustments |  |
| Location | Inferior to Subject |
| Time of Sale | Inferior to Subject |
| Condition of Improvements | Comparable to Subject |
| Visibility/Access | Comparable to Subject |
| Comments: | NA |

Table 22: 1716 Wilson Blvd. (CoStar, 2012a)

## Pro forma Analysis And Valuation

Based on the above information, pro forma operating statements and values for both office and retail may be determined.

## Office

## Rent Roll.

Based on the office and retail rents determined above, the proposed rent roll is as
follows. The property is assumed to be speculative and lease during construction, with all tenants in occupancy and paying rent upon delivery.

Table 23
Office Rent Roll

|  | Retail (First Floor) | Office (Second Floor) | Office (Third Floor) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total size (sf) | 39,136 | 39,136 | 39,136 |
| Number of Suites | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| Size of Each Tenant (sf) | 9,784 | 19,567 | 4,892 |
| Rent | $\$ 35$ | $\$ 45$ | $\$ 45$ |
| Reimbursement | NNN | Base Stop | Base Stop |
| Escalation | $3 \%$ annually | $3 \%$ annually | $3 \%$ annually |
| Term | 5 | 10 | 5 |

## Expenses.

Total operating costs for new, Class A buildings in the District of Columbia are typically $\$ 20$ to $\$ 24$ per square foot; for new trophy buildings, they are $\$ 26$ to $\$ 28$ per square foot. (Ralph, November 10, 2011). These costs include real estate taxes for the District of Columbia. To arrive at comparable operating expenses for Northern Virginia office buildings, the District of Columbia taxes must be removed and the Northern Virginia taxes must be added in.

In the District of Columbia, commercial and industrial properties are assessed at $\$ 1.65$ per $\$ 100$ for the first $\$ 3$ million of value. If a property is assessed at more than $\$ 3$ million in
value, the portion greater than $\$ 3$ million is taxes at $\$ 1.85$ per $\$ 100$ of value (District of Columbia Office of Tax and Revenue).

In Arlington County, where the proposed property is located, the rate of tax on all of the parcels is $\$ 1.083$ per every $\$ 100$ of value (Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011b, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011c, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011d, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011e, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011f, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011g, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011h, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011i, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011j, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011k, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011I, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011m, Arlington County Department of Real Estate Assessments 2011n). Therefore, in order to arrive at the expenses for office, the expense structure and value of the property is a circular calculation dependent on the value of the property.

Based on the first run of the pro forma, the initial value is approximately $\$ 28,900,000$. Taxes under the District of Columbia are charged at $\$ 1.65$ per $\$ 100$ for the first $\$ 3$ million of value (in this case, $\$ 49,500$ ) and $\$ 1.85$ per $\$ 100$ for any portion thereafter (or $\$ 479,150$ ), for a total of $\$ 528,650$ or $\$ 4.50$ per square foot (District of Columbia Office of Tax and Revenue). The total operating expenses of $\$ 25$ minus taxes of $\$ 4.50$ results in operating expenses net of taxes of $\$ 20.50$ per square foot. The per square foot equivalent of the Arlington County rate of $\$ 1.083$ per $\$ 100$ is input into the expense assumptions, and the value re-run until the tax per square foot accurately reflects the value. At the process' conclusion, the taxes per square foot are $\$ 3.21$ per square foot and total operating expenses are $\$ 23.40$ per square foot. The final value is discussed further in this document.

## Tenant improvements.

Ralph states that the tenant improvements for office deals are approximately $\$ 55$ per square foot to $\$ 65$ per square foot from cold, dark shell (Ralph, November 10, 2011). Tenant improvements from vanilla shell for new tenants are assumed to be $\$ 40$ to $\$ 45$ per square foot.

## Pro forma.

Below is the pro forma operating statement for the proposed office property. The analysis incorporates a conservative vacancy allowance of 10\%, compared to actual RosslynBallston vacancy of $8.9 \%$ (CoStar, 2011i). The property is assumed to be speculative and lease during construction, with all tenants in occupancy and paying rent upon delivery. A summary of lease expirations is also below.
OFFICE AND RETAIL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201


## Retail

## Rent roll.

Based on Parker's assessment of the potential tenant profile (November 10, 2011), the projected rent roll a mix of tenants ranging from small, inline tenants that are less than 5,000 square feet up to "junior anchor" tenants. The property is assumed to be speculative and lease during construction, with all tenants in occupancy and paying rent upon delivery.

Table 26
Retail Rent Roll

|  | Junior Anchor | Mid-Size Tenants | Inline |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total size (sf) | 20,000 | 20,000 | 27,444 |
| Number of Suites | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Size of Each Tenant (sf) | 20,000 | 10,000 | 4,574 |
| Rent | $\$ 35$ | $\$ 35$ | $\$ 35$ |
| Reimbursement | NNN | NNN | NNN |
| Escalation | $3 \%$ annually | $3 \%$ annually | $3 \%$ annually |
| Term | 10 | 7 | 5 |

## Expenses.

Parker states that expenses including real estate taxes for retail properties in Arlington would be between $\$ 8$ per square foot and $\$ 15$ per square foot (November 10, 2011). Higher expenses, and therefore reimbursements, would arise if higher cost amenities such as structured parking are provided. Peters concurs, stating that retail expenses in Arlington can be as high as $\$ 15$ per square foot (Peters, November 10, 2011), including taxes.

## Tenant improvements.

Parker states that tenant improvements for inline retail space are approximately $\$ 10$ per square foot to $\$ 20$ per square foot, with more complex uses such as restaurants commanding the higher end of the range (November 10, 2011). From cold, dark shell, tenant improvements are $\$ 50-\$ 60$, with restaurants as high as $\$ 150$ per square foot (Peters, November 10, 2011).

## Pro forma.

Using conservative vacancy allowance of 5\%, compared to actual Rosslyn-Ballston vacancy of 2.2\% (CoStar, 2011j), and operating expenses of $\$ 15$ per square foot (Parker, November 10, 2011), the pro forma is as follows.
OFFICE AND RETAIL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201
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## Valuation

## Valuation rates.

The discounted flow method was used to determine the value of both the office and the retail property. The property's cash flows over a holding period and a reversion value (in turn based on the following year's income divided by a capitalization rate to arrive at a projected value upon a sale at the end of the holding period) are discounted to arrive at a net present value for the property. Discount rates and terminal capitalization rates can differ according to property type and market.

Below are the rates suggested by PricewaterhouseCoopers' Real Estate Investor Survey, upon which the rates for the subject analysis are based (Second Quarter 2011). The discount rates for both Northern Virginia and for national strip retail centers are approximately 100 basis points above the terminal cap rate. The average discount rates and average terminal cap rates, rounded to the nearest $0.25 \%$ are selected, while maintaining the difference of 100 basis points between the two rates. For both property types, the discount rate is $9 \%$ and the terminal cap rate is $8 \%$.

Table 29
Discount Rates and Terminal Cap Rates

|  | Northern Virginia Office |  |  | National Strip Shopping Centers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Selected | Average | Range | Selected | Average | Range |
| Discount Rate | $9.00 \%$ | $8.75 \%$ | $7.50 \%-10.00 \%$ | $9.00 \%$ | $8.85 \%$ | $6.75 \%-12.50 \%$ |
| Terminal Cap Rate | $8.00 \%$ | $7.90 \%$ | $7.00 \%-9.00 \%$ | $8.00 \%$ | $7.97 \%$ | $6.50 \%-12.00 \%$ |

Table 29: PricewaterhouseCoopers (Second Quarter 2011)

## Office.

In a standard discounted cash flow analysis, it is customary to discount ten years of operating performance and base a reversion, or sales, value on the net operating income of the eleventh year. However, the property will undergo significant tenant rollover in Year 11; leases on fully one-third of the premises will expire. This means that this year will not have an income reflective of normalized operations, rendering the reversion value less representative of a sale
value. Shortening the hold period exposes the owner (the seller) to a discount on the reversion price due to the then-upcoming rollover risk. Therefore, it is recommended that the hold period be extended to eleven years, with the reversion value based on the twelfth year.

The stabilized value of the office building is determined to be \$34,750,000 (\$296 per square foot).

Table 30
Office Valuation: Discounted Cash Flow

| $\frac{\text { Analysis Year }}{1}$ | Cash Flow |  | Discounted at 9\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | 2,538,519 | \$ | 2,328,917 |
| 2 | \$ | 2,664,313 | \$ | 2,242,498 |
| 3 | \$ | 2,793,886 | \$ | 2,157,393 |
| 4 | \$ | 2,927,337 | \$ | 2,073,799 |
| 5 | \$ | 3,064,797 | \$ | 1,991,908 |
| 6 | \$ | $(12,610)$ | \$ | $(7,519)$ |
| 7 | \$ | 3,199,279 | \$ | 1,750,115 |
| 8 | \$ | 3,348,842 | \$ | 1,680,671 |
| 9 | \$ | 3,502,894 | \$ | 1,612,830 |
| 10 | \$ | 3,661,572 | \$ | 1,546,688 |
| 11 | \$ | $(40,694)$ | \$ | $(15,771)$ |
| Total Cash Flow | \$ | 27,648,135 | \$ | 17,361,529 |
| Property Retail at 8\% Cap Rate | \$ | 44,869,303 | \$ | 17,388,329 |
| Total Property Present Value (Rounded) |  |  | \$ | 34,750,000 |
| Per Square Foot |  |  | \$ | 296 |
| Percentage Value Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| Prospective Income |  | 50\% |  |  |
| Prospective Property Resale |  | 50\% |  |  |
| Total |  | 100\% |  |  |

## Retail.

As with the office property, the retail project experiences significant rollover in Year 11.
Here, too, it is recommended that the hold period be extended to eleven years, with the reversion value based on the twelfth year.

The stabilized value of the retail building is determined to be $\$ 30,100,000$ ( $\$ 446$ per square foot).

Table 31
Retail Valuation: Discounted Cash Flow

| Analysis Year | Cash Flow |  | Discounted at 9\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 2,185,343 | \$ | 2,004,902 |
| 2 | \$ | 2,250,905 | \$ | 1,894,542 |
| 3 | \$ | 2,318,426 | \$ | 1,790,250 |
| 4 | \$ | 2,387,983 | \$ | 1,691,707 |
| 5 | \$ | 2,459,625 | \$ | 1,598,588 |
| 6 | \$ | 2,040,128 | \$ | 1,216,461 |
| 7 | \$ | 2,604,122 | \$ | 1,424,544 |
| 8 | \$ | 2,300,870 | \$ | 1,154,729 |
| 9 | \$ | 2,758,625 | \$ | 1,270,148 |
| 10 | \$ | 2,841,383 | \$ | 1,200,231 |
| 11 | \$ | 1,784,245 | \$ | 691,453 |
| Total Cash Flow | \$ | 25,931,655 | \$ | 15,937,555 |
| Property Retail at 8\% Cap Rate | \$ | 36,534,613 | \$ | 14,158,363 |
| Total Property Present Value (Rounded) |  |  | \$ | 30,100,000 |
| Per Square Foot |  |  | \$ | 446 |
| Percentage Value Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| Prospective Income |  | 53\% |  |  |
| Prospective Property Resale |  | 47\% |  |  |
| Total |  | 100\% |  |  |

## Financing Overview

## Equity.

In order to determine if a developer is receiving a sufficient yield on a project, developers use a number of metrics to gauge performance. According to Peters, developers seek a 10\% yield of net operating income over the total development cost of the property, including land (November 10, 2011). David Sislen, President of Bristol Capital Corporation, states that owners generally seek an unlevered internal rate of return (IRR) of at least 10\% and a levered IRR of at least 20\% (November 8, 2011).

## Debt.

Developers must frequently supplement their equity investments with debt. Today, sources of financing are typically commercial banks and life insurance companies, rather than securitized conduits (Peters, November 10, 2011). Currently, active lenders prefer low-risk investments on good markets (Peters, November 10, 2011). Based on the economic and real estate fundamental data provided above, the Washington, DC metropolitan area and the Rosslyn - Ballston Corridor qualify.

Elizabeth Morrison, an Assistant Vice President in commercial real estate lending of Bank of America, adds that ideal underwriting constraints typically limit loan terms to 5 years or less to accommodate construction itself. Loan amounts are constrained by loan-to-cost, loan-to-value, and debt service coverage ratios. A loan must be no more than $70 \%-75 \%$ of the total cost of the project, no more than $70 \%-75 \%$ of the project's stabilized value, and must support a debt service coverage ratio of $1.25 x$ on stabilized net operating income, based on an interest constant of $8 \%$ overall or $7 \%$ rate at a 30 -year amortization (Morrison, November 8, 2011).

If the borrower already owns the site upon which the property is located, it may be counted as equity against the total cost of the project and reduce the borrower's out of pocket cash contributions to the project. Morrison states that if the land has been owned for more than three years, underwriters are willing to use the cost paid by the borrower as equity, on the presumption that a land purchase made in that time frame is reflective of market prices. If the land has been owned for more than three years, prevailing market values, based on comps, should be used. In this case, part of the loan proceeds will be used to finance acquisition of the land (Morrison, November 8, 2011).

Although it is typically construction lenders' preference to have the loans repaid upon maturity or completion of construction, the current low interest rate environment has encouraged developers to seek retain construction loans on their books for 5 to 7 years rather than seek higher-rate permanent financing, even if the project has been fully delivered (Morrison,

November 8, 2011). The aforementioned loan-to-cost, loan-to-value, and debt service coverage constraints still apply (Morrison, November 8, 2011). In his experience, Peters has seen combined construction and permanent financing for up to ten years (November 10, 2011).

Although the loan amount is sized based on the assumption that the completed project would be able to achieve permanent financing at a constant of $8 \%$ (Morrison, November 8, 2011), pay rates on construction loans are typically LIBOR plus 225 to 275 basis points. Based on the LIBOR rates below, the interest rate could be as low as $2.5 \%$ to $3 \%$. To counteract such low interest rates, construction lenders typically set a floor interest rate of 5\% (Peters, November 10, 2011).

For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that a more conventional interest rate market has returned. Construction financing is for two years to allow for construction and delivery of the project at a minimum interest rate of $5 \%$. The aforementioned loan to cost, loan to value, and debt service coverage ratio constraints of $75 \%, 75 \%$, and $1.25 x$ on a constant of $8 \%$, respectively, apply.

Table 32
Fixed and Floating Interest Rates

| LIBOR Rates (Floating) | Yield | US Treasury Rates (Fixed Rate) | Yield (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 month | 0.26 | - | - |
| 3 months | 0.52 | 3 months | 0.07 |
| - | - | 1 year | 0.12 |
| - | - | 5 years | 0.76 |
| - | - | 7 years | 1.33 |
| - | - | 10 years | 1.92 |

Table 32: Bloomberg (January 7, 2012a). Bloomberg (January 7, 2012b).

## Construction costs

Below are the projected costs of construction for office and retail properties as determined by the construction cost database by RS Means. The database determines the hard costs (including tenant improvements), contractor's overhead and profit, and architectural fees for building projects based upon the asset class of project, the square footage of the project, and the location of the project. The database is recommended by Ben Krasnow of Buzzuto Construction Company as an effective tool to determine the feasibility of projects
(November 10, 2011).

Table 33
Office and Retail Construction Costs

| Office Project |  |  | Retail Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Value | \$ | 18,270,000 | Land Value | \$ | 18,270,000 |
| Office Building |  |  | Retail Building |  |  |
| Hard costs | \$ | 11,902,000 | Hard costs | \$ | 3,960,000 |
| Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 2,975,500 | Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 990,000 |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 1,041,500 | Architectural Fees | \$ | 396,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 15,919,000 | Subtotal | \$ | 5,346,000 |
| Parking garage |  |  | Parking garage |  |  |
| Hard costs | \$ | 4,445,000 | Hard costs | \$ | 4,097,500 |
| Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 1,111,500 | Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 1,024,500 |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 444,500 | Architectural Fees | \$ | 410,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 6,001,000 | Subtotal | \$ | 5,532,000 |
| Total Construction Budget | \$ | 40,190,000 | Total Construction Budget | \$ | 29,148,000 |

Table 33: RS Means (2012).

## Construction and Permanent Financing

## Office.

As stated above, the loan will be underwritten to a $75 \%$ loan-to-cost ratio, a $75 \%$ loan-tovalue ratio, and 1.25 times debt service coverage on stabilized net operating income assuming an $8 \%$ constant. Because no tenants will be in occupancy and generating no income during construction, the construction loan must include an interest reserve until paying tenants are in
place. This line item is added to the construction budget, again resulting in an iterative process until the budget, loan amount, and interest reserve are resolved. The loan amount is constrained by the debt service coverage ratio, resulting in a construction loan of $\$ 25,500,000$.

The tables below outline the rationale for the construction loan amount, the revised budget, and a sources and uses statement for the construction loan showing total sources of financing for the project. The draw schedule used to calculate interest during the projected 24 months of the construction is in the appendices.

Table 34
Construction Loan

| Final Loan Amount |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Constraint | $\frac{\text { Criteria }}{}$ |  | Loan Per Constraint |
| DSCR | 1.25 | $\$$ | $25,500,000$ |
| LTV | $75 \%$ | $\$$ | $26,060,000$ |
| LTC | $75 \%$ | $\$$ | $31,220,000$ |

In order to achieve a debt service coverage of 1.25x, the resulting loan has a $61 \%$ loan-to-cost ratio and a $73 \%$ loan-to-value ratio.

Table 35
Construction Loan Source and Uses

| Sources |  |  | Uses |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loan | \$ | 25,500,000 | Land | \$ | 18,270,000 |
| Equity | \$ | 16,121,093 | Construction Costs | \$ | 21,920,000 |
| Total | \$ | 41,621,093 | Financing | \$ | 1,431,093 |
|  |  |  | Total | \$ | 41,621,093 |

The revised budget below includes interest reserve, for a total project cost of approximately $\$ 41,600,000$.

Table 36
Office Project Revised Budget

| Office Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Value | \$ | 18,270,000 |
| Office Building |  |  |
| Hard costs | \$ | 11,902,000 |
| Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 2,975,500 |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 1,041,500 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 15,919,000 |
| Parking garage |  |  |
| Hard costs | \$ | 4,445,000 |
| Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 1,111,500 |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 444,500 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 6,001,000 |
| Total Construction Budget | \$ | 40,190,000 |
| Financing costs |  |  |
| Interest reserve | \$ | 1,431,093 |
| Total Project Budget | \$ | 41,621,093 |

A similar debt service coverage and loan-to-value analysis is performed to determine the permanent loan for which the property is eligible. Because the property is complete, there is no loan-to-cost constraint. In this case, the permanent loan amount is the same as the construction loan.

Table 37
Permanent Loan

| Final Loan Amount |  | \$ | 25,500,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant |  |  | 8\% |
| Debt Service |  | \$ | 2,040,000 |
| Constraint | Criteria |  | Constraint |
| DSCR | 1.25 | \$ | 25,500,000 |
| LTV | 75\% | \$ | 26,060,000 |

Because there is no change in loan amount, the developer cannot withdraw equity from the transaction upon refinancing.

Table 38
Permanent Loan Sources and Uses

| Sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loan | $\$$ | $25,500,000$ | $\frac{\text { Uses }}{\text { Refi Construction Loan }}$ | $\$$ | $25,500,000$ |
| Equity | $\$$ | - | Total | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Total | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |  |  |

OFFICE AND RETAIL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201
Below is the pro forma operating statement for the office property after delivery with the debt service coverage ratio of the
permanent loan.
Office Pro Forma with Debt Service

| Operating Year |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 |  | 7 |  | 8 |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potential Gross Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Rental Revenue | \$ | 4,891,955 | \$ | 5,038,711 | \$ | 5,189,880 | \$ | 5,345,571 | \$ | 5,505,941 | \$ | 5,671,120 | \$ | 5,818,000 | \$ | 5,992,540 | \$ | 6,172,313 | \$ | 6,357,483 | \$ | 6,548,214 | \$ | 6,717,697 |
| Absorption \& Turnover Vacancy | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | (775,064) | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | (898,493) | \$ |  |
| Scheduled Base Rental Revenue | \$ | 4,891,955 | \$ | 5,038,711 | \$ | 5,189,880 | \$ | 5,345,571 | \$ | 5,505,941 | \$ | 4,896,056 | \$ | 5,818,000 | \$ | 5,992,540 | \$ | 6,172,313 | \$ | 6,357,483 | \$ | 5,649,721 | S | 6,717,697 |
| Expense Reimbursement Revenue | \$ | 929,566 | \$ | 1,012,003 | \$ | 1,096,909 | \$ | 1,184,364 | \$ | 1,274,441 | \$ | 1,046,766 | \$ | 1,317,985 | \$ | 1,416,410 | \$ | 1,517,791 | \$ | 1,622,215 | \$ | 1,213,495 | \$ | 1,527,907 |
| Total Potential Gross Revenue | \$ | 5,821,521 | \$ | 6,050,714 | \$ | 6,286,789 | \$ | 6,529,935 | \$ | 6,780,382 | \$ | 5,942,822 | \$ | 7,135,985 | \$ | 7,408,950 | \$ | 7,690,104 | \$ | 7,979,698 | \$ | 6,863,216 | \$ | 8,245,604 |
| General Vacancy | \$ | $(523,937)$ | \$ | $(544,564)$ | \$ | (565,811) | \$ | $(587,694)$ | \$ | $(610,234)$ |  |  | \$ | $(642,239)$ | \$ | $(666,806)$ | \$ | $(692,109)$ | \$ | $(718,173)$ |  |  | \$ | $(742,104)$ |
| Effective Gross Revenue | \$ | 5,297,584 | \$ | 5,506,150 | \$ | 5,720,978 | \$ | 5,942,241 | \$ | 6,170,148 | \$ | 5,942,822 | \$ | 6,493,746 | \$ | 6,742,144 | \$ | 6,997,995 | \$ | 7,261,525 | \$ | 6,863,216 | \$ | 7,503,500 |
| Operating Expenses | \$ | 2,747,324 | \$ | 2,829,744 | \$ | 2,914,636 | \$ | 3,002,075 | \$ | 3,092,137 | \$ | 3,184,901 | \$ | 3,280,448 | \$ | 3,378,862 | \$ | 3,480,228 | \$ | 3,584,634 | \$ | 3,692,173 | \$ | 3,802,939 |
| Net Operating Income | \$ | 2,550,260 | \$ | 2,676,406 | \$ | 2,806,342 | \$ | 2,940,166 | \$ | 3,078,011 | \$ | 2,757,921 | \$ | 3,213,298 | \$ | 3,363,282 | \$ | 3,517,767 | \$ | 3,676,891 | \$ | 3,171,043 | \$ | 3,700,561 |
| Leasing \& Capital Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,515,336 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,756,651 | \$ | - |
| Leasing Commissions |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,241,584 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,439,307 | S | - |
| Reserves | \$ | 11,741 | \$ | 12,093 | \$ | 12,456 | \$ | 12,829 | \$ | 13,214 | \$ | 13,611 | \$ | 14,019 | \$ | 14,440 | \$ | 14,873 | \$ | 15,319 | \$ | 15,779 | \$ | 16,252 |
| Total Leasing \& Capital Costs | \$ | 11,741 | \$ | 12,093 | \$ | 12,456 | \$ | 12,829 | \$ | 13,214 | S | 2,770,531 | \$ | 14,019 | \$ | 14,440 | \$ | 14,873 | \$ | 15,319 | \$ | 3,211,737 | \$ | 3,211,737 |
| Cash Flow Before Debt Service | \$ | 2,538,519 | \$ | 2,664,313 | \$ | 2,793,886 | \$ | 2,927,337 | \$ | 3,064,797 | \$ | $(12,610)$ | \$ | 3,199,279 | \$ | 3,348,842 | \$ | 3,502,894 | \$ | 3,661,572 | \$ | $(40,694)$ |  | \$3,684,309 |
| Debt Service | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 | \$ | 2,040,000 |
| Cash Flow After Debt Service | \$ | 498,519 | \$ | 624,313 | \$ | 753,886 | \$ | 887,337 | \$ | 1,024,797 | \$ | $(2,052,610)$ | \$ | 1,159,279 | \$ | 1,308,842 | \$ | 1,462,894 | \$ | 1,621,572 | \$ | $(2,080,694)$ | \$ | 1,644,309 |
| DSCR NOI |  | 1.25 |  | 1.31 |  | 1.38 |  | 1.44 |  | 1.51 |  | 1.35 |  | 1.58 |  | 1.65 |  | 1.72 |  | 1.80 |  | 1.55 |  | 1.81 |
| DSCR NCF |  | 1.24 |  | 1.31 |  | 1.37 |  | 1.43 |  | 1.50 |  | (0.01) |  | 1.57 |  | 1.64 |  | 1.72 |  | 1.79 |  | (0.02) |  | 1.81 |

## Retail.

As with the office project, the loan for the retail project will be underwritten to a $75 \%$ loan-to-cost ratio, a $75 \%$ loan-to-value ratio, and 1.25 times debt service coverage on stabilized net operating income assuming an $8 \%$ constant. Likewise, the construction loan must include an interest reserve until tenants are in occupancy and paying. The loan amount is constrained by the debt service coverage ratio, resulting in a construction loan of $\$ 21,920,000$. The revised budget, loan amount, and interest reserve are below. The draw schedule used to calculate interest during the projected 24 months of the construction is in the appendices.

Table 39
Construction Loan

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Final Loan Amount |  | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 9 2 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Constraint | Criteria |  | Loan Per Constraint |
| DSCR | 1.25 | $\$$ | $21,920,000$ |
| LTV | $75 \%$ | $\$$ | $22,570,000$ |
| LTC | $75 \%$ | $\$$ | $23,060,000$ |

In order to achieve a $1.25 x$ debt service coverage ratio, the resulting loan-to-cost ratio is $71 \%$ and the resulting loan-to-value ratio is $73 \%$.

Table 40
Construction Loan Sources and Uses

| Sources |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loan | $\$ 21,920,000$ | Uses | Land |
| Equity | $\$ 8,822,366$ | Construction Costs | $\$ 18,270,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 30,742,366$ | Financing | $\$ 1,594,000$ |
|  |  | Total | $\$ \mathbf{3 0 , 7 4 2 , 3 6 6}$ |

The revised budget, which includes the interest reserve, indicates a total project cost of approximately $\$ 30,700,000$.

Table 41
Retail Project Revised Budget

| Retail Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Value | \$ | 18,270,000 |
| Retail Building |  |  |
| Hard costs | \$ | 3,960,000 |
| Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 990,000 |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 396,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 5,346,000 |
| Parking garage |  |  |
| Hard costs | \$ | 4,097,500 |
| Contractor's Overhead and Profit | \$ | 1,024,500 |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 410,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 5,532,000 |
| Total Construction Budget | \$ | 29,148,000 |
| Financing costs |  |  |
| Interest reserve | \$ | 1,594,366 |
| Total Project Budget | \$ | 30,742,366 |

A debt service coverage and loan-to-value analysis is performed to determine the permanent loan for which the property is eligible. Because the property is complete, there is no loan-to-cost constraint. As with the office property, the permanent loan amount for the retail property is the same as the construction loan.

Table 42
Permanent Loan

| Final Loan Amount |  | \$ | 21,920,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant |  |  | 8\% |
| Debt Service |  | \$ | 1,753,600 |
| Constraint | Criteria |  | er Constraint |
| DSCR | 1.25 | \$ | 21,920,000 |
| LTV | 75\% | \$ | 22,570,000 |

Likewise, the developer cannot withdraw any equity from the refinancing.

Table 43
Permanent Loan Sources and Uses

| $\frac{\text { Sources }}{}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loan | $\$$ | $21,920,000$ | Uses <br> Retal <br> Rofi Construction Loan <br> Total | $\$ 21,920,000$ <br> $\$ 21,920,000$ |
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Below is the pro forma operating statement for the retail property after delivery with the debt service coverage ratio of the
permanent loan.
Table 44
Retail Pro Forma with Debt Service

| Operating Year | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 | 5 |  | 6 |  | 7 |  | 8 |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potential Gross Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Rental Revenue | \$ | 2,360,540 | \$ | 2,431,358 | \$ | 2,504,294 | \$ | 2,579,427 | \$ | 2,656,810 | s | 2,736,512 | \$ | 2,813,041 | \$ | 2,897,434 | \$ | 2,980,051 | \$ | 3,069,451 | \$ | 3,161,533 | \$ | 3,245,226 |
| Absorption \& Turnover Vacancy | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | (185,586) | \$ |  | \$ | (143,486) | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | (371,938) | \$ |  |
| Scheduled Base Rental Revenue | \$ | 2,431,358 | \$ | 2,504,294 | \$ | 2,579,427 | \$ | 2,656,810 | \$ | 2,550,926 | S | 2,813,041 | \$ | 2,753,948 | \$ | 2,980,051 | S | 3,069,451 | \$ | 2,789,595 | \$ | 3,245,226 | \$ | 3,389,154 |
| Expense Reimbursement Revenue | \$ | 1,011,825 | \$ | 1,042,181 | \$ | 1,073,444 | \$ | 1,105,648 | \$ | 1,138,820 | , | 1,094,025 | \$ | 1,208,170 | \$ | 1,183,369 | \$ | 1,281,749 | \$ | 1,320,202 | \$ | 1,201,564 | \$ | 1,400,604 |
| Total Potential Gross Revenue | \$ | 3,372,365 | \$ | 3,473,539 | \$ | 3,577,738 | \$ | 3,685,075 | \$ | 3,795,630 | \$ | 3,644,951 | \$ | 4,021,211 | \$ | 3,937,317 | \$ | 4,261,800 | \$ | 4,389,653 | \$ | 3,991,159 | \$ | 4,645,830 |
| General Vacancy | \$ | $(168,618)$ | \$ | $(173,677)$ | \$ | $(178,887)$ | \$ | $(184,254)$ | \$ | $(189,782)$ | \$ | $(5,941)$ | \$ | $(201,061)$ | \$ | $(60,554)$ | \$ | $(213,090)$ | \$ | $(219,483)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(232,292)$ |
| Effective Gross Revenue | \$ | 3,203,747 | \$ | 3,299,862 | \$ | 3,398,851 | \$ | 3,500,821 | \$ | 3,605,848 | \$ | 3,639,010 | \$ | 3,820,150 | \$ | 3,876,763 | \$ | 4,048,710 | \$ | 4,170,170 | \$ | 3,991,159 | \$ | 4,413,538 |
| Operating Expenses | \$ | 1,011,660 | \$ | 1,042,010 | \$ | 1,073,270 | \$ | 1,105,468 | \$ | 1,138,632 | \$ | 1,172,791 | \$ | 1,207,975 | \$ | 1,244,214 | \$ | 1,281,541 | \$ | 1,319,987 | \$ | 1,359,586 | \$ | 1,400,374 |
| Net Operating Income | \$ | 2,192,087 | \$ | 2,257,852 | \$ | 2,325,581 | \$ | 2,395,353 | \$ | 2,467,216 | \$ | 2,466,219 | \$ | 2,612,175 | \$ | 2,632,549 | \$ | 2,767,169 | \$ | 2,850,183 | \$ | 2,631,573 | \$ | 3,013,164 |
| Leasing \& Capital Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 187,710 | \$ | - | \$ | 145,126 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 376,190 | \$ | - |
| Leasing Commissions | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 230,562 | \$ | - | s | 178,258 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 462,074 | \$ | - |
| Reserves | \$ | 6,744 | \$ | 6,947 | \$ | 7,155 | \$ | 7,370 | S | 7,591 | \$ | 7,819 | \$ | 8,053 | S | 8,295 | \$ | 8,544 | \$ | 8,800 | \$ | 9,064 | \$ | 9,336 |
| Total Leasing \& Capital Costs | \$ | 6,744 | \$ | 6,947 | \$ | 7,155 | \$ | 7,370 | \$ | 7,591 | \$ | 426,091 | \$ | 8,053 | \$ | 331,679 | \$ | 8,544 | \$ | 8,800 | \$ | 847,328 | \$ | 9,336 |
| Cash Flow Before Debt Service \& Taxes | \$ | 2,185,343 | \$ | 2,250,905 | \$ | 2,318,426 | \$ | 2,387,983 | \$ | 2,459,625 | \$ | 2,040,128 | \$ | 2,604,122 | \$ | 2,300,870 | \$ | 2,758,625 | \$ | 2,841,383 | \$ | 1,784,245 | \$ | 3,003,828 |
| Debt Service | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 | \$ | 1,753,600 |
| Cash Flow After Debt Service | \$ | 431,743 | \$ | 497,305 | \$ | 564,826 | \$ | 634,383 | \$ | 706,025 | \$ | 286,528 | \$ | 850,522 | \$ | 547,270 | \$ | 1,005,025 | \$ | 1,087,783 | \$ | 30,645 | \$ | 1,250,228 |
| DSCR NOI |  | 1.25 |  | 1.29 |  | 1.33 |  | 1.37 |  | 1.41 |  | 1.41 |  | 1.49 |  | 1.50 |  | 1.58 |  | 1.63 |  | 1.50 |  | 1.72 |
| DSCR NCF |  | 1.25 |  | 1.28 |  | 1.32 |  | 1.36 |  | 1.40 |  | 1.16 |  | 1.49 |  | 1.31 |  | 1.57 |  | 1.62 |  | 1.02 |  | 1.71 |
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## Project evaluation

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Below are the leverage and unleveraged IRRs for the office project. Although it is typical for the leveraged IRR to be higher } \\
& \text { than the unleveraged IRR, due to a high expenditure in leasing costs near the end of the investment horizon, the leveraged IRR is } \\
& \text { lower ( } 4.2 \% \text { compared to } 5.5 \% \text { ). Both metrics are insufficient to meet typical developer goals of } 10 \% \text { unleveraged and } 20 \% \\
& \text { leveraged (Sislen, November 8, 2011). }
\end{aligned}
$$

Office

| Levered IRR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Year |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 |  | 7 |  | 8 |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |
| Costs | \$ | $(16,121,093)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Flow |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 498,519 | \$ | 624,313 | \$ | 753,886 | \$ | 887,337 | \$ | 1,024,797 | \$ | $(2,052,610)$ | \$ | 1,159,279 | \$ | 1,308,842 | \$ | 1,462,894 | \$ | 1,621,572 | \$ | $(2,080,694)$ | \$ | 1,644,309 |
| Equity Return (Payout) |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
| Reversion |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 20,757,013 |  |  |
| Total Inflows (Outflows) | \$ | $(16,121,093)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 498,519 | \$ | 624,313 | \$ | 753,886 | \$ | 887,337 | \$ | 1,024,797 | \$ | $(2,052,610)$ | \$ | 1,159,279 | \$ | 1,308,842 | \$ | 1,462,894 | \$ | 1,621,572 | \$ | 18,676,319 |  |  |
| IRR |  | 4.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


Based on the above valuation, the office project is not feasible.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Below are the leverage and unleveraged IRRs for the retail project. Here, the leveraged IRR is higher than the unleveraged. } \\
& \text { However, both are still insufficient, failing to meet the guidelines of } 10 \% \text { unleveraged and } 20 \% \text { leveraged (Sislen, November 8, }
\end{aligned}
$$



Based on the above valuation, the retail project is not feasible either.

## Conclusion

Due insufficient return expectations, neither the office nor the retail projects are feasible. Higher IRRs and yields may be achievable if land prices decrease, resulting in a lower total cost. Additionally, a developer could perhaps seek additional development capacity with Arlington County at the approval stage, thereby increasing cash flows from the property.

## Appendix A: Office Pro Forma
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Annually (Endpoint on Cash Flow \& Resale)
$9.00 \%$
$\$ 34,749,858$ at $9.00 \%$
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|  | Presertasion Rent Roll 8 Current Term Tenant Bummsy Ac of Apr-2012 for 117,A07 Bquare Feet (contnued from previous page) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tenant Name Type a Sute Number Lease Dates 8 Tem | $\begin{gathered} \text { Floor } \\ \text { saft } \\ \text { Bigg shyre } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rate } 8 \text { Amourt } \\ & \text { per Yesr } \\ & \text { per Morth } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Changer on | Changes to | CPI a Current Porters' Wage Macelyneous | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mortra } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Abste } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Part } \\ \text { to } \\ \text { Abate } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Dearration of Operating Experos Reimbursements | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Imonmitt } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \text { Amount. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Commeara } \\ \text { Ryate } \\ \text { Amout! } \end{gathered}$ | Assumption about subsequent serme for wis tensit |
| B11 Offce-3dF. - Te Office, sute: Mb1 Aor-2012 to Mar-2017 60 Montha | $\begin{array}{r} 4,892 \\ 4.17 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25.00 \\ 5220.140 \\ \$ 3.75 \\ \$ 18,345 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Apr-2013 } \\ & \text { Apr-2014 } \\ & \text { Apr-2015 } \\ & \text { Acr-2016 } \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 46.35$ <br> $\$ 47.74$ <br> $\$ 49.17$ <br> $\$ 50.65$ | - | - |  | Cross: Payst the incresses over a base yey ending Dec-2012: \$23.23. | - | - | Makset See assurpotor Office |
| B1: Offce-3rd F. - Te Office, sute: Mb 1 Acr-2012 10 Mar-2017 60 Montha | $\begin{array}{r} 4,992 \\ 4.17 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25,00 \\ \$ 220,140 \\ \$ 3.75 \\ \$ 18,345 \end{array}$ | Apr-2013 <br> Apr-2014 <br> Apr-2015 <br> Apr-2016 | $\$ 46.35$ <br> $\$ 47.74$ <br> $\$ 49.17$ <br> $\$ 50.65$ | - | - | - | Groas: Pays the increseses over a base yer ending Dec-2012: $\$ 23.23$ | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mrket } \\ & \text { See assurgotor: } \\ & \text { Offce } \end{aligned}$ |
| B12 Offce-3rd F. - Te Offce, sute: Mo 1 Agr-2012 to Mar-2017 60 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 4,992 \\ 4.17 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 245.00 \\ \$ 220,140 \\ \$ 3.75 \\ \$ 18,345 \end{array}$ | Apr-2013 <br> Apr-2014 <br> Apr-2015 <br> Apr-2016 | $\$ 46.35$ <br> 847.74 <br> $\$ 49.17$ <br> $\$ 50.65$ | - | - | - | Groas: Paya the incresoss over a base yer ending Dec-2012: $\$ 23.23$ | - | - | Maket See assurptor Office |
| B14 Office-3rdF. - Te Cffice, Sule: Mo 1 Agr-2012 to Mar-2017 60 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 4,992 \\ 4.17 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 45.00 \\ \$ 220,140 \\ \$ 3.75 \\ \$ 18,345 \end{array}$ | Apr-2013 Apr-2014 Apr-2015 Apr-2016 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 46.35 \\ & \$ 47.74 \\ & \$ 49.17 \\ & \$ 30.65 \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | Groas: Payat the incresoses over a base yey ending Dec-2012: \$23.23. | - | - | Market See assurpors Office |
| Tobal Occupied Saft Total Avalisble SqP! | $\begin{array}{r} 117,407 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| ARGUS | OWIce w 1at FL. Retall - 3pec Wison a Clarendon Blvds. <br> VA 22201 <br> N. Danvile \& N. Cleveland Sts <br> Bupporting Schedule - Occupancy \& Absorption Ras ccupancy Based on Absorption 8 Tumover Vacanc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| For the Years Ending | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 1 \\ \text { Mar-2013 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 2 \\ \text { Mar-2014 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } \\ \text { Mar } 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 4 \\ M a r-2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 5 \\ \text { Mar-2017 } \end{array}$ | $\text { Year } 6$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 7 \\ \text { Mar-2019 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 8 \\ M \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 9 \\ \text { Mar-2021 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 10 } \\ \text { Mar-2022 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 11 } \\ \text { Mar-2023 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 12 \\ \mathrm{Mar}-2024 \end{array}$ |  |
| saftoccupled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Msy | ${ }_{117,407}^{17,407}$ | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 39,135 | 117,407 | 117,007 | 117,407 | 117,407 | ${ }_{78,272}$ | 117,407 |  |
| Jure | 117.407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117.407 | 78,271 | 117.407 | 117,407 | 117.407 | 117,407 | 39,136 | 117,477 |  |
| Juy | 117407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117707 | 117,407 | 78,271 | 117,407 |  |
|  | 1177407 117407 | 117,07 117,07 | 117407 117407 | 117,407 117,407 | 1177407 117407 | 117,407 117,007 | 117407 117407 | 117,407 117407 | 117407 117407 | 117,407 117,407 | 117407 | -117,407 |  |
| October | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 |  |
| November | 117.407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 |  |
| December | 117407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117407 | 117,407 | 117.407 | 117,407 |  |
| January | 117407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117407 | 117,407 | 117.407 | 117,407 |  |
| February March | 1174.407 117407 | 117,407 117,07 | 117,407 117407 | 117,407 117407 | 117407 117407 | 117,407 117,07 | 117,407 | 117,407 117,07 | 1174.407 <br> 117407 <br> 18 | 117,407 | 117407 | 117,407 |  |
| Average occupled For The Year | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 101,100 | 117,407 | 117,407 | 117.407 | 117.407 | 101.10 | 117.407 |  |
| Net Absorption Annual Bquare Feet Absorbed Average Monthly Absorption |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| For the Years Ending | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 1 \\ \text { Mar } 2013 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 2 \\ M a r-2014 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 3 \\ \text { Mar } 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 4 \\ \text { Mar-2016 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 5 \\ \text { Mar-2017 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 6 \\ \text { Mar-2018 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\text { Year } 7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 8 \\ \text { Mar } 2020 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 9 \\ \text { Mar-2021 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year 10 } \\ \text { Mar-2022 } \end{array}$ | Year 11 Mar-2023 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 12 \\ & \text { Mar-2024 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Percentage occupancy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 100.00\% | 10000\% | 100.00\% | 10000\% | 100.00\% | 33,33\% | ${ }^{100.00 \%}$ | 10000\% | 100.00\% | 10000\% | ${ }^{66.57 \%}$ | 100.00\% |  |
| May | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 33.33\% | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 66.67\% | 100.00\% |  |
| June | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 66.67\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 33.33\% | 100.00\% |  |
| Juy | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 66.67\% | 100.00\% |  |
| August | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| September | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| October | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| November December | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | ${ }^{1000.00 \%}$ | 10000\% | 100.00\% | 10000\% | ${ }^{100.00 \%}$ | 10000\% | 100.00\% | $10000 \%$ | 100.00\% | 10000\% |  |
| December | ${ }^{1000.0 \% \%}$ | $10000 \%$ $10000 \%$ | 100.00\% 100.00\% | 100.00\% | - ${ }^{1000.00 \%}$ | $10000 \%$ $10000 \%$ | $1000.00 \%$ $100.00 \%$ | (10000\% | - ${ }^{1000.00 \%}$ | $10000 \%$ $10000 \%$ | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| February | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 10000\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 10000\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| March | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| Aversge Occupancy for The Year | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 86.11\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 86.11\% | 100.00\% |  |
| Net Absomption <br> Annual Percentage Absorted <br> Average Monthly Percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |
| :---: |


| $A^{\text {ARGUS }}$ | Office w 1st Fl. Retall - 3pec <br> N. Danvile a N. Cleveland Ots VA 22201 |  |  |  | Software : ARGU3 Ver. 15.0 .0 .54 Fle : office - spec Property Type : Office B. Retal Fortfollo: Date : $2 / 14 / 12$ Time : 14:29 Reft: AHS Page:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dote Amount Unts | Doter | Amount Unts | -ove | Amoust Unts |  |
| ${ }_{13}^{13}$ | ${ }_{13}^{13}$ |  | ${ }_{13}{ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| Omice-brat fl- Tensont 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dote Amount Unts | Oote | Amount Unts | Dove | Amourt Unts |  |
|  | 1 | $4 \xi$ §BqFeYr 2 \% Inc, Annual | ${ }_{13}^{13}$ | 45 yoprert |  |
| Detal Base Rent mice - 3rd F - Tenant | Detal Base RentOffce - 3rd FL - Tenant 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Dote Amount Unlts | -oon | Amouns Unts |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{13}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Waset Lesang essumpotions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leasing Assumptons Category: Retal |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | New usmet | Renemal mat | Unise meas |  |  |
|  | Retar | Reneasal |  |  |  |
| Moensi vocant | monera | 0 |  |  |  |
| Leasin coumesions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | None ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | None | men |  |  |
| Non-Welghted Item: Rent Changes Reimbursement Term Lengths | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { Net } \\ \text { Not } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | reas |  |  |  |
| Rent Changes: Retal, current term <br> Changing Base: $3 \%$ annually |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amours: | (coranues on netresoe) |  |  |  |  |
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## Appendix B: Retail Pro Forma
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| $\begin{aligned} & 8_{8} \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  <br>  |  | gmgom 5n <br>  |  |  |  <br>  |  | g ${ }^{2}$ mg <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $8_{8}^{8}$ |  <br>  |  <br>  | 点点名名 |  |  <br> 多多名 |  <br> 多多家 | ํํำ！ दे2 | $\cdots \stackrel{u}{\square} \frac{\omega}{\square}$ <br> \％25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Tensnt Name Type \＆sute Number Lease Dates 3 Term |
| :---: |
| 81 Retal－Jurior Ancto Real，Bute：Mo 1 Acr－2012 to Mar－2022 120 monera |
| 8：Real－Mc－size 1 Acr－2012 to Mar－2019 s4 Monthe |
| 8：Retal－Morsize 2 Retal，sute：Mo ACP－2012 to Mar－2019 94 Montha |
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(




| ear 2 |
| :--- |
| -2014 |

                            Year
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|  |  65665656656\％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 专 } \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 类  <br> 吕  <br>   |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 守每号会会会会 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 合 } \\ & \text { 离 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  <br>  <br>  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 물 } \\ & \text { 号 } \\ & \succ \frac{1}{2} \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 娄 } \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  8889888988888 음음믐음으믐뭄무믐믐 |  |
|  |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{7} \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  믐믐믐믐ㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁ <br>  |  |
|  |  <br>  |  |  |  <br>  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 营 } \\ & \text { 品 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  믐믐믐믐믐ㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁ 우우우우우우우우우우웅 | 总 号 |
|  |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 号 } \\ & \text { ल } \\ & \text { í } \end{aligned}$ |  | 可－8888888888 <br>  |  |
|  |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 券 } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  믐믐믐ㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁ <br>  |  |
|  | 寺导寺寺导导导导寺导 <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 专 } \\ & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  888989898989 유믐뭄믐무믐믐무믐믐 |  |
|  |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{7} \\ & 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  음ㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁ <br>  | 哭 |
|  |  を地 <br>  | 专 <br> 5 <br> 5 <br>  |  |  |  |
|  |  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 券 } \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -\frac{m}{5} \\ & \stackrel{y}{5} \stackrel{9}{2} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  믐믐ㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁㅁ 우우우웅우우우우우우우 | 哭 |
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grozuen izoznew ozozuen

| $\text { \# of Months } \begin{array}{rr} \text { Mar-2013 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Mar}-2014 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2015 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2016 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2017 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar } 2018 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2019 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2020 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2021 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2022 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2023 } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2024 } \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{Mar}-2025 \\ 6 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tenart improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvementa Category TI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payment Made: First Month Unit of Measure: $\$ / 0 \mathrm{gFt}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Mar-2013 <br> Renewal 15 <br> Inflition 2 <br>   | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2014 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2015 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2016 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2017 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar- } 2018 \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2019 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2020 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} M a r-2021 \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar- } 2022 \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2023 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar- } 2024 \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2025 } \\ 15 \\ 2 \end{array}$ |
| Lesaing Commisaions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lessing Commissiona Category: LC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payment Made: Firat Month Unit of Mesaure: Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lr}  & \text { Mar-2013 } \\ \text { New } & 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Mar}-2014 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} M a r-2015 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2016 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\operatorname{Mar} 2017$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2018 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Mar}-2019 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar-2020 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar- } 2021 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mar- } 2022 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c}  \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\text { Mar } 2024$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \mathrm{Mar}-2025 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Renewal inflition | ${ }^{3}$ | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | , | , | ${ }^{3}$ |
| Caiculation Includes: <br> Base Rent: Free Rent Step Rent: Reimbursementa: Retal Saiea: CPIRent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Appendix C: Draw Schedules and Interest Reserve

Office


## Retail

| Interest Rate <br> Loan Amount <br> Equity <br> Total | 5.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | 21,920,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | 8,822,366 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | 30,742,366 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Month |  | y Funding <br> . Land) |  | nd Loan unding |  | struction Draw |  | Total sbursed |  | standing Balance |  | terest |
| 1 | \$ | 8,822,366 | \$ | 9,447,634 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 9,967,316 | \$ | 9,967,316 | \$ | 41,530 |
| 2 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 10,486,998 | \$ | 43,696 |
| 3 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 11,006,680 | \$ | 45,861 |
| 4 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 11,526,362 | \$ | 48,027 |
| 5 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 12,046,044 | \$ | 50,192 |
| 6 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 12,565,726 | \$ | 52,357 |
| 7 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 13,085,408 | \$ | 54,523 |
| 8 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 13,605,089 | \$ | 56,688 |
| 9 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 14,124,771 | \$ | 58,853 |
| 10 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 14,644,453 | \$ | 61,019 |
| 11 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 15,164,135 | \$ | 63,184 |
| 12 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 15,683,817 | \$ | 65,349 |
| 13 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 16,203,499 | \$ | 67,515 |
| 14 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 16,723,181 | \$ | 69,680 |
| 15 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 17,242,863 | \$ | 71,845 |
| 16 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 17,762,545 | \$ | 74,011 |
| 17 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 18,282,227 | \$ | 76,176 |
| 18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 18,801,909 | \$ | 78,341 |
| 19 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 19,321,590 | \$ | 80,507 |
| 20 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 19,841,272 | \$ | 82,672 |
| 21 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 20,360,954 | \$ | 84,837 |
| 22 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 20,880,636 | \$ | 87,003 |
| 23 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 21,400,318 | \$ | 89,168 |
| 24 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 519,682 | \$ | 21,920,000 | \$ | 91,333 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \$ | 1,594,366 |
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