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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

7550 Wisconsin Avenue in Bethesda Maryland is home to a vacant 10 story GSA office building that is no longer in use and is currently mothballed. This proposal examines several possible uses for the existing site including office, multifamily, and hospitality. It has been determined that the highest and best use for the property is the conversion of its current use of office into a full - service boutique hotel, more specifically the Hotel Indigo brand from Intercontinental Hotel Group (IHG). This analysis provides a detailed description of how the end user was determined.

The site analysis examines the current zoning, demographics, FAR, and the existing structures surrounding the property.

A market report and feasibility analysis will be performed on each of the three above mentioned potential uses. Upon completion of this analysis it has been determined that the highest and best use for this building is a boutique hotel. It is important to note that a full market study is not included in this development proposal but will be completed during the first month of the development schedule. This information helps support the final conclusion for the highest and best use of this site.

Due to the nature of urban redevelopment it is also important to address the new building design and construction approach. A brief description of the exterior building façade, interior amenities, and necessary parking changes are included to help support the decision to renovate 7550 Wisconsin. Current land use and proposed uses for the site are addressed along with a preliminary design of the building.

A financial analysis will be reviewed with the necessary spreadsheets listed as appendixes. The financial analysis will include the discounted cash flow, pro forma assumptions, direct capitalization method, and the conclusion of the value.

Following the financial analysis is the strategy and implications section. In this section of the document the strategy, borrowing entity, capital sources, management fee structure, and marketing strategy are covered. This information is a helps support the information provided in the financial analysis appendixes

## SITE ANALYSIS

The property is located in downtown Bethesda, Maryland one block north of the Bethesda Metro station and numerous area amenities. It is situated on the corner of Wisconsin Avenue, and Commerce Lane. The site is a total of 13,860 SF or 0.318 acres. ${ }^{i}$ It has an excellent presence on that block with great visibility from Wisconsin Avenue to the east, Old Georgetown Road to the south west, and the Bethesda Metro Escalators just one block south. "Montgomery County's dynamic and business-friendly environment, coupled with the property's premier location give this offering additional upside potential for redevelopment. ${ }^{\text {ii }}$

The site is currently controlled by a single owner the General Services Administration or GSA. GSA is disposing of the property via its online auction website www.auctionrp.com. The asset has officially been declared surplus and has cleared all federal regulatory hurdles to allow a fee-simple disposal to the private sector.

The parcel is zoned CBD-2. All three suggested uses are consistent with the Bethesda Master Plan and zoning regulations. However, the density required to construct a 130,000 square foot building exceeds the density for a standard development method permitted pursuant to the CBD- 2 zoning district allowing for a maximum FAR of 5.0 and a total height of $143^{\prime}$.

The good news is that currently the site has an existing FAR of 9.17 far exceeding the current zoning allowance. With a FAR at 9.17 the site lends itself to multiple uses allowing it to maximize the buildings
square footage. Currently the building is $105^{\prime}$ tall allowing for additional height to be retrofitted to the existing structure.

7550 Wisconsin Avenue


## Zoning Maps Downtown Bethesda


iii

Montgomery County Parks and Planning

## MARKET REPORT AND FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

## Investment Approach

There are three primary uses of the proposed site: multifamily, office, and hotel/lodging. The zoning at 7550 Wisconsin is CBD-2 which allows mixed use/ retail space along the first floor. The multifamily and office use will have a retail component on the ground floor. Hotel will not have retail space on the first floor. Due to limited space, the first floor of the hotel will be used for conference areas and a restaurant. Meeting space and food and beverage are extremely important for a full-service hotel. The restaurant revenue and expenses will be included in its revenues and expenses under food and beverage (APPENDIX II DISCOUNTED CASH FLOW ANALYSIS).

The purpose of this study is to determine which of the three uses would be the most profitable. It is assumed that the General Services Administration (GSA) is seeking to maximize its profit through the selling of 7550 Wisconsin. Although some uses may demand a higher premium for the site the risks associated with the market conditions and vacancy may restrict the purchase of the project. Another important assumption is that the future owner of this asset will be seeking a long-term hold for this investment.

Parking will play an important part of the decision process for when redeveloping 7550 Wisconsin.

Currently there are 55 spaces existing on two levels of "below grade" parking. It is assumed that the future owner will not be expanding any parking on site. The cost of excavation and the reengineering of the building would not allow for an expansion to the existing parking garage.

Commercial Real Estate Analysis and Investments by Geltner and Miller second addition ${ }^{\text {iv }}$ provide methodologies were used in determining the highest and best use for the site. The methodologies will be used to evaluate each proposed use. These approaches are considered by those in the industry as a "back of the envelope" approach. The following is a list of information that must be determined.

- Gross Square Footage
- Rentable Square Footage
- Number of parking spaces required
- Development Cost per Square Foot
- Projected Capitalization Costs
- Projected Operating Expense Ratio
- Projected Stabilized Occupancy Percentage

The acquisition costs of the site can be determined Based on the above assumptions. "It is assumed that the developer will "borrow to the hilt," that is he will take out the maximum permanent loan the completed project will support."vThe total cost will include a full renovation for that particular use. It is important to note that certain assumptions are based off of available market data. The total acquisition price of the current building is unknown and will be determined through the following analysis. Listed below are the steps used to arrive at a conclusion.

The first step is to take the leasable square footage in the building and multiply it by the expected average rent per square foot (hotels are different they are based on a per room/key evaluation). This will equal your potential gross income (PGI). Then subtract the vacancy allowance from the PGI to get the effective gross income (EGI). Subtracting the EGI from the operating expenses produces the net operating income (NOI). Taking that NOI and dividing it by a supportable market cap rate equals the market value of the property. Subtracting the supportable market value of the property from the total development costs derives the supportable acquisition cost of the site.

There are two perspectives to consider when analyzing the highest and best use for the site. First, the GSA is looking to maximize the value of the asset and would consider the highest and best use as the project that can support the highest acquisition price for the property. From an investment standpoint both the internal rate of return (IRR) and the net present value (NPV) of the property are important metrics for a highest and best use assessment. The use with the highest IRR and NPV will be viewed as the most profitable to the investor. Depending on the degree of risk that investor is willing to take affects the type of asset he or she would be willing to invest in.

It is important to note that this analysis is based on the current FAR of 9.17 and a height restriction of 143'. Rentable square footage is determined for each use through the subtraction of commonly shared areas within the building. Vertical penetration (stairs, elevator shafts, mechanical shafts, and trash chutes), lobbies, common areas are all subtracted to determine the rentable square footage of the building. Based on the asset type this number will vary.

## Approach

## TABLE 1.1

Total square footage $X$ Expected Average Rent Per Square foot $=$ Potential Gross Income (PGI)
Potential Gross Income (PGI) - Vacancy Allowance = Effective Gross Income (EGI)
Effective Gross Income (EGI) - Operating Expenses = Net Operating Income (NOI)
Net Operating Income / Market Cap Rate = Project Value

Project Value - Development Costs = Maximum Supportable Site Acquisition Cost

## Office Market and Feasibility Analysis

Due to cost restrictions, the floor to floor height of the building will remain at $10^{\prime}-5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ therefore, the total building height will not change and will remain 10 stories above ground and 2 stories below ground. As mentioned before the building is zoned an FAR of 9.17. There are no plans of expanding the building vertically. Having determined that the building will remain the same height we know that the site and building conform to the already existing land use regulations.

In office buildings, the rentable square footage is determined by adding all of the tenant's usable square footage (USF), hallways, bathrooms, corridors, front lobbies, and other shared areas. Tenants pay rent not only for their specific space but the entire shared space as well on a pro-rata basis. "The usable area or Usable Square Feet (USF) is the floor area where you can actually lay carpet and place furniture within your space; it is also known as the carpetable area. In addition to the usable area, office space is allocated a proportionate share of all the common elements of the building, which must exist for the building to operate. These common areas can include the main lobby, bathrooms, mechanical floors, garage lobbies and sometimes other common areas. Common areas vary widely from building to building. The USF, plus the proportionate share of the common areas make up the RSF."vii

Taking the rentable square footage (RSF) less the vertical penetrations including elevator shafts (three per floor), stairways (two total) and mechanical shafts we have determined the following numbers in

TABLE 1.2.

## TABLE 1.2 GROSS AREAS

| GROSS AREAS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PARKING |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEVEL P-3 | 13,000 Sf |  |  |  |  |
| LEVEL P-2 | $13,000 \mathrm{Sf}$ |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PARKING | $26,000 \mathrm{Sf}$ |  |  |  |  |
| OFFICE |  | CORE \& SHAFT | TENANT | LOBBY | RETAIL |
| CONCOURSE | 9,800 Sf | 2,196 | 7,604 |  |  |
| LEVEL 1 | 11,415 Sf | 2,240 |  | 1,684 | 7,491 |
| LEVEL 2 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 3 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 4 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 5 | $11,415 \mathrm{Sf}$ | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 6 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 7 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 8 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 9 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| LEVEL 10 | 11,415 Sf | 1,515 | 9,900 |  |  |
| PENTHOUSE | 3,000 Sf | 3,000 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL OFFICE | 126,950 Sf | 21,071 | 96,704 | 1,684 | 7,491 |

The total square footage of 7550 Wisconsin is 126,950 . Deducting the vertical penetrations, elevator shafts, and stair ways gives us 105,879 . Then you subtract 7,491 SF of retail space and 1,684 SF for the lobby and you have a total of 96,704 SF occupied by the office tenants.

## TABLE 1.3: SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS FOR CLASS A OFFICE BUILDING BETHESDA/CHEVY CHASE

| OFFICE "BACK DOOR" APPROACH |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| OFFICE RSF | 98,388 |
| BASE RENTS | 38.67 |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | $4,808,843$ |
| VACANCY | $10.00 \%$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | $4,327,958$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $42.24 \%$ |
| NOI | $2,499,707$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $21,706,740$ |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $33,329,422$ |
| CAP RATE | $7.50 \%$ |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $11,622,682$ |

Next step in the analysis is to determine the parking requirements for the site. Currently there are two floors of underground parking totaling 55 spaces. Again as previously mentioned this analysis assumes that expanding the parking underground will be cost prohibited. The site has a close proximity to the metro and bus transportations therefore the site receives an enormous deduction from the 2.84 spaces per 1000 SF required by code required for suburban office buildings. According to Montgomery County Zoning Code (Section 59-E) vs. Industry Standards, buildings within the CBD receive a total of 15-25\% deduction in parking requirements. The 55 spaces that exist within the building are sufficient for the parking requirements. ${ }^{\text {vii }}$

Now that the building square footage and parking have been determined; the analysis will begin to determine the total cost of an office building by taking the total square footage and multiplying that by the average rent per square foot. According to the Co-Star report ${ }^{\text {viii }}$, the average rent for a Class A office building in Bethesda/Chevy Chase is $\$ 38.67$ SF.

Taking the total square footage and multiplying it by an expected rent per square foot of $\$ 38.67$ totals $\$ 4,574,209$ adding this to the 6,700 SF of retail space at $\$ 34.00$ per foot, and additional revenue through parking and reimbursements totals $\$ 4,808,803$ of potential gross income (PGI). Subtracting out the vacancy allowance of $10.00 \%$ equals $\$ 4,327,958$ of effective gross income (EGI). Office expense ratios vary depending on the condition of the property. The operating expense ratio of $42 \%$ is slightly lower than its competitors. However, this is justified in that the building post construction will be LEED certified creating operating expenses significantly lower than its competitors who were built more than a decade ago. Deducting the operating expenses from the EGI equals a net operating income of \$2,499,707.

Taking this NOI and capping with an acceptable market cap rate equals the market value of the building. The cap rate being used is $7.50 \%$. This rate was determined through researching the $20101 q$ Korpacz
report ${ }^{\text {ix }}$. The Korpacz cap rates represent values of completed and stabilized office buildings in downtown Bethesda. This Cap rate was further justified through conversations with Chip Ryan ${ }^{\text {a }}$ a managing director at Northmarq in Bethesda. Taking this finished value and subtracting it from the total development costs equals the value of the total allowable acquisitions cost for the existing building 7550 Wisconsin at \$11,622,682.

Having determined the maximum supportable acquisition cost of a Class A office building in downtown Bethesda. The next step in the analysis is to compare our findings with market data available through several sources. According to CoStars Office Report for Washington, DC, 1Q 2010 the vacancy rates in Bethesda are on the uptick. Currently the overall vacancy is at $13.00 \%$. This includes all classes of Office $A, B$, and $C$. More specifically the vacancy for Class A offices space is $10 \%$. There are no real advantages for 7550 Wisconsin in relation to its competitors. Location and amenities are similar when comparing 7550 Wisconsin to its competitors. Many of the adjacent buildings are experiencing a high vacancy rate. This past quarter we saw a negative absorption rate of $(416,886)$. The negative absorption rate and rising vacancies have driven down the overall rent per square foot from a high of $\$ 37.63$ in the third quarter of 2008 to $\$ 35.07$. Currently there are no new plans for development in the pipeline. Ironically CoStar who has provided much of the market data for office in this analysis is moving out of Bethesda to Washington, DC in the fall of 2010. ${ }^{\text {xi }}$ This will create even higher vacancies in the market in the near future.

TABLE 1.4 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS FOR FULL SERVICE HOTEL

|  | OFFICE ANALYSIS SUMMARY |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| GSF | 126,491 | Going In Cap Rate | $7.50 \%$ |
| RSF | 98,388 | Terminal Cap Rate | $9.50 \%$ |
| PARKING SPACES | 55 | Cost of Sale | $3.00 \%$ |
| AVERAGE RENT | 38.67 | 10 Year Treasury | $3.03 \%$ |
| RETAIL RENT | 34.00 | Risk Premium | $6.47 \%$ |
| RETAIL RENTABLE SQ FT. | 7,491 | Discount Rate | $9.5 \%$ |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | $4,808,843$ | Current Value | $33,329,422$ |
| VACANCY | $10.00 \%$ | Equity Requirement | $11,665,298$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | $4,327,958$ | Loan Amount | $21,664,124$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $42.24 \%$ | LTV | $65.00 \%$ |
| NOI | $2,499,707$ | Annual | $1,601,101$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $21,706,740$ | Monthly Payment | 133,425 |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $33,329,422$ | Constant | $1,601,101$ |
| CAP RATE | $7.50 \%$ | DSCR | 1.50 |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $11,622,682$ | NPV | $(2,356,640)$ |

## Office Summary Takeaways

There are five things that are important takeaways for the office analysis.

1. The terms of the loan quoted by Royal Bank of Scotland's (RBS). ${ }^{\text {xii }}$ Office/Retail uses require and loan to value of (LTV) 60-70\%, debt service coverage ratio of 1.25 , and sits 230 basis points above the 10 yr treasury. These requirements are met.
2. Vacancy is projected to go down $\downarrow$ over the next 5 years to $8.8 \%$.
3. Asking rents are expected to go up $\uparrow 1.6 \%$ over the next 5 years, which is below $\downarrow$ expected inflation of 3\%.
4. Net operating income is positive in year 3 at $\$ 2.5$ million.
5. NPV is negative

## BETHESDA / CHEVY CHASE OFFICE MARKET OVERVIEW (CoStar Report)




## Multifamily Market and Feasibility Analysis

The previous section of the analysis dealt with an office use for the site. Repeating what was mentioned earlier, due to the current zoning of CBD-2 and an FAR of 9.17 the site lends itself to several different uses. The current zoning and FAR will be sufficient for a multifamily project that will have to be retrofitted to the existing building. Talking with several developers in the Washington DC market ${ }^{\mathrm{xv}}$, all agreed that changing the building from and office to multifamily would be well suited for the site. Changing the current use of the proposed space from office to residential will involve being creative with the existing spaces. The building will consist of 10 floors of rentable space and two underground parking levels. The first floor will consist of retail and a fitness center for residents. The retail space will
total 5,000 SF, and the fitness center will be $1,700 \mathrm{SF}$, all accessible from the first floor entry. There will be approximately 300SF for the leasing office. In addition, there will be two apartments on the first floor a 1 bedroom, and a studio apartment totaling 1,450SF. The building will boast an efficiency rating of $83 \%$. Each floor (2-10) will have 9,740 SF of rentable living area for a building total of 89,111 SF. Each of the floors will have 960 SF of vertical penetrations, 150 SF for enclosures, and 680 SF of corridor space ( $5^{\prime}$ wide). The unit mix will be 19 efficiencies, 64 one bedroom units, and 27 one bedroom units with dens. The total number of units will be 110 at 7550 Wisconsin. The layout of the building and the proposed market penetration restricted the construction of any 2 and 3 bedroom units. The roof top will be converted into a lounge and meeting area amenity. With open space, plantings, gas log fire pits, chairs, and a water feature.

With the unit mix defined it is important to understand the parking requirements for a 110 unit urban apartment building in Bethesda. Currently, Montgomery County gives deductions in parking requirements if the retail portion of a building is within $1600^{\prime}$ of a metro stop or if the residential building is the Central Business District. 7550 Wisconsin qualifies under both requirements for reduced parking. The Montgomery County parking code is as follows, 1.2 spaces for each residential dwelling unit and five parking spaces per 1,000 SF of retail. This leaves us with a total of 157 parking spaces. Viewing the parking plans of several notable DC developers (The Clarett Group and Carr Development) for 7550 Wisconsin Avenue, they have determined that given the buildings access to the metro and being in the CBD that 7550 Wisconsin would qualify for a substantial deduction in parking requirements. Ultimately, the parking requirements would be 99 spaces for both retail and multifamily. Currently the building has 55 spaces. Therefore, an additional 44 spaces will be added through stacked parking (see APPENDIX ) which is included in the development costs of the building.

## TABLE 1.5 APARTMENT "BACKDOOR" APPROACH

| APARTMENT "BACK DOOR" APPROACH |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| APARTMENT RSF | 89,111 |
| RENTS | $2,940,815$ |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | $3,141,770$ |
| VACANCY | $7.00 \%$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | $2,921,847$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $37.84 \%$ |
| NOI | $1,816,181$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $21,112,302$ |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $30,269,682$ |
| CAP RATE | $6.00 \%$ |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $9,157,380$ |

The next step in the analysis is to determine the total cost of the asset. Backing into the cost of the acquisition price requires multiplying the total number of units (110) by the average monthly rent per apartment. The average monthly rent is $\$ 2,100$ (Class A apartments) then multiplying this sum by 12 (number of months) which equals $\$ 3,141,770$ of potential gross income (PGI). The PGI includes 77 rentable parking spaces at $\$ 100$ a month $(\$ 127,308)$ and 6,700 SF of first floor retail at $\$ 34$ SF $(\$ 234,634)$. A vacancy allowance of $\$ 219,924$ which is $7 \%$ of the PGI is subtracted from the PGI. Investigating the vacancy of apartments built post 1999. It was determined through a REIS apartment asset advisor that vacancy fell between $6.3 \%$ and $7.8 \%$ with vacancy expected to decrease over the next few months due to an increase in population and the limited amount of new product in the market. The next step is to take the effective gross income of $\$ 2,921,847$ and subtract the operating expenses to arrive at the net operating income. Through conversations with an apartment owner and developer, this analysis has concluded that a conservative operating expense ratio would be $32-37 \%$ of effective gross income (EGI). $37 \%$ of the EGI for apartments at 7550 Wisconsin is $\$ 1,110,301$. Subtracting this from the EGI creates a net operating income ( NOI ) of $\$ 1,816,181$. The expense ratio was reviewed and
found to be representative of the current market by Adam Davis a development manager of Foulger Pratt. ${ }^{\text {xvi }}$

The next step is to determine what the projected cap rate for apartments is. The Korpacz Investor Survey revealed that in the first quarter of 2010 that Mid Atlantic cap rates ranged anywhere from 5$10 \%$. Drilling down further into the Washington DC market it was determined that apartment buildings were trading anywhere from $5.75 \%$ to $7.5 \%$. A conservative cap rate of $6 \%$ was chosen. Capping the NOI using a market cap rate of $6 \%$ creates a market value of $\$ 30,269,682$.

The stabilized value of apartments at 7550 Wisconsin is $\$ 30,269,682$. Subtracting that from the total estimated development costs of $\$ 21,112,302$ determines the acquisition allowance of $\$ 9,157,380$. The breakdown of the development costs are found in the appendix.

It is important to note that 7550 Wisconsin will be built to LEED Certified standards with high efficiency windows, green roof, energy efficient mechanical systems and appliances. Recyclable components like carpet, paint, and interior features, as well as an environmentally friendly management program will help mitigate operational costs and environmental impact. This will reduce operating expenses and create more value in the future for the project because lower expenses will create a higher NOI.

TABLE 1.6 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS FOR APARTMENTS

|  | APARTMENT ANALYSIS SUMMARY |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| GSF | 126,491 | Going In Cap Rate | $6.00 \%$ |
| AVG PRICE PER UNIT PER MONTH | 2,100 | Terminal Cap Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| NUMBER OF UNITS | 110 | Cost of Sale | $3.00 \%$ |
| PARKING SPACES | 99 | 10 Year Treasury | $3.03 \%$ |
| RETAIL RENT | 34 | Risk Premium | $5.88 \%$ |
| RETAIL RENTABLE SQ FT. | 6,700 | Discount Rate | $9 \%$ |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | $3,141,770$ | Current Value | $30,269,682$ |
| STABILIZED OCCUPANCY | $93.00 \%$ | Equity Requirement | $9,080,905$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | $2,921,847$ | Loan Amount | $21,188,778$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $37.84 \%$ | LTV | $70.00 \%$ |
| NOI | $1,816,181$ | Annual | $1,490,857$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $21,112,302$ | Monthly Payment | 124,238 |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $30,269,682$ | Constant | $1,490,857$ |
| CAP RATE | $6.00 \%$ | DSCR | 1.19 |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $9,157,380$ | NPV | $(494,994)$ |

## Apartment Summary Takeaways

There are five important takeaways to identify from the analysis.

1. The terms of the loan quoted by Royal Bank of Scotland's (RBS). ${ }^{\text {xvii }}$ Apartment/retail uses require and loan to value (LTV) 70-75\%, debt service coverage ratio of 1.20 , and sits 200 basis points above the 10 yr treasury. These requirements are met.
2. Vacancy is projected to go down $\downarrow$ over the next 5 years.
3. Asking rents are expected to go up $\uparrow 3.5 \%$ over the next 5 years, which is above expected inflation of 3\%.
4. Net operating income is positive year 3 at $\$ 1.8$ million.
5. NPV is negative

## BETHESDA / CHEVY CHASE APARTMENT MARKET OVERVIEW (REIS Report)

Asking Rent Distribution

| Low | $25 \%$ | Mean | Median | $75 \%$ | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 1,243$ | $\$ 1,672$ | $\$ 1,866$ | $\$ 1,903$ | $\$ 2,325$ | $\$ 3,044$ |



Asking Rent Growth Rate Distribution

| Low | $25 \%$ | Mean | Median | $75 \%$ | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $-4.6 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $-0.2 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |




## Hotel Market and Feasibility Analysis

The hotel industry has a variety of different hotel classification systems. These systems are used to define the type of product and service expected by the consumer. A general understanding of the different types of hotel products that exist is necessary in choosing the appropriate hotel for the site.

Classification is based on many criteria, and classifying hotels into different types is not an easy task. The hotel industry is so vast that many hotels do not fit into a single well defined category. The Industry can be classified in various ways, based on location, size of property etc. ${ }^{\text {xix }}$

## Based on location

- City center: Generally located in the heart of city within a short distance from business center, shopping arcade. Rates are normally high due to their location advantages. They have high traffic on weekdays and the occupancy is generally high. ${ }^{\mathrm{xx}}$
- Motels: They are located primarily on highways, they provide lodging to highway travelers and also provide ample parking space. The length of stay is usually overnight. ${ }^{\mathrm{xxi}}$
- Suburban hotels: They are located in suburban areas, it generally have high traffic on weekend. It is ideal for budget travelers. In this type of hotel rates are moderately low. ${ }^{\text {xxii }}$
- Airport hotels: These hotels are set up near by the airport. They have transit guest who stay over between flights. ${ }^{\text {xiii }}$
- Resort hotels: They are also termed as health resort or beach hill resort and so depending on their position and location. They cater a person who wants to relax, enjoy themselves at hill station. Most resort work to full capacity during peak season. Sales and revenue fluctuate from season to season. ${ }^{\text {xxiv }}$


## Based on size

- Small hotel: hotel with 100 rooms and less may be termed as small hotels. ${ }^{\mathrm{xxv}}$
- Medium sized hotel: hotel which has $100-300$ rooms is known as medium sized hotel. ${ }^{\text {xxvi }}$
- Large hotels: hotel which have more than 300 rooms are termed as large hotels. ${ }^{\text {xxvii }}$
- Mega hotels: are those hotels with more than 1000 rooms. ${ }^{\text {xxviii }}$


## Based on level of service

- Economy/ Budget hotels: These hotels meet the basic need of the guest by providing comfortable and clean room for a comfortable stay. ${ }^{\text {xxix }}$
- Mid market hotels: It is suite hotel that offers small living room with appropriate furniture and small bed room with king sized bed. ${ }^{\text {xxx }}$
- Luxury hotels: These offer world class service providing restaurant and lounges, concierge service, meeting rooms, dining facilities. Bath linen is provided to the guest and is replaced accordingly. These guest rooms contain furnishings, artwork etc. ${ }^{\text {xxxi }}$


## Based on theme

- Heritage hotel: In this hotel a guest is graciously welcomed, offered room that have their own history, serve traditional cuisine and are entertained by folk artist. These hotels put their best efforts to give the glimpse of their region. ${ }^{\text {xxxii }}$
- Ecotels: these are environment friendly hotels these hotel use eco friendly items in the room. ${ }^{\text {xxxiii }}$
- Boutique hotels: This hotel provides exceptional accommodation, furniture in a themed and stylish manner and caters to corporate travelers. ${ }^{\text {xxiv }}$
- Spas: is a resort which provide therapeutic bath and massage along with other features. ${ }^{\mathrm{xxxv}}$


## TABLE 1.7 HOTEL BRANDS WITHIN THE SMITH TRAVEL RESEARCH CHAIN SCALE

| Luxury | Upper Upscale | Upscale |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Four Seasons | Doubletree | Aloft |
| Parky Hyatt | Embassy Suites | Courtyard |
| Inter-contiental | Hilton | Crowne Plaza |
| Ritz Carlton | Hyatt | Four Points |
| W Hotel | Kimpton | Hilton Garden Inn |
|  | Marriott | Radisson |
|  | Shearton | Residence Inn |
|  | Westin | Wyndham |
|  |  |  |
| Midscale with F\&B | Midscale without F\&B | Economy |
| Best Western | Comfort Inn | Days Inn |
| Clarion | Fairfield Inn | Motel 6 |
| Holiday Inn | Hampton Inn | Red Roof Inn |
| Quality Inn | La Quinta Inn | Travelodge |
| Ramada |  |  |

Hotels are defined as either full-service or limited-service. Full-service hotels according to Smith Travel Research (STR) are "generally mid-price, upscale, or luxury hotels with a restaurant, lounge facilities and meeting spaces as well as minimum service levels often including bell service and room service." STR describes Limited -service as the following, "have rooms-only operations, (i.e. without food and beverage service) offer a bedroom and bathroom for the night, but very few other services and amenities. These hotels are often in the budget or economy group and do not report food and beverage revenue." ${ }^{\text {xxxvii }}$

There are a few other categories of hotel classes that are not defined by STR. The first is "select-service" these hotels offer a hybrid of services that fall in between full-service and limited-service. Their food and beverage is limited and many of these hotels have small meeting areas and break out space. The second hotel class not represented in STR's report is the "suites" or extended stay hotels that offer
larger rooms with kitchens for those looking to stay for more than a week. Below in table 1.8 are a list of examples from the different types of service hotels.

## TABLE 1.8 HOTEL BRANDS BY SERVICE TYPE

| Full - Service | Select-Service | Extended-Stay | Limited Service |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Four Seasons | Aloft | Embassy Suites | Days Inn |
| Ritz Carlton | Courtyard | Residence Inn | Motel 6 |
| W Hotel | Four Points |  | Red Roof Inn |
| Haytt | Hilton Garden Inn | Travelodge |  |
| Kimpton | Hyatt Place | Comfort Inn |  |
| Marriott |  | Fairfield Inn |  |
| Westin |  | Hampton Inn |  |

Now that we have a better understanding of the hotel classes we can analyze what's existing in the Bethesda Market. Taking a competitive set of hotels from an STR report we see that currently the hotel choices for consumers is limited.

## TABLE 1.9 SMITH TRAVEL RESEARCH COMPETITIVE SET

|  | Name of Establishment | City \& State | Zip Code | Aff Date | Open Date | Rooms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27603 | Embassy Suites Washington DC @ Chevy Chase | Washington, DC | 20015 | Oct 1990 | Oct 1990 | 198 |
| 59353 | Hilton Garden Inn Bethesda | Bethesda, MD | 20814 | Oct 2009 | Oct 2009 | 216 |
| 22130 | Residence Inn Bethesda Downtown | Bethesda, MD | 20814 | Apr 1991 | Nov 1986 | 187 |
| 5792 | Hyatt Regency Bethesda Metro Center | Bethesda, MD | 20814 | Nov 1985 | Nov 1985 | 390 |
| 261 | Courtyard Chew Chase | Chew Chase, MD | 20815 | Jul 2009 | Jan 1971 | 226 |
| 27556 | Marriott Bethesda Suites | Bethesda, MD | 20817 | Mar 1990 | Mar 1990 | 272 |
|  |  |  | Total Properties: 6 |  |  | 1489 |

Categorizing the hotels listed above it appears that there are four full-service hotels, one select-service, and one extended stay hotel. This proposal will evaluate the possibility of developing a boutique hotel for the site for two reasons. First there is nothing like a boutique hotel in the market. Over the past 5 to 10 years the Bethesda/Chevy Chase area has become well known for its high end shopping, restaurants, open air markets, arts, and other amenities that are associated with clientele that stay in boutique hotels. Secondly, the site is located in downtown Bethesda where the highest and best use for
any asset will be a "Class A" project. The previous assets that were analyzed were Class A office and Class A multifamily. It will be important for the purposes of this study to choose a hotel that is considered Class A. Therefore, it has been determined that the hotel type that would be the highest and best use for this site would be a full-service "boutique hotel".

Lucienne Anhar of HVS International defines a boutique hotels as "a term popularized in North America and the United Kingdom to describe intimate, usually luxurious or quirky hotel environments. Boutique hotels differentiate themselves from larger chain/branded hotels and motels by providing personalized accommodation and services / facilities. Sometimes known as "design hotels" or "lifestyle hotels", boutique hotels began appearing in the 1980s in major cities like London, New York, and San Francisco. Typically boutique hotels are furnished in a themed, stylish and/or inspirational manner. They usually are considerably smaller than mainstream hotels, often ranging from 3 to 50 guest rooms. Boutique hotels are always individual and are therefore extremely unlikely to be found amongst the homogeneity of large chain hotel groups. Guest rooms and suites may be fitted with telephony and Wi-Fi Internet, airconditioning, honesty bars and often cable/pay TV, but equally may have none of these, focusing on quiet and comfort rather than gadgetry. Guest services are often attended to by 24 -hour hotel staff. Many boutique hotels have on-site dining facilities, and the majority offer bars and lounges that may also be open to the general public., ${ }^{\times 1}$

Amenities in boutique hotels range from restaurants and bars, spa, fitness areas, small meeting spaces, and sometimes pools. Their services include bell service, concierge service, and 24 - hour room service.

The first step in analyzing a boutique hotel for the proposed site is to determine how many "keys" the site will allow. Continuing with the same scenario proposed for the multifamily project it's assumed that the hotels gross square footage is $126,941 \mathrm{SF}$ subtracting out the core areas the total rentable square footage area is 89,111 . It is also assumed that the same corridor space, vertical penetrations, and
stairwells given the size and shape of the building. Parking and first floor layouts for floors 2-9 are discussed in detail below.

The building will be vertically stacked as follows: Two floors of underground parking, a ground floor with $2,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of conference room and break out space, $4,300 \mathrm{SF}$ for a restaurant and bar area, as well as a 2,500 SF for an open lobby housing the concierges and receptionists desks, seating area for Wi-Fi, and open group tables. The bar and restaurant will be open to this area allowing for food and beverage service. The building currently has three elevators. For the purposes of the hotel two elevators will be used for guest convenience, and the third will be used by house cleaning and restaurant staff providing food and services throughout the building. Each floor will have 960 SF of vertical penetrations, 150 SF for enclosures, and 680 SF of corridor space ( $5^{\prime}$ wide).

Floors two through nine will be have the same amount of vertical penetrations, enclosures, and corridor space as mentioned above. Each floor will consist of 16 guest rooms for a total of 128 "keys". Each floor will have 11,530 SF. After you subtract the unusable space the total usable area will be 9,740 SF. Dividing this by 16 guest rooms per floor gives us a room average of 608 SF .

Now that we have determined the number of rooms in our hotel and the total amount of retail and restaurant space it is imperative that we make sure the current buildings parking is sufficient. The current parking requirements in Montgomery County for urban hotels within the CBD are as follows, $1 / 2$ space for each guest room and 10 spaces per 1,000 SF of conference/ball room. In addition, the restaurant and bar which will be open to the public and will require 40 parking spaces. The total number of parking spaces will be 124. Currently there are only 55 parking spaces at 7550 Wisconsin. The hotel will plan on doubling its capacity to 99 parking spaces using a lift system (a detail on this system is found in the appendix).

The additional parking spaces will be purchased through colonial parking. Colonial parking operates more than 175 parking garages throughout the Washington Metropolitan area. Both the Chevy Chase Bank building directly east of 7550 Wisconsin and Bethesda Metro Center directly south have parking garages that operate during peak working hours (7am-5pm). The hotel would need these spaces for the restaurant which is considered to have its peek business hours in the evening ( $5 \mathrm{pm}-11 \mathrm{pm}$ ). Given this scenario there wouldn't be any conflict with times of peak operation. It is proposed that the additional spaces if required by the county would be shared with the adjacent buildings that have parking garages underused during peak evening hours. Here is a brief description of Montgomery Counties shared parking policy "shared parking is usually an intrinsic part of downtown settings where there is public parking because the same parking facility serves many different destinations within walking distance (promoting public rather than private parking facilities is covered further under ("fees-in-lieu"). Shared parking is also effective in mixed use developments, either when there is a mix of uses on a single site or when sites with different uses are located suitably close together. ${ }^{\text {xli }}$ One example of this is an office building sharing parking with a restaurant or Movie Theater, since most of the office workers (and their cars) will be gone in the evenings when there is the most demand for parking from the restaurant or theater. Montgomery County requires that there be more than two uses within a building and that the building be within 500 ft of the parking garage. Both of these requirements are met with 7550 Wisconsin.

Hotels depend on having amenities that attract customers to their facility. It is assumed that the $10^{\text {th }}$ floor be used for a work out facility that overlooks the city to the south as well as a closed in area for the mechanical and maintenance rooms. In addition, this area will be impeded from above by the roof top swimming pool. The roof top will consist of a bar, pool, hot tub and lounge area with a gas log fire pit.

## TABLE 1.10 FULL SERVICE HOTEL "BACKDOOR" APPROACH

| HOTEL "BACK DOOR" APPROACH |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| HOTEL RSF | 89,111 |
| AVERAGE DAILY RATE | 239 |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | $8,803,253$ |
| VACANCY (INCLUDED IN ADR) |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | $8,803,253$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $65 \%$ |
| NOI | $2,772,205$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $23,519,873$ |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $32,614,172$ |
| CAP RATE | $8.50 \%$ |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $9,094,298$ |

The next step in the analysis is to determine the total cost of the asset. Backing into the cost of the acquisition price will require the total number of room nights available if every room were sold 365 nights a year. The total number of room nights would be 46,720 rooms per year. Multiplying this by an occupancy rate of $75 \%$ (the five year average for Bethesda/Chevy Chase is $75.20 \%$ ) ${ }^{\text {xlii }}$ at stabilization yields total rooms occupied per year of 35,040 . Then multiply 35,040 by the average daily rate (ADR) of a room which at stabilization is projected to be $\$ 239$ per night. This is based off of market research through Smith Travel Research STR and Washington DC asset managers Shawn Smith Asset Manager at $J B G^{\text {xliii }}$ and Chris Ostapovicz Vice President of Asset Management of the Eastern Region at Host Hotels and Resorts. ${ }^{\text {xliv }}$

Multiplying the total rooms occupied by the projected ADR we get $\$ 8,364,136$. Adding in parking and food and beverage we arrive at an effective gross income (EGI) of $\$ 8,808,253$. It is important to note
that occupancy was included in the determination of the total rooms occupied per year therefore; it will not be necessary to subtract the vacancy from the PGI to arrive at our EGI.

Full-service hotels run higher operating expense ratios than select-service, and limited-service hotels. ${ }^{\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{v}}$ Generally, a full-service hotel will run an operating expense ratio of 65-70\%. Based on this data it has been assumed that $65 \%$ is reasonable for total operating expenses. The subject hotel will be LEED certified and operate at a lower percentage rate than its competitors. Subtracting a 65\% operating expense ratio from the EGI will determine the net operating income (NOI) to be $\$ 2,772,205$. Greg Fang Senior Analyst at Host Hotels and Resorts has reviewed and verified the operating expense ratio numbers to be accurate for a full service hotel. ${ }^{\text {xlvi }}$

The next step is to determine what the projected cap rate for hotel/lodging is. Using the Korpacz Investor Survey it was determined that in 1Q 2010 that Mid Atlantic cap rates for full-service hotels ranged anywhere from $6-14 \%$ with an average of $10.08 \%$. ${ }^{\text {xlvii }}$ Local area research revealed that current assets are trading at $8-10 \%$. A cap rate of $8.50 \%$ was chosen. Capping the NOI with an $8.50 \%$ cap rate we now have a supportable value of $\$ 32,614,172$. Subtracting this from the development costs of $\$ 23,324,022$ we have an acquisition cost of $\$ 9,094,298$.

## TABLE 1.11 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS FOR FULL SERVICE HOTEL

|  | FULL SERVICE HOTEL ANALYSIS SUMMARY |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| GSF | 126,491 | Going In Cap Rate | $8.50 \%$ |
| RSF | 89,111 | Terminal Cap Rate | $9.50 \%$ |
| TOTAL KEYS | 128 | Cost of Sale | $3.00 \%$ |
| ROOMS AVAILABLE | 46,720 | 10 Year Treasury | $3.03 \%$ |
| ROOMS OCCUPIED | 35,040 | Risk Premium | $10.00 \%$ |
| PARKING SPACES | 99 | Discount Rate | $13.03 \%$ |
| ADR | 239 | Current Value | $32,614,172$ |
| OCC | $75 \%$ | Equity Requirement | $13,045,669$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | 8803252.719 | Loan Amount | $19,568,503$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $64.67 \%$ | LTV | $60.00 \%$ |
| NOI | $2,772,205$ | Annual | $1,517,271$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $23,519,873$ | Monthly Payment | 126,439 |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $32,614,172$ | Constant | $1,517,271$ |
| CAP RATE | $8.50 \%$ | DSCR | 1.83 |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $9,094,298$ | NPV | 287,347 |

Hotel Summary Takeaways
There are five important takeaways to identify from the analysis.

1. The terms of the loan quoted by Royal Bank of Scotland's (RBS). ${ }^{\text {xlviii }}$ Hotel uses require a loan to value (LTV) 50-60\%, debt service coverage ratio of 1.30, and sits 300 basis points above the 10 yr treasury. These requirements are met.
2. Vacancy is projected to go down $\downarrow$ over the next 5 years.
3. Asking rents are expected to go up $\uparrow 3.5 \%$ over the next 5 years, which is above expected inflation of $3 \%$.
4. Net operating income is positive year 3 at $\$ 1.8$ million.
5. NPV is positive


Exhibit 7*: Occupancy Change

| All U.S. | $\longrightarrow$ Upper-Priced Hotels |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lower-Priced Hotels | $=$ All Hotels |



Source: PKF Hospitality Research, Smith Travel Research

## Exhibit 9*: RevPAR Change



Source: PKF Hospitality Research, Smith Travel Research

## Summary of Market and Feasibility Analysis

The analysis has now been completed for three uses; below is a summary describing why the hotel use is the highest and best use for the site. Multifamily has the lowest stabilized NOI and cost the least to build. However it's IRR is heavily weighted on the sale. Another negative aspect of developing apartments is that it has a negative NPV. Office generates the second highest NOI and is also second in cost to build. Similar to an apartment use the offices internal rate of return is heavily weighted on the sale of the asset. This is because of its hit to cash flow in the first year when it's still leasing up and in year 8 when major tenant improvements, tenant roll over, and leasing commissions are necessary. The full service hotel is the most expensive to build primarily because of its amenities and fully furnished rooms. It has the highest NOI even with an operating cost $25 \%$ higher than office and $38 \%$ higher than apartments. The great news about a full-service hotel is that it has a strong IRR and when partitioned its evident that the hotels cash flow is considerably higher than office and apartment uses. The most notable is the NPV of the asset. The hotels NPV is $\$ 287,347$ which is significantly higher than both office and apartments, but most importantly the NPV is positive and the other two uses are negative. The NPV is based off the series of cash flows with a discount rate bringing those cash flows to a current value.

The discount rates were chose using the 10 year treasury plus a risk premium. The discount rates were as follows office $9.50 \%$, apartments $9 \%$, and hotels at $13 \%$. Based on this analysis we've determined that a full service hotel is most likely to succeed in the acquisition of the site.

## TABLE 1.12 SUMMARIES OF PROPSED USES

|  | USES |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | OFFICE | MULTIFAMILY | FULL SERVICE HOTEL |
|  |  |  |  |
| STABILIZED NOI | $2,499,707$ | $1,816,181$ | $2,772,205$ |
| ASSET COST | $21,706,740$ | $21,112,302$ | $23,519,873$ |
| MARKET CAP RATE | $7.50 \%$ | $6.00 \%$ | $8.50 \%$ |
| DISCOUNT RATE | $9.50 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| MARKET VALUE | $33,329,422$ | $30,269,682$ | $32,614,172$ |
| ACQUISITION VALUE | $11,622,682$ | $9,157,380$ | $9,094,298$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| IRR | $6.64 \%$ | $8.22 \%$ | $13.41 \%$ |
| SALE | $72.25 \%$ | $80.94 \%$ | $45.53 \%$ |
| CASH FLOW | $27.75 \%$ | $19.06 \%$ | $54.47 \%$ |
| NPV | $(2,356,640)$ | $(494,994)$ | 287,347 |

## ZONING AND BUILDING DESIGN

The highest and best use for the current site is a boutique full-service hotel. This proposal is for the redevelopment of an existing class C retail and office buildings into a 128 -room boutique, "lifestyle" brand hotel. The property subject to the proposal consists of one tax parcel HN22, N294, Lot P11, all of which will be acquired through the acquisition of 7550 Wisconsin. These lots will be consolidated into one parcel totaling 13,860 square feet, which provides an adequate footprint for a hotel. The parcel is zoned CBD-2. The hotel use is consistent with the Bethesda Master Plan and both of the zoning regulations; however, the density of the 126,000 square foot hotel exceeds the density limitations standard development method permitted pursuant to the CBD-2 zoning district. The lot lines and set backs will stay the same and parking will remain underground.

## Master Plan Analysis

Our development is located within Montgomery County's South Central Transit Corridor and the Sector Plan for the Bethesda Central Business District, as amended by the Woodmont Triangle Amendment.

## Woodmont Triangle Background

The Woodmont Triangle Amendment is a comprehensive examination of land use, housing to serve a variety of income levels, retail revitalization, enhancement of the Arts and Entertainment District, streets, and public amenities. The amendment covers the Woodmont Triangle Study Area located south of the National Institutes of Health, west of Wisconsin Avenue, and east of Old Georgetown Road.


The Woodmont Triangle Amendment was implemented in 2006 after it was determined that the 1994 Sector Plan for the Bethesda CBD inhibited development in the Woodmont Triangle.

The 1994 Sector Plan for Woodmont Triangle had the following objectives:

1) Preserve the predominantly low-density and low-scale character of the district
2) Provide additional housing particularly in the north end of the district.
3) Support a diverse specialty retail and restaurant environment to serve the community, including sidewalk cafes and dispersed parking.
4) Improve the pedestrian environment with upgraded streetscape including street trees and green open spaces.

Limited by the onerous height restrictions in the Woodmont Triangle, development began to concentrate south of the Triangle closer to the Metro Station. As a result of the inhibited development, developers located retail and housing south of Woodmont Triangle, leaving the area in a state of decline state.

The 2006 Amendment to the Bethesda Central Business District Sector Plan recommended higher FARs and building heights as well as encouraged redevelopment to provide housing while retaining the retail and restaurants in the neighborhood. To accommodate the changes, a zoning text amendment was initiated which reduced the minimum lot size requirement and permitted transfers of density. The Planning Commission adopted the proposed amendment and the Plan serves as the official amendment to the General Plan for the Woodmont Triangle section of Montgomery County. The proposed hotel development is consistent with the master plan because it incorporates ground floor retail and a restaurant which will contribute additional amenities to the residents in the neighborhood. A new hotel will add tax revenue by providing a destination for guests to come to and contribute to the vision set forth. This development will bring vitality back to a declining area that contrasts with new developments and the street level retail that residents of the Bethesda Central Business District enjoy.

## Required Zoning Information

Description: Redevelopment of an existing class C office buildings into a 128 -room boutique, "lifestyle" brand hotel.

Public Benefit: The proposed hotel development is consistent with the master plan because it incorporates ground floor retail and a restaurant which will contribute additional amenities to the residents in the neighborhood. A new hotel will add tax revenue by providing a destination for guests to come to and contribute to the vision set forth. This development will bring vitality back to a declining area that contrasts with new developments and the street level retail that residents of the Bethesda Central Business District enjoy.

Height Restrictions: The total floor space of the building will be 126,000 square feet on the 13,860 square foot lot equates to a 9.17 FAR versus the standard development method limitation of 1.0 and a
maximum FAR of 5.0. Based on its current FAR allowance the redevelopment will not exceed the current FAR. Therefore, the proposed use does not exceed the height restrictions.

Woodmont Triangle in the downtown district of Bethesda is zoned CBD-2. This zoning allows for a Hotel development at an FAR of 3. This project is not considered new construction and the current FAR will transfer with the sale of the property. Its allowable uses are commercial, residential, retail, hospitality. We are building this hotel within compliance with code by keeping the FAR the same and providing adequate parking for our project and the public. Also there is restaurant space to help provide a mixed use adaptation of the site.

TABLE 1.13:PROJECT PLAN

| PROJECT PLAN |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT NAME | BOUTIQUE HOTELS LLC. / HOTEL INDIGO |
| MAP PAGE | HN 22 |
| LEGAL LOTS | P11 |
| SUBDIVISION NUMBER | 049 |
| ZONE | CBD-2 |
| MIN. LOT AREA* | 18,000 SF |
| CURRENT FAR | 9.17 |
| PROPOSED FAR | 9.17 |
| MAX. LOT COVERAGE | 75\% |
| MIN. PUBLIC USE** | 20\% |
| MAX. HEIGHT | 143' |
| RIGHT OF WAY*** | $1^{\prime}$ ' ${ }^{\prime}$ OR EVERY 6' BY WHICH THE HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING EXCEEDS 30' |
| ADJOINING LOTS | 15' |
| *Assumes Optional Met <br> ** A payment instead of <br> *** Required setback for | otional pending approval under Division 59-D-2 based on a building height of 120' |

## PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN AND BUILDING DESIGN

The building design and layout is described below.
Orientation: The site has great visibility from Wisconsin Ave, Old Georgetown Rd, and the Bethesda Metro station. The footprint of the building will remain the same. There will be no additional stories built on top of the existing structure.

Façade: The building will be completely stripped of its current skin and replaced with a combination of brick, steel, and glass. The entrance to the hotel will have a covered walkway leading up from Wisconsin Ave. All loading and parking will be accessed from Commerce Lane directly north of 7550 Wisconsin. Large self contained planters will line the perimeter of the building allowing for plants and trees to be part of the atmosphere.

Height: $\quad$ the building height will remain the same. The typical ceiling height will remain $8^{\prime}$.
Interior: Rooms will average 608 gross square feet. The first floor will include a restaurant, bar, lounge, and meeting space.

Figure 1: Building Footprint


Figure 2: Exterior / Facade


Figure 3: Typical Room Layout


Figure 4: Room Pictures


Figure 5: Lobby


Figure 6: Restaurant - Bar


Figure 7: Pool


## DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

## Development Costs

This analysis covers a detailed description of the line items on Appendix I, "Development Cost Analysis". Each line item is described and supported in detail.

## Site Acquisition Costs

Existing Site: It has been determined that the total supportable acquisition cost of the proposed site is $\$ 9,094,298$. This does not include any additional costs that are associated with purchasing the property. The acquisition cost covers the fee simple property located at 7550 Wisconsin Avenue.

## Hard Costs

Building Construction: The total building construction costs are estimated to be $\$ 13.7$ million dollars or $\$ 127$ per square foot. The total construction costs, including soft costs are $\$ 185$. Parking costs are estimated to be $\$ 3$ per square foot. Included in this is the hydraulic lift system for parking spaces as well as resurfacing, refinishing, and the installation of new doors in the parking garage. The general contractor's fee and the general conditions for the job are estimated at $4 \%$. The contingency built into the budget to cover project cost overruns is at $5 \%$. The total cost for building construction is $\$ 16$ million dollars including parking renovations. An estimate through RS means for a 10+ story hotel in Bethesda, Maryland is $\$ 181$ per square foot. These numbers were confirmed by an estimate through several developers in the Washington, DC metropolitan area who competitively bid these jobs. ${ }^{\text {lii }}$ It is important to note that this is a replacement cost estimate. However, 7550 Wisconsin is a redevelopment with many of the necessary components already existing in the structure. Steel, concrete, excavation, foundations are all ready in place. Therefore it is hard to compare an RS means estimate for new construction to a redevelopment project. This analysis recognizes that renovations harbor unknown problems for the developer and GC. These problems are usually discovered once construction has begun. For this reason we have accepted the replacement cost estimate as a legitimate reflection of actually development cost for 7550 Wisconsin.

Furniture Fixtures and Equipment (FF\&E): These costs are divided up in to seven categories: guestrooms, public areas, kitchen equipment, laundry equipment, fitness equipment, and information technology. The total cost per guest room is 4,598 per key this includes a bed frame, desk, bureau, two chairs, bed side table, mini bar refrigerator, light fixture, television, and safe. The corridor costs are estimated to be $\$ 125,000$. The areas account for $\$ 275,000$ which include decorations, common area tables and chairs in lobby, televisions in lobby, pool equipment, business center and meeting space furniture. The kitchen equipment is projected to be $\$ 150,000$ and includes both the restaurant and roof top bar equipment. Laundry equipment is estimated to cost $\$ 50,000$. The fitness equipment which will be on the $10^{\text {th }}$ floor is $\$ 65,000$ and will include treadmills, free weights, nautilus machines, TVs, and a sauna. Information Technology consists of wiring CAT 5 cable throughout, all necessary Wi-Fi stations, telephone system, and hotel computer system. A 3\% purchasing fee is added to the total cost. The total cost for FF\&E is $\$ 12,058$ per key. An asset manager for JBG has reviewed the FF\&E costs and considers them consistent with current development costs in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. ${ }^{\text {liii }}$

Operating Supplies and Equipment OS\&E: OS\&E consists of three categories; guestrooms, public areas and back of the house, and food and beverage. Guestroom room OS\&E totals $\$ 2,148$ per key and includes linens, pillows, mattress, towels, soap, shampoo, lotion, and everything else needed to stock the hotel for its guests. Public areas and back of the house OS\&E totals $\$ 225,000$. The items included in the OS\&E for the back of the house are uniforms, cleaning supplies, and office equipment. Food and beverage totals $\$ 50,000$ and includes everything needed to stock the kitchen and pantry shelves, dinnerware, menus for the restaurant and rooms. An asset manager for JBG has reviewed the OS\&E costs and considers them consistent with current development costs in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. ${ }^{\text {liv }}$

## Soft Costs

Fees and services: The first line item for fees and services is a formal market study for $\$ 15,000$. Details of the market study are found on page 41 under the Development Timeline. Architects and Engineers account for $\$ 365,000$. Testing, inspectors, and appraisals is $\$ 38,550$. This includes testing of existing column and foundation concrete, third party bank inspectors, and final appraisal for permanent financing. Builders risk is a necessary part of development and is found in soft costs. General liability insurance is found under the general conditions under hard costs. Legal and accounting fees are $\$ 102,000$. Municipality fees and utility fees are $\$ 25,000$, and permitting is $\$ 30,000$.

Project Management: The developer will be included in the equity partnership of the proposed project. In addition the developer will collect a fee of $3.5 \%$ or $\$ 799,704$ and a salary of $\$ 200,000$ with travel and expenses budget for $\$ 25,000$.

Other Soft Costs: Included in this category are property taxes, construction loan interest, loan fees, developer equity carrying costs, marketing and pre-opening expenses, and the project contingency. Construction loan interest is $9 \%$ and is drawn out over a twelve month period. Loan fees are $1 \%$ of the construction loan and developer carrying costs are $9.5 \%$ divided amongst the investors as a percentage of total funds invested. Marketing and pre-opening expenses totals $\$ 250,000$. The project contingency is $\$ 650,000$ which is just over $2.5 \%$ of the total development costs. The total for the other soft cost category is $\$ 3.6$ million dollars or $\$ 28.00$ per key.

## Summary of Development Costs

The total development cost is $\$ 32.6$ million dollars or $\$ 254,798$ per key. Acquisition cost for the site is at $\$ 9$ million or $\$ 71,000$ per key and represents $27.88 \%$ of the total development cost. Hard costs are $\$ 18.2$ million dollars or $\$ 142,359$ per key and represents $55.87 \%$ of the total development cost. Soft costs are $\$ 5.8$ million dollars or $\$ 41,390$ per key representing $16.24 \%$ of the total development cost.

## FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The development estimates are an important part of determining operational costs and total value of hotel over a 10 year period. The discounted cash flow (DCF) makes assumptions for the average daily rate (ADR), expenses, and occupancy to arrive at projected net operating income (NOI). The NOI determines the value at the end of the 10 year hold by capping the $11^{\text {th }}$ year NOI and adding in the $10^{\text {th }}$ years NOI to get the projected sales price in year 10. A detailed description in APPENDIX II "Discounted Cash Flow Analysis" and APPENDIX III "Stabilized Income Analysis" elaborate on these assumptions. Details are found in the description below.

Average Daily Rate (ADR): The average daily rate is the expected average rate per room over the course of an entire year. The ADR is projected to be $\$ 225$ in year 1 , and $\$ 239$ in year three the chosen year for stabilization. ADR is expected to escalate at $3 \%$ per year. The ADR for year 1 (2013) is higher than the expected ADR for the Bethesda/Chevy Chase market. ${ }^{\text {lv }}$ However, the market is currently in decline but, growth is expected over the next several years. "ADR growth expectations are increasing, positive $0.7 \%$ vs. the past 4 quarters' rate of negative $9.7 \%$ however, they are below the long run average of positive $3.2 \%$." ${ }^{\text {lvi }}$ ADR is expected to grow at $2.9 \%$ in $2011,5.6 \%$ in $2012,5.7 \%$ in 2013, and $4.0 \%$ in 2014. ${ }^{\text {lvi }}$ For the purposes of the analysis the escalation was kept conservatively at $3 \%$ as mentioned earlier.

Occupancy: The occupancy is projected to be $69 \%$ in year 1. As the asset stabilizes occupancy is projected to increase to $74 \%$ in year 2 . Once the asset reaches stabilization it is projected to maintain occupancy at $75 \%$. Again this is based off of a 5 year average for the Bethesda/Chevy Chase market. This information was provided through the Smith Travel Research Global competitive set.

Revenue Per Available Room (RevPar): RevPar is an important metric when analyzing hotel performance. To find RevPar you simply multiply Occupancy by the Average Daily Rate (ADR).

Revenue: Rooms revenue is found by multiplying the ADR by the total number of rooms occupied for the year. Food and beverage is determined by multiplying the room revenue by $2.75 \%$. Parking revenue is found by estimating that 45 of the 99 spaces will be metered at $\$ 12$ per day. The other 54 spaces are an amenity for guests. Other income is through miscellaneous sales (outsourced dry cleaning, guest laundry, and hotel gift shop sales). Food and beverage, parking, and other revenue are projected to grow at 3\% per year.

Departmental Expenses: Departmental expenses are found by multiplying the expense by the revenue. For example rooms are projected to be an expense of $20 \%$, food $90 \%$, beverage $70 \%$, other income $65 \%$, and parking $50 \%$. Parking expenses are high based off of the facts that 44 of the spaces will be stacked through hydraulic lifts that are expensive to maintain, and the site will have a parking staff through colonial parking services.

Operating Expenses: Operating expenses are determined as a percentage of the total revenue. The percentages are as follows. Administrative and general expenses are $9 \%$, sales and marketing $5 \%$, operations and maintenance $6 \%$, and utilities are $4 \%$. The utility expense is slightly higher than the industry standard of $3.5 \%$ due to increases expected for Montgomery County residents and businesses. ${ }^{\text {Iviii }}$

Management/Franchise Fees: The management fee is projected to be 3\% of total revenue. Franchise fees are projected to be $5.5 \%$ of total revenue. Both are consistent with the industry standards and practices.

Fixed Charges: The property taxes for 7550 were determined using the Montgomery County Maryland Real Tax rate of $1.2090 \%$ of assessed value post development. ${ }^{\text {lix }}$ The insurance for the site is calculated at \$1.10 per gross square foot, and is projected to increase annually at 3\%.

Replacement Reserves: The replacement reserves were estimated to be 5\%.

Net Operating Income (NOI): The NOI was determined to be $\$ 2.7$ million at stabilization in year 3. NOI experiences significant growth in years 1 and two because of occupancy increasing. After stabilization NOI grows at 3\% per year.

Reversionary Value: The projected sales price in year 10 is calculated by multiplying the NOI from year 11 by a predetermined cap rate. The cap rate used to find this value is $9.5 \%$. This is 100 bases points higher than the going in cap rate of $8.5 \%$. The higher cap rate represents a lower value, and takes into account the aging building and the unpredictability of the real estate market 10 years into the future. There are an additional $3 \%$ deducted from the sales price for selling costs.

Unleveraged Cash Flow Summary: The purpose of APPENDIX II "unleveraged cash flow summary" is to show the total cash flow for the property as if the capital stack were all equity. The initial negative cash outlay is the total development costs. Years 1 through 9 show the property cash flows without debt and are therefore equal to the NOI. Year 10 equals the cash flow plus the reversionary value which is year 11 's NOI divided by the cap rate. The projected unleveraged IRR is $9.47 \%$ which is lower than the discount rate of $9.78 \%$. According to the Korpacz report discount rates for full-service hotel investors range from $10-16 \%$ and average $12.43 \%$. These are national averages and broadly apply to the Washington, DC market. A more detailed search found that a risk premium of 6.75\% applied to the 10 year treasury displayed a more realistic view of hurdle rates in the DC metropolitan area.
Zach Schwartz a Vice President at REVPAR International and Chris Otsapovicz Vice President of Asset Management at Host Hotels and Resorts reviewed these assumptions and agreed that they reflected current market conditions here in Washington, DC.

## Debt Financing/Debt Market

Currently, the commercial real estate market is recovering from the economic downturn which began in December 2007. By September of 2008 Fannie and Freddie Mac were put into conservatorship, and financial institutions like Lehman Brothers collapsed sparking worldwide panic about the state of the US economy. A large part of the economic problems stemmed from bad commercial real estate loans and hyper inflated values. Commercial real estate transactions ceased to exist and construction lending and development came to a stop. Commercial lenders who made loans with high loan to values (LTV) began experiencing default with their risky loans. The commercial mortgage backed securities (CMBS) market crashed. This forced banks to hold their assets instead of selling them into the CMBS market. This has caused difficulties in funding new commercial real estate projects.

Commercial real estate loans are assessed using three metrics Loan to Value (LTV), Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR), and the interest rate of the loan (basis points over 10 year treasuries). ${ }^{\text {l. }}$ The LTV
for hotels are currently between 50-60\%, significantly lower than in previous years when hotels were being leveraged with LTV's up to $90 \%$. ${ }^{\text {ki }}$ The DCSR has risen just slightly to 1.30 . According to Matt Warren an analyst for commercial real estate at Royal Bank of Scotland he has recently seen loan transactions for hotels interest rates 300 basis points above treasuries. The U.S. Treasury is currently between $3 \%$ to $3.5 \%$. New loans are now being underwritten with full recourse requirements to the borrower's assets in the event the borrower goes into default.

Given the area and market the proposed hotel is being built in. A few assumptions are made in the events leading up to financing. First, the construction lender would require permanent financing already be in place before the construction loan is approved. Second, as mentioned before the owner will need to accept the terms of a full recourse loan.

The assumptions page (See APPENDIX-VIII) shows the terms of the loan for a hotel. The loan will have a fixed interest rate of $6.03 \%$. It will be a 10 year loan with a 25 year amortization, requiring a debt service coverage ratio of 1.30 the actual debt service coverage ratio is 1.83. The Bank requires an LTV of $60 \%$. The value of the asset will be based off the third years NOI. This is the projected year for stabilization. The loan will total $\$ 19.5$ million. The balloon payment due at the end of year 10 is $\$ 14.9$ million.

The construction loan is at a higher interest rate of $9.0 \%$ (See APPENDIX XII). The construction loan interest and $2 \%$ loan fee total $\$ 1.1$ million. The length of the loan is based on a construction schedule of 12 months.

## Equity Financing

The leveraged IRR for the hotel is $13.41 \%$ (See APPENDIX V: Before Tax Equity Cash Flow Analysis). Typically investors like to see returns on hotel equity investments to be above 20\%. ${ }^{\text {kii }}$ The return is significantly lower and may create some concern for investors looking at the deal. However, one could easily make the argument that given the current economic conditions a return of $13.41 \%$ is a significantly higher return than most investments currently available. If the equity provider feels confident that the project is viable then these returns may be sufficient. Going with the assumption that an IRR of $13.41 \%$ is an acceptable return then the net present value (NPV) of the project is at $\$ 287,347$ thousand. The permanent financing is based off the $3^{\text {rd }}$ years NOI and an LTV of $60 \%$. This requires the equity partners to contribute a combined total of $\$ 13,045,669$. The "sponsor" or developer will be contributing $\$ 3$ million dollars ( $23 \%$ of required equity) and the equity partner will be required to contribute the remaining $\$ 10,045,669$ ( $77 \%$ of required equity). Under this assumption the developer will own $23 \%$ of the development, and the equity partner will own $77 \%$. The IRR for the equity investment is $13.41 \%$ and the IRR is $5.98 \%$ in the first year, $8.67 \%$ in the second and rising to $13.74 \%$ by year 9 . This would be the scenario if the equity returns were based off a Parri-Passu partnership.

Another possibility would be that the equity partnership be set up in an $8 \%$ cumulative noncompounded return on equity. In this scenario the equity partner gets a return of $8 \%$. Anything in excess of $8 \%$ is split $50 / 50$ between the "sponsor" and equity partner. It becomes a little more complicated at the sale of the asset. At this point the equity sponsor is paid back in full if they haven't been already. After that that the first $50 \%$ of the remaining cash flow is paid as follows, $5 \%$ to the "sponsor" and $45 \%$ to the equity partner. The remaining $50 \%$ goes to the "sponsor".

## TABLE 1.14 EQUITY SPLITS

|  | Parri-Passu | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ Non-Compounded |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| INVESTOR II -Equity Partner |  |  |
| IRR | $13.41 \%$ | $13.22 \%$ |
| Payback Period | 10 years\% | 8.5 years |
|  |  |  |
| INVESTOR I - SPONSOR (DEVELOPER) | $13.41 \%$ | $11.52 \%$ |
| IRR | 10 years | 10 years |
| Payback Period |  |  |

With the assumptions already outlined it becomes evident that there are advantages and disadvantages to both. Parri-Passu generates a higher IRR however for both the developer and the equity partner however; it has a longer payback period for both investors. Depending on the equity partners return requirements they may want to go with an $8 \%$ Non-compounded approach this option returns their initial investment sooner and has an IRR for the equity partner that is comparable to the Parri-Passu equity structure.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## Timeline

The development plan is an instrumental part of completing the project. It gives the milestones and necessary dates for the project's completion. The tasks are organized into several different categories that are listed below.

Partnership: A crucial step when starting the process of the development is the formation of partnerships. The developer will solicit an equity partner for the redevelopment of 7550 Wisconsin Avenue. The equity partner will require the following information in order to make the decision.

1. Zoning requirements for the building
2. Estimated hard and soft costs for the development
3. 10 year discounted cash flow analysis detailing cash flows, net present value, and internal rates of return.
4. Proposal for the equity partnership between the developer, and equity partner.

An RFP will be distributed to several local area general contractors. The numbers will be vague and lack detail however; they will provide the developer and potential equity partner an understanding of the costs associated with the proposed development. This is scheduled to take one month and will be handled and presented by the developer. All fees associated with the development will be disclosed.

Market Study: Assuming both parties feel comfortable with the costs the next step is to issue and RFP for a third party market analysis. The analysis should have the following information included. The purpose of the market study is to "identify prospective users of real estate, both buyers and renters, and their characteristics. Most real estate market analyses examine both the market potential and the marketability, or competitiveness, of the proposed project."lxiii The analysis will contain the following information; a description of the regional and metropolitan area, defining the market area, demand analysis, supply analysis, recommendations, economic indicators, historical trends and current conditions, future construction activity, and product types.

Brand Selection: Based off of the market research several brands will be considered. This is a very important part of the process. These hotel brands will require certain design elements be included in their hotels. These requirements will be negotiated and priced thorough an architect. The selected brand will bring credibility to the proposal from the perspective of the lender. It is expected that the developer and equity partner finalize a fee structure and finished project for the development with the brand within 3 months of starting the search.

Design: As soon as the developer and equity partner form a contractual obligation the next will be to choose an architect. The architect should be part of the RFP to general contractors and understand the scope of work being proposed. They must have a license to do business in Maryland and have experience with hotel design and development. The architect's first step will be to recreate the original plans. This will be necessary in expediting the process for bids and be mandatory for permits and fees from Montgomery County. Most architects prohibit the reuse of plans. This clause will need to be researched with the original plans because it was designed and constructed over 45 years ago. The next step will be to design the schematic plans. These plans will be given to the general contractor and the selected hotel brand. The schematic plans will be presented to Montgomery County for a design review. The next step for the architect will be to complete the design development drawings, and submit them to the county and provide a copy to the general contractor. These plans along with the $80 \%$ completed construction documents will be reviewed by the county and be approved for permitting. The last step for the architect is to get the construction document to $100 \%$ this is scheduled to be completed by 5/1/2011.

Permitting and Approvals: The schedule provides an outline for the permitting and approval process. The construction documents will be $80 \%$ completed and turned into the city by $3 / 1 / 2011$ with the final construction documents being completed two months later. The building design approval and right to begin construction will begin seven months later on 5/1/2011.

Financing: It is assumed that permanent financing will be necessary to secure in order to obtain a construction loan. This permanent financing will be based up the discounted cash flow of the project as well as total development costs provided by the general contractor. Upon securing permanent financing it will take two months to secure a construction loan. The first draw on the construction loan will happen at the end of May 2011 the first month of construction.

Construction: It is imperative that the general contractor (GC) be chosen early in the design process. It is assumed that the GC is chosen and contractually bound by $5 / 1 / 2011$. The selected $G C$ will be working under the guidelines of a guaranteed maximum price (GMP). The sooner a GS is selected the better it is for the design and the start of the development. If a contractor is not selected until the plans are $100 \%$ complete the project will be delayed several months. It is assumed that the GC will be chosen and GMP agreed upon based off the $80 \%$ construction documents distributed on $4 / 1 / 2011$. The total construction
time is scheduled to take 12 months. The GC will start May of 2011 and finish May of 2012 with one month for final clean and grand opening preparation in June of 2012.

## Project Risks

Entitlement Risks: The entitlement process can be very risky for most development projects. For the proposed development it is not expected to experience any major setbacks while attempting approval. The reason for this is that the project is working within its allowable use and is therefore a by right development. The entitlement risks that may be encountered will be with the county accepting the design proposal. It is not expected that this will occur given that the project will be very conservative and appropriate for the Bethesda downtown area. However, it will be important that the design team pay close attention to the process of getting approval to redevelop the site.

Construction Cost Risks: Construction costs account for the largest portion of the development. It is important they be closely monitored to assure that the project does not run over budget. Hard costs account for $56 \%$ of the total development cost and $77 \%$ of the combined hard and soft costs see (APPENDIX 1: Development Costs). Material costs fluctuate and can become dangerously overpriced if not properly secured through written documentation. These responsibilities are primarily handled by the GC and developer. The failure to accurately estimate costs can become problems for furniture fixtures and equipment (FF\&E) and operating supplies and equipment (OS\&E). These items are not required to be on the job until the end of the project however; they must be priced and purchased months before they are needed. Offsite storage of such items is also important. Stolen or damaged goods may not be covered by insurance and can become a costly overrun of the development budget. It is assumed that the building will be LEED certified and therefore meet all of the necessary requirements for the buildings certification. Many hotel brands require that new construction or redeveloped hotels follow the LEED certification steps as a requirement for their brand. The risks associated with acquiring the LEED certification happen primarily during the construction stage of development. It will be important for the developer and GC to work together so that this goal is met. LEED certified buildings create lower operating costs and attract environmentally conscious customers that create value through higher net operating incomes year over year.

Financing Risk: A termination clauses will be required for every contracted member of the development team. This is a preventive measure in the event that financing becomes unavailable. Today's financial market is extremely volatile. Equity requirements from the bank may change as well as the availability of construction loans and permanent financing. The pro forma and discounted cash flow analysis are based off of the terms given earlier in this analysis. If any of those terms change the returns and requirements of the developer and equity partner will have to be reevaluated.

Market Risk: Hotels are arguably the riskiest investment of any commercial real estate product. The metrics used to determine hotels performance like ADR and occupancy can change drastically depending on economic conditions. Even when times are good hotels may not be achieving their market share. It is important that the developer and equity partners evaluate their appetite for risk before considering this development. Although the pro forma assumes a $3 \%$ growth in ADR, it is important to remember that ADR growth one year may be $9 \%$ and $-3 \%$ the next. This is not uncommon for hotels. Owners must be prepared to experience highs and lows even in good economic times.

Brand Risk: Brands play an intricate part in a hotels success. Finding a brand that fits the market is important during the selection process. Brand recognition creates an identity between the hotel and the customer. Hotel brands charge a fee that provide services to the hotel like guest reservations, marketing and sales, food and beverage selections, and a loyal customer base. Franchise agreements typically last a minimum of 10 years, so selecting a brand that fits best for the owner and the site is very important.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion a full service boutique hotel located at 7550 Wisconsin Avenue has been found to be the highest and best use for the proposed site. Currently, economic conditions are unpredictable and require a significant commitment of capital. The proposed development is a unique investment given its location and the growth potential of the market. The assumptions used for this development project are conservative, and produced an unleveraged IRR of $9.47 \%$ and a leveraged IRR of $13.41 \%$. It is recommended that the developer move forward with the partnership formation, and take the project through the entitlement process, approvals financing, and development. Based on the development timeline it is anticipated that the grand opening will be June 2012.
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| APPENDIX 1: DEVELOPMENT COST SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| total gsf | 126,491 |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL RSF | 89,111 |  |  |  |  |
| total keys | 128 |  |  |  |  |
| total parking spaces | 99 |  |  |  |  |
| PARKING SPACES (Metered) | 45 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | cost | COST PER GSF | COST PER KEY | \% Of total cost |
| bulling acquistion |  | 9,094,298 | 71.90 | 71,049 | 27.88\% |
| hard costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Renovation |  | 16,083,484 | 180.49 | 125,652 | 49.31\% |
| Building |  | 13,786,986 | 154.72 | 107,711 | 42.27\% |
| Parking |  | 375,000 | 4.21 | 2,930 | 1.15\% |
| 4\% General Conditions |  | 566,479 | 6.36 | 4,426 | 1.74\% |
| 4\% General Contractors Fee |  | 589,139 | 6.61 | 4,603 | 1.81\% |
| 5\% Contingency |  | 765,880 | 8.59 | 5,983 | 2.35\% |
| Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment |  | 1,543,460 | 17.32 | 12,058 | 4.73\% |
| Guestrooms |  | 588,505 | 6.60 | 4,598 | 1.80\% |
| Corridors |  | 125,000 | 1.40 | 977 | 0.38\% |
| Public Areas |  | 275,000 | 3.09 | 2,148 | 0.84\% |
| Kitchen Equipment |  | 150,000 | 1.68 | 1,172 | 0.46\% |
| Laundry Equipment |  | 50,000 | 0.56 | 391 | 0.15\% |
| Fitnesss Equipment |  | 65,000 | 0.73 | 508 | 0.20\% |
| Information Technology |  | 245,000 | 2.75 | 1,914 | 0.75\% |
| $3 \%$ Purchasing Fee |  | 44,955 | 0.50 | 351 | 0.14\% |
| Operating Supplies and Equipment |  | 595,000 | 6.68 | 4,648 | 1.82\% |
| Guestrooms |  | 275,000 | 3.09 | 2,148 | 0.84\% |
| Public Area and Back of House |  | 225,000 | 2.52 | 1,758 | 0.69\% |
| Food and Beverage |  | 50,000 | 0.56 | 391 | 0.15\% |
| 3\% Purchasing Fee |  | 45,000 | 0.50 | 352 | 0.14\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.00\% |
| Total Hard Costs |  | 18,221,944 | 204.49 | 142,359 | 55.87\% |
| SOFt costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional Service and Fees |  | 668,500 | 7.50 | 5,223 | 2.05\% |
| Formal Market Study |  | 15,000 | 0.17 | 117 | 0.05\% |
| Architects and Engineers |  | 356,000 | 4.00 | 2,781 | 1.09\% |
| Testing, Inspectors, Appraisals |  | 38,500 | 0.43 | 301 | 0.12\% |
| Builders Risk Insurance |  | 102,000 | 1.14 | 797 | 0.31\% |
| Legal and Accounting Fees |  | 102,000 | 1.14 | 797 | 0.31\% |
| Municipal and Utility Fees |  | 25,000 | 0.28 | 195 | 0.08\% |
| Permits |  | 30,000 | 0.34 | 234 | 0.09\% |
| Project Management |  | 1,024,704 | 11.50 | 8,006 | 3.14\% |
| Salaries and Wages |  | 200,000 | 2.24 | 1,563 | 0.61\% |
| Travel and Expenses |  | 25,000 | 0.28 | 195 | 0.08\% |
| Developer's Fee | 3.50\% | 799,704 | 8.97 | 6,248 | 2.45\% |
| Other Soft Costs |  | 3,604,725 | 40.45 | 28,162 | 11.05\% |
| Property Taxes |  | 135,000 | 1.51 | 1,055 | 0.41\% |
| Construction Loan Interest |  | 953,965 | 10.71 | 7,453 | 2.93\% |
| Loan Fees |  | 195,685 | 2.20 | 1,529 | 0.60\% |
| Developer Equity Carrying Costs |  | 1,420,075 | 15.94 | 11,094 | 4.35\% |
| Marketing and Pre-Opening |  | 250,000 | 2.81 | 1,953 | 0.77\% |
| Project Contingency |  | 650,000 | 7.29 | 5,078 | 1.99\% |
| total soft costs |  | 5,297,929 | 59.45 | 41,390 | 16.24\% |
| development costs |  | 23,519,873 | 263.94 | 183,749 | 72.12\% |
|  |  | cost | COST PER GSF | COST PER KEY | \% OF Total cost |
| LAND Costs |  | 9,094,298 | 72 | 71,049 | 27.88\% |
| hard costs |  | 18,221,944 | 204 | 142,359 | 55.87\% |
| SOFt Costs |  | 5,297,929 | 59 | 41,390 | 16.24\% |
| total development costs |  | 32,614,172 | 336 | 254,798 | 100.00\% |

APPENDIX II: DISCOUNTED CAS FLOW ANALYSIS

| YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| total keys |  |  |  | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| rooms available |  |  |  | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 | 46,720 |
| ROoms occupied |  |  |  | 32,237 | 34,573 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 | 35,040 |
| ADR |  |  | 3.00\% | 225 | 232 | 239 | 246 | 253 | 261 | 269 | 277 | 285 | 294 | 302 |
| Occ |  |  |  | 69\% | 74\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% |
| RevPAR |  |  |  | 155.25 | 171.50 | 179.03 | 184.40 | 189.93 | 195.63 | 201.50 | 207.54 | 213.77 | 220.18 | 226.79 |
| revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ 12 |  | Rooms |  | 7,253,280 | 8,012,246 | 8,364,136 | 8,615,060 | 8,873,511 | 9,139,717 | 9,413,908 | 9,696,326 | 9,987,215 | 10,286,832 | 10,595,437 |
|  |  | Food | 3.00\% | 199,465 | 220,337 | 230,014 | 236,914 | 244,022 | 251,342 | 258,882 | 266,649 | 274,648 | 282,888 | 291,375 |
|  |  | Beverage | 3.00\% | 199,465 | 220,337 | 230,014 | 236,914 | 244,022 | 251,342 | 258,882 | 266,649 | 274,648 | 282,888 | 291,375 |
|  |  | Parking | 3.00\% | 197,100 | 203,013 | 209,103 | 215,376 | 221,838 | 228,493 | 235,348 | 242,408 | 249,680 | 257,171 | 264,886 |
|  |  | Other Income | 3.00\% | 100,000 | 103,000 | 106,090 | 109,273 | 112,551 | 115,927 | 119,405 | 122,987 | 126,677 | 130,477 | 134,392 |
|  |  | total revenue |  | 7,949,310 | 8,758,933 | 9,139,356 | 9,413,537 | 9,695,943 | 9,986,822 | 10,286,426 | 10,595,019 | 10,912,870 | 11,240,256 | 11,577,463 |
| \% Of DEPT REV |  |  | DEPARTMENTAL EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20\% | Rooms |  | 1,450,656 | 1,602,449 | 1,672,827 | 1,723,012 | 1,774,702 | 1,827,943 | 1,882,782 | 1,939,265 | 1,997,443 | 2,057,366 | 2,119,087 |
|  | 90\% | Food |  | 179,519 | 198,303 | 207,012 | 213,223 | 219,619 | 226,208 | 232,994 | 239,984 | 247,184 | 254,599 | 262,237 |
|  | 70\% | Beverage |  | 139,626 | 154,236 | 161,010 | 165,840 | 170,815 | 175,940 | 181,218 | 186,654 | 192,254 | 198,022 | 203,962 |
|  | 65\% | Parking |  | 98,550 | 101,507 | 104,552 | 107,688 | 110,919 | 114,246 | 117,674 | 121,204 | 124,840 | 128,585 | 132,443 |
|  |  | Other IncomeTOTAL EXPENSES |  | 65,000 | 66,950 | 68,959 | 71,027 | 73,158 | 75,353 | 77,613 | 79,942 | 82,340 | 84,810 | 87,355 |
|  |  |  |  | 1,933,350 | 2,123,445 | 2,214,359 | 2,280,790 | 2,349,214 | 2,419,690 | 2,492,281 | 2,567,049 | 2,644,061 | 2,723,383 | 2,805,084 |
| total departmental income |  |  |  | 6,015,960 | 6,635,488 | 6,924,997 | 7,132,747 | 7,346,729 | 7,567,131 | 7,794,145 | 8,027,970 | 8,268,809 | 8,516,873 | 8,772,379 |
| \% OF TOT REV | OPERATING EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9\% | Admin - General |  | 754,549 | 831,398 | 867,508 | 893,533 | 920,339 | 947,949 | 976,388 | 1,005,679 | 1,035,850 | 1,066,925 | 1,098,933 |
|  | 5\% | Sales and Marketing |  | 500,000 | 480,953 | 501,842 | 516,897 | 532,404 | 548,376 | 564,828 | 581,772 | 599,226 | 617,202 | 635,719 |
|  | 6\% | Operations and Maintenance |  | 476,959 | 525,536 | 548,361 | 564,812 | 581,757 | 599,209 | 617,186 | 635,701 | 654,772 | 674,415 | 694,648 |
|  | 4\% | Utilities |  | 317,972 | 350,357 | 365,574 | 376,541 | 387,838 | 399,473 | 411,457 | 423,801 | 436,515 | 449,610 | 463,099 |
|  |  | TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES |  | 2,049,480 | 2,188,244 | 2,283,285 | 2,351,784 | 2,422,338 | 2,495,008 | 2,569,858 | 2,646,954 | 2,726,362 | 2,808,153 | 2,892,398 |
| gross operating profit |  |  |  | 3,966,480 | 4,447,244 | 4,641,712 | 4,780,963 | 4,924,392 | 5,072,124 | 5,224,287 | 5,381,016 | 5,542,447 | 5,708,720 | 5,879,982 |
| MANAGMEMENT / FRANCHISE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3\% | Management Fee |  | 238,479 | 262,768 | 274,181 | 282,406 | 290,878 | 299,605 | 308,593 | 317,851 | 327,386 | 337,208 | 347,324 |
| 6\% |  | Franchise Fee |  | 476,959 | 525,536 | 548,361 | 564,812 | 581,757 | 599,209 | 617,186 | 635,701 | 654,772 | 674,415 | 694,648 |
|  |  | total |  | 715,438 | 788,304 | 822,542 | 847,218 | 872,635 | 898,814 | 925,778 | 953,552 | 982,158 | 1,011,623 | 1,041,972 |
| income before fixed charges |  |  |  | 3,251,043 | 3,658,940 | 3,819,170 | 3,933,745 | 4,051,757 | 4,173,310 | 4,298,509 | 4,427,464 | 4,560,288 | 4,697,097 | 4,838,010 |
| fixed charges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Property Taxes | 3.00\% | 416,988 | 429,498 | 442,383 | 455,654 | 469,324 | 483,403 | 497,905 | 512,843 | 528,228 | 544,075 | 560,397 |
|  |  | Insurance | 3.00\% | 139,141 | 143,315 | 147,615 | 152,043 | 156,604 | 161,303 | 166,142 | 171,126 | 176,260 | 181,547 | 186,994 |
|  |  | total fixed charges |  | 556,129 | 572,813 | 589,997 | 607,697 | 625,928 | 644,706 | 664,047 | 683,969 | 704,488 | 725,622 | 747,391 |
| 5\% REPLACEMENT RESERVES |  |  |  | 397,466 | 437,947 | 456,968 | 470,677 | 484,797 | 499,341 | 514,321 | 529,751 | 545,643 | 562,013 | 578,873 |
| Net operating income |  |  |  | 2,297,448 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,648,181 \\ 13.2 \% \end{array}$ | 2,772,205$4.5 \%$ | $2,855,371$$2.9 \%$ | 2,941,032 | 3,029,263 | 3,120,141 | 3,213,7452.9\% | 3,310,157 | 3,409,462 | $3,511,746$$2.9 \%$ |
| Annual \% Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.9\% |  |
| terminal cap rate |  |  |  | 9.50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SALE PRICE (BASED ON YR 11 Noil) |  |  |  | 36,965,746 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SELING COSTS <br> yr 10 reversion value |  |  | 3.00\% | $36,965,74$ $1,108,972$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 35,856,773 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNLEVERAGED CASH FLOW SUMMARY |  |  |  | $(32,614,172)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,297,448 \\ 7.04 \% \end{array}$ | 2,648,181$8.12 \%$ | 2,772,205 | 2,855,371 | 2,941,032 | 3,029,263 | 3,120,141 | 3,213,745 | 3,310,157 | 39,266,235 |  |
|  |  | RETURN ON ASSETS | 8.50\% |  |  |  | 8.75\% | 9.02\% | 9.29\% | 9.57\% | 9.85\% | 10.15\% | 120.40\% |  |

## APPENDIX III: STABILIZED INCOME ANALYSI

| YEAR | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| TOTAL GSF | 126,491 |
| TOTAL KEYS | 128 |
| ROOMS AVAILABLE | 46,720 |
| ROOMS OCCUPIED | 32,237 |
| ADR | 225 |
| OCC | $69 \%$ |
| RevPAR | 155.25 |

REVENUE
$\quad$ Rooms
Food
$\quad$ Beverage
Parking
Other Income
TOTAL REVENUE
DEPARTMENTAL EXPENSES
Rooms
Food
Beverage
Parking
Other Income
TOTAL EXPENSES
TOTAL DEPARTMENTAL INCOME
OPERATING EXPENSES
Admin - General
$\quad$ Sales and Marketing
Operations and Maintenance
Utilities
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES
GROSS OPERATING PROFIT

| MANAGMEMENT / FRANCHISE |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management Fee | 238,479 | $1,863.12$ | $3.00 \%$ | 1.89 |
| $\quad$ Franchise Fee | 476,959 | $3,726.24$ | $6.00 \%$ | 3.77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| INCOME BEFORE FIXED CHARGES | $3,251,043$ | $25,398.77$ | $40.90 \%$ | 25.70 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FIXED CHARGES | 416,988 | $3,257.72$ | $5.25 \%$ | 3.30 |
| $\quad$ Property Taxes | 139,141 | $1,087.04$ | $1.75 \%$ | 1.10 |
| $\quad$ Insurance | 556,129 | $4,344.76$ | $7.00 \%$ | 4.40 |
| $\quad$ TOTAL FIXED CHARGES | 397,466 | $3,105.20$ | $5.00 \%$ | 3.14 |
| REPLACEMENT RESERVES | $2,297,448$ | $17,948.81$ | $28.90 \%$ | 18.16 |


| YEAR | 4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| TOTAL GSF | 126,491 |
| TOTAL KEYS | 128 |
| ROOMS AVAILABL | 46,720 |
| ROOMS OCCUPIEC | 35,040 |
| ADR | 239 |
| OCC | $75 \%$ |
| RevPAR | 179.03 |

## APPENDIX IV: PROJECT FINANCING

| CAPITAL SOURCES AND USES | Stabilized Loan terms |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AMOUNT | \% OF TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Interest rate |  | 6.03\% |  |
| SOURCES |  |  |  | TERM |  | 10 |  |
| DEVELOPER | 3,000,000 |  |  | AMORTIZATION |  | 25 |  |
| CHAPPELL HILL INVESTMENT GROUP | 10,045,669 |  |  | MAX LTV |  | 60\% |  |
| Total Equity | 13,045,669 |  |  | APPLIED CAP RATE |  | 8.50\% |  |
|  |  |  |  | Year 1 NOI |  | 2,772,205 |  |
| BANK LOAN | 19,568,503 |  |  | Value at cap rat |  | 32,614,172 |  |
| total | 32,614,172 |  |  | MAX LOAN AMT |  | 19,568,503 |  |
|  |  |  |  | MIN DCR |  | 1.35 |  |
|  |  |  |  | MAX ANNUAL PMT | given DCR | 2,053,485 |  |
| USES |  |  |  | MAX LOAN AMT given DCR |  | 26,484,147 |  |
| Hard Costs | 18,221,944 |  |  | Projected loan amt |  | 19,568,503 |  |
| Soft Costs | 5,297,929 |  |  | MONTHLY PMT |  | 126,439 |  |
| Acquistion | 9,094,298 |  |  | ANNUAL PMT |  | 1,517,271 |  |
| total | 32,614,172 |  |  | DEBT CONSTANT |  | 12 |  |
|  |  |  |  | YR 10 ballon Pmt |  | 14,954,755 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2\% LOAN FEE |  | 391,370 |  |
| CONSTRUCTION LOAN TERMS | CONSTRUCTION DRAW SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | MONTH | DATE | draw | total draw | Interest | total interest |
|  |  | 1 | 2/1/2011 | 986,530 | 986,530 | 6,577 | 6,577 |
|  |  | 2 | 3/1/2011 | 1,125,350 | 2,111,880 | 14,079 | 20,656 |
| InTEREST RATE (INTEREST ONLY) | 8.00\% | 3 | 4/1/2011 | 1,352,691 | 3,464,571 | 23,097 | 43,753 |
| term | 3 years max | 4 | 5/1/2011 | 1,698,658 | 5,163,229 | 34,422 | 78,175 |
| AMORTIZATION | None | 5 | 6/1/2011 | 1,785,105 | 6,948,334 | 46,322 | 124,497 |
| Projected loan amount | 18,221,944 | 6 | 7/1/2011 | 2,198,655 | 9,146,989 | 60,980 | 185,477 |
| TOTAL INTEREST PAID | 782,925 | 7 | 8/1/2011 | 1,985,351 | 11,132,340 | 74,216 | 259,692 |
| 1\% Loan fee | 179,498 | 8 | 9/1/2011 | 1,786,510 | 12,918,850 | 86,126 | 345,818 |
|  |  | 9 | 10/1/2011 | 1,629,634 | 14,548,484 | 96,990 | 442,808 |
|  |  | 10 | 11/1/2011 | 1,423,598 | 15,972,082 | 106,481 | 549,289 |
|  |  | 11 | 12/1/2011 | 1,123,560 | 17,095,642 | 113,971 | 663,260 |
|  |  | 12 | 1/1/2012 | 854,123 | 17,949,765 | 119,665 | 782,925 |
| EQUITY CARRYING COSTS | EQUITY CONTRIBUTION SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | MONTH | Date | draw | total draw | interest | total interest |
|  |  | 1 | 7/1/2010 | 50000 | 50000 | 396 | 396 |
|  |  | 2 | 8/1/2010 | 50000 | 100000 | 792 | 1,188 |
| COST OF FUNDS | 9.50\% | 3 | 9/1/2010 | 50000 | 150000 | 1,188 | 2,375 |
| INITIAL EQUITY AMOUNT | 1,815,000 | 4 | 10/1/2010 | 50000 | 200000 | 1,583 | 3,958 |
| TOTAL COST OF FUNDS | 113,881 | 5 | 11/1/2010 | 50000 | 250000 | 1,979 | 5,938 |
|  |  | 6 | 12/1/2010 | 50000 | 300000 | 2,375 | 8,313 |
|  |  | 7 | 1/1/2011 | 50000 | 350000 | 2,771 | 11,083 |
|  |  | 8 | 2/01/211 | 150000 | 500000 | 3,958 | 15,042 |
|  |  | 9 | 3/1/2011 | 150000 | 650000 | 5,146 | 20,188 |
|  |  | 10 | 4/1/2011 | 15000 | 665000 | 5,265 | 25,452 |
|  |  | 11 | 5/1/2011 | 175000 | 840000 | 6,650 | 32,102 |
|  |  | 12 | 6/1/2011 | 175000 | 1015000 | 8,035 | 40,138 |
|  |  | 13 | 7/1/2011 | 175000 | 1190000 | 9,421 | 49,558 |
|  |  | 14 | 8/1/2011 | 175000 | 1365000 | 10,806 | 60,365 |
|  |  | 15 | 9/1/2011 | 150000 | 1515000 | 11,994 | 72,358 |
|  |  | 16 | 10/1/2011 | 125000 | 1640000 | 12,983 | 85,342 |
|  |  | 17 | 11/1/2011 | 150000 | 1790000 | 14,171 | 99,513 |
|  |  | 18 | 12/1/2011 | 25000 | 1815000 | 14,369 | 113,881 |

## APPENDIX V: BEFORE TAX EQUITY CASH FLOW ANALYSIS

## net operating income <br> Annual \% Chang

operating expense ratio
TERMINAL CAP RATE
SALE PRICE (BASED ON YR 11 NOI)
SELING COTS
YR 10 REVERSION VALUE

UNLEVERAGED CASH FLOW SUMMARY
RETURN ON ASSETS
UNLEVERAGED IRR
debt service
debt service coverage ratio
CASH FLOW AFTER DEBT SERVICE

> YR 10 REVERSION VALUE
> LOAN PAYMENT
> BEFORE TAX CASH FLOW FROM SALE
leveraged cash flow summary
return on equity
EVERAGED IRR
discount rate
NPV

## PARTITIONIED IRE

\% OF BEFORE TAX CASH FLOW FROM NO
\% OF BEFORE TAX CASH FLOW FROM SAL

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2,297,448$ | $2,648,181$ | $2,772,205$ | $2,855,371$ | $2,941,032$ | $3,029,263$ | $3,120,141$ | $3,213,745$ | $3,310,157$ | $3,409,462$ |
|  | $13.24 \%$ | $4.47 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ |


|  | 10\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 36,965,746 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,108,972 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 35,856,773 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(32,614,172)$ | 2,297,448 | 2,648,181 | 2,772,205 | 2,855,371 | 2,941,032 | 3,029,263 | 3,120,141 | 3,213,745 | 3,310,157 | 39,266,235 |
|  | 7.04\% | 8.12\% | 8.50\% | 8.75\% | 9.02\% | 9.29\% | 9.57\% | 9.85\% | 10.15\% | 120.40\% |
| 9.47\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 | 1,517,271 |
|  | 1.51 | 1.75 | 1.83 | 1.88 | 1.94 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.12 | 2.18 | 2.25 |
|  | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,254,934 | 1,338,100 | 1,423,761 | 1,511,992 | 1,602,870 | 1,696,474 | 1,792,886 | 1,892,191 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,917,801 |
| 35,856,773 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14,954,755 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20,902,018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(13,045,669)$ | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,254,934 | 1,338,100 | 1,423,761 | 1,511,992 | 1,602,870 | 1,696,474 | 1,792,886 | 22,794,209 |
|  | 5.98\% | 8.67\% | 9.62\% | 10.26\% | 10.91\% | 11.59\% | 12.29\% | 13.00\% | 13.74\% | 174.73\% |
| 13.41\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3,286,863 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| APPENDIX VI: PARTNERSHIP STRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INITIAL EQUITY INVESTMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investor I - Sponsor (Developer) | 23\% | 3,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INVESTOR II-Equity Partner | 77\% | 10,045,669 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL EQUITY INVESTMENT | 100\% | 13,045,669 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PARRI-PASSU |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| BEFORE TAX EQUITY CASH FLOW SUMMARY |  | $(13,045,669)$ | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,254,934 | 1,338,100 | 1,423,761 | 1,511,992 | 1,602,870 | 1,696,474 | 1,792,886 | 22,794,209 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,650,204 |  |
| 77.00\% INVESTOR II -Equity Partner |  | $(10,045,669)$ | 600,767 | 870,844 | 966,347 | 1,030,389 | 1,096,351 | 1,164,292 | 1,234,272 | 1,306,351 | 1,380,592 | 17,552,422 |
| RETURN ON EQUITY |  |  | 5.98\% | 8.67\% | 9.62\% | 10.26\% | 10.91\% | 11.59\% | 12.29\% | 13.00\% | 13.74\% | 174.73\% |
| IRR |  | 13.41\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23.00\% INVESTOR I - SPONSOR (DEVELOPER) |  | $(3,000,000)$ | 179,411 | 260,066 | 288,586 | 307,711 | 327,410 | 347,700 | 368,598 | 390,124 | 412,295 | 5,241,788 |
| RETURN ON EQUITY |  |  | 5.98\% | 8.67\% | 9.62\% | 10.26\% | 10.91\% | 11.59\% | 12.29\% | 13.00\% | 13.74\% | 174.73\% |
| IRR |  | 13.41\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,881,900 |  |
| 8\% CUMULATIVE NON-COMPOUNDED RETURN ON EQUITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET CASH FLOW |  |  | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,254,934 | 1,338,100 | 1,423,761 | 1,511,992 | 1,602,870 | 1,696,474 | 1,792,886 | 22,794,209 |
| Distribution Level 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Equity |  |  | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 | 13,045,669 |
| Preferred Return | 8.00\% |  | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 |
| Cumulative Unpaid Preferred Return |  |  | 1,043,654 | 1,307,130 | 1,219,874 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 |
| Cash Distribution - Level 1 |  |  | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,219,874 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 | 1,043,654 |
| Remaining Unpaid Preferred Return |  |  | 263,476 | 176,220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Excess Funds |  |  |  |  | 35,060 | 294,446 | 380,107 | 468,338 | 559,216 | 652,821 | 749,233 | 848,538 |
| Distribution Level 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity Partners (Front-End) | 50.00\% |  |  |  | 17,530 | 147,223 | 190,054 | 234,169 | 279,608 | 326,410 | 374,616 | 424,269 |
| Promote - Sponsor (Back-End) | 50.00\% |  |  |  | 17,530 | 147,223 | 190,054 | 234,169 | 279,608 | 326,410 | 374,616 | 424,269 |
| Total-Distribution Level 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summary of Distributions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,962,493 |  |
| Equity Partners (Front-End) |  |  | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,237,404 | 1,190,877 | 1,233,707 | 1,277,823 | 1,323,262 | 1,370,064 | 1,418,270 | 1,467,922 |
| Promote - Sponsor (Back-End) |  |  | , | 0 | 17,530 | 147,223 | 190,054 | 234,169 | 279,608 | 326,410 | 374,616 | 424,269 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,254,934 | 1,338,100 | 1,423,761 | 1,511,992 | 1,602,870 | 1,696,474 | 1,792,886 | 1,892,191 |
| Projected Sales Price |  | 36,965,746 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additions to Sales Proceeds |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deductions From Sale |  | $(1,108,972)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loan Balance |  | (14,954,755) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Proceeds from Sale |  | 20,902,018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Flow Year 10 |  | $(1,892,191)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Return of Equity Group Initial Investment |  | (13,045,669) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balance to be distributed |  | 5,964,158 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distributions to all Equity Investors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INVESTORI - SPONSOR (DEVELOPER) | 5.00\% | 298,208 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INVESTOR II-Equity Partner | 45.00\% | 2,683,871 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution to Promote | 50.00\% | 2,982,079 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INVESTOR II-Equity Partner |  | $(10,045,669)$ | 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,237,404 | 1,190,877 | 1,233,707 | 1,277,823 | 1,323,262 | 1,370,064 | 1,418,270 | 14,197,462 |
| RETURN ON EQUITY |  |  | 7.77\% | 11.26\% | 12.32\% | 11.85\% | 12.28\% | 12.72\% | 13.17\% | 13.64\% | 14.12\% | 141.33\% |
| IRR |  | 13.22\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INVESTORI-SPONSOR (DEVELOPER) |  | $(3,000,000)$ | - | - | 17,530 | 147,223 | 190,054 | 234,169 | 279,608 | 326,410 | 374,616 | 6,704,555 |
| RETURN ON EQUITY |  |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.58\% | 4.91\% | 6.34\% | 7.81\% | 9.32\% | 10.88\% | 12.49\% | 223.49\% |
| IRR |  | 11.52\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX VII: AFTER TAX EQUITY CASH FLOW ANALYSIS

## net operating income

PLUS RESERVES
LESS INTEREST
Less buildable depreciation LESS DEPRECIATION ON IMPROVEMENTS
tax
CASH FLOW AFTER DEBT SERVICE
LESS TAX
$\frac{\text { LESS TAX }}{\text { AFTER TAX CASH FLOW }}$
ORIGINAL BASIS
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES
LESS ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION
ADJUSTED BASIS

RIC
LESS SELLING COSTS
LESS ADJUSTED BASIS
GAIN ON SALE

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,297,448 | 2,648,181 | 2,772,205 | 2,855,371 | 2,941,032 | 3,029,263 | 3,120,141 | 3,213,745 | 3,310,157 | 3,409,462 | 3,511,746 |
| 397,466 | 437,947 | 456,968 | 470,677 | 484,797 | 499,341 | 514,321 | 529,751 | 545,643 | 562,013 | 578,873 |
| $(1,170,501)$ | $(1,149,003)$ | $(1,126,172)$ | $(1,101,926)$ | $(1,076,177)$ | $(1,048,832)$ | $(1,019,791)$ | $(988,950)$ | $(956,196)$ | $(921,413)$ | $(884,473)$ |
| $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ | $(643,920)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $(70,441)$ | $(70,441)$ | $(70,441)$ | $(70,441)$ | $(70,441)$ | $(70,441)$ |
| 880,493 | 1,293,204 | 1,459,080 | 1,580,201 | 1,705,732 | 1,765,411 | 1,900,310 | 2,040,185 | 2,185,243 | 2,335,701 | 2,491,785 |
| 308,172 | 452,621 | 510,678 | 553,070 | 597,006 | 617,894 | 665,109 | 714,065 | 764,835 | 817,495 | 872,125 |
| 780,177 | 1,130,910 | 1,254,934 | 1,338,100 | 1,423,761 | 1,511,992 | 1,602,870 | 1,696,474 | 1,792,886 | 1,892,191 | 1,994,475 |
| $(308,172)$ | $(452,621)$ | $(510,678)$ | $(553,070)$ | $(597,006)$ | $(617,894)$ | $(665,109)$ | $(714,065)$ | $(764,835)$ | $(817,495)$ | $(872,125)$ |
| 472,005 | 678,288 | 744,256 | 785,029 | 826,755 | 894,098 | 937,761 | 982,409 | 1,028,051 | 1,074,696 | 1,122,350 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 32,614,172 \\ 5,477,797 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(7,083,120)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31,008,848 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 36,965,746 \\ & (1,108,972) \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(31,008,848)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,847,925 |


| CAPITAL GAIN TAX ON APPRECIATION | 15\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| tax on accumulated depreciation | 25\% | TOTAL TAX

before tax cash flow from sale
less tax
LESS TAX
AFTER TAX CASH FLOW SUMMARY retrun on equity
AFTER TAX IRR
\% Of BEFORE TAX CASH FLOW FROM NO \% OF BEFORE TAX CASH FLOW FROM SALE
$\qquad$

## -

$\qquad$ -


| OFFICE DCF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| Income | $\stackrel{\text { Rents }}{ }$ |  | 3,804,664 | 3,918,804 | 4,036,368 | 4,157,459 | 4,282,183 | 4,410,648 | 4,542,968 | 4,679,257 | 4,819,634 | 4,964,224 | 5,113,150 |
|  | Reimbursments |  | 380,466 | 391,880 | 403,637 | 415,746 | 428,218 | 441,065 | 454,297 | 467,926 | 481,963 | 499,422 |  |
|  | Parking | 4,574,209 | 120,000 | 123,600 | 127,308 | ${ }^{131,127}$ | 135,061 | 139,113 | 143,286 | 147,58 | 152,012 | 156,573 | 161,270 |
|  | Retail |  | 113,900 | 227,800 | 234,634 | ${ }^{241,673}$ | 248,923 | 256,391 | 264,083 | 272,055 | 280,165 | 288,50 | 297,227 |
|  | Other |  | ${ }^{6,500}$ | 6,695 | ${ }^{6,8966}$ | 7,103 | ${ }^{7,316}$ | ${ }^{7} 7.535$ | 7,761 | 7,994 | 8,234 | 8,481 | 8,735 |
|  | PGI |  | 4,252,530 | 4,668,779 | 4,808,843 | 4,953,108 | 5,101,701 | 5, 54,7532 | 5,412,395 | 5,574,767 | 5,742,010 | 5,994,270 | 6,091,998 |
|  | Vacancy |  | 2,212,765 | 1,167,195 | 480,884 | 495,311 | 510,170 | 525,475 | 541,239 | 557,477 | 574,201 | 591,427 | 699,170 |
|  | EGI |  | 2,121,765 | 3,501,584 | 4,327,958 | 4,45,797 | 4,591,531 | 4,729,277 | 4,871,155 | 5,017,290 | 5,167,809 | 5,322,843 | 5,48,528 |
| Expenses | Common Area Maintenance |  | 787,104 | 810,717 | 835,339 | 860,090 | 885,892 | 912,469 | 939,843 | 968,339 | 997,080 | 1,026,992 | 1,057,802 |
|  | Real Estate Txes |  | 590328 | 608.038 | 626,279 | 645,067 | 664,419 | 684,352 | 704883 | 726,029 | 747,810 | 770,244 | 793,351 |
|  | Insurance |  | 98,388 | 101,340 | 104,380 | 107,511 | 110,737 | 114,059 | 117,480 | 121,005 | 124,635 | 128,374 | 132,225 |
|  | Repairs |  | 147,582 | 152,009 | 156,570 | 161,267 | 166,105 | 171,088 | 176,221 | ${ }^{181,507}$ | ${ }^{186,952}$ | 192,561 | 198,338 |
|  | Management |  | 88,511 | ${ }_{91,166}$ | 93,901 | 96,718 | 99,619 | 102,08 | 105,686 | 108,857 | 112,123 | 115,486 | 118,951 |
|  | Retail xxpenses |  | 11,390 | 11,732 | 12,084 | 12.446 | 12,820 | 13,204 | 13,600 | 14,008 | 14,429 | 14,861 | 15,307 |
|  | total |  | 1,723,303 | 1,75,002 | 1,882,252 | 1,88,099 | 1,939,592 | 1,997,780 | 2,05,773 | 2,119,45 | 2,183,028 | 2,248,519 | 2,315,975 |
|  | Exxense Ratio |  | 77.88\% | 50.69\% | ${ }^{42.24 \%}$ | 42.24\% | ${ }^{42.24 \%}$ | 42,24\% | 42.24\% | ${ }^{42.24 \%}$ | 42.24\% | 42.24\% | 42.24\% |
| RESERVEs | Nol | (11,665,28) | 489,463 | 1,726,583 | 2,499,707 | 2,574,698 | 2,651,939 | 2,731,497 | 2,813,442 | 2,897,845 | 2,984,780 | 3,074,324 | 3,16,554 |
|  | Tenant Improvements (T.1.) |  |  |  |  | 49,194 | 4,194 |  |  | 1,967,760 |  |  |  |
|  | Leasing Commisions |  | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 | 24,597 |
|  | Capex |  | 73,991 | 73,91 | 73,991 | 73,991 | 73,791 | 73,991 | 73,791 | 73,791 | 73,791 | 73,991 | 73,791 |
|  | Total |  | 98,388 | 98,388 | 98,388 | 147,582 | 147,582 | 98,388 | 98,388 | 2,066,148 | 98,388 | 98,388 | 98,388 |
|  | cbos |  | 391,075 | 1,28,195 | 2,401,319 | 2,42,7116 | 2,504,357 | 2,633,109 | 2,715,054 | 831,697 | 2,886,392 | 2,975,936 | 3,068,166 |
|  | Debt Serice |  | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,01 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,101 | 1,601,10 |
|  | cfads |  | $(1,210,026)$ | 27,94 | 800,218 | 826,015 | 903,256 | 1,032,008 | 1,113,953 | (769,404) | 1,285,291 | 1,374,835 | 1,467,065 |
|  | Value At Sale (Reversion) Transaction Cost | $\begin{aligned} & 33,3,32,123 \\ & 9999,964 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Loan Repayment Net Gainon Sale | 16,297,61 16,034,518 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (11,665,28) | (1,210,026) | 27,94 | 800,218 | 826,015 | 903,256 | 1,032,008 | 1,113,953 | (769,404) | 1,285,291 | 17,00,352 |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {SAR }}^{\text {IRR }}$ | ${ }^{\text {7. }}$ 7.25\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {cash }}$ flow | ${ }^{27.75 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NPV | (2,356,640) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| APARTMENT DCF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INCOME | Year | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | ${ }_{3}^{12,75,336}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { Rents }}{ }$ |  | 2,72,000 | 2,855,160 | 2,940,815 | 3,29,039 | 3,119,910 | 3,213,508 | 3,309,913 | 3,409,210 | 3,511,487 | 3,616,831 |  |
|  | ParkingOther |  | 92,400 | 95,172 | 98,027 | 100,968 | 103,997 | 107,117 | 110,330 | 113,640 | 117,050 | 120,51125,589 |  |
|  |  |  | 97,20 | 9,931 | 102,229 | 106,016 | 109,197 | 112,473 | 115,847 | 119,322 | 122,902 |  |  |  |
|  | RetailPGI |  | 113,900 | 227,800 | 234,634 | 241,673 | 248,923 | 256,391 | 264,083 | 272,005 | 280,165 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 3,68, }{ }^{2681} & \text { 3,979,901 }\end{array}$ | 3,979,901 |
|  |  |  | 3,075,320 | 3,050,263 | 3,141,700 | 3,236,024 | 3,333,104 | 3,433,097 | 3,536,090 | 3,642,173 | 3,751,438 |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {PGI }}$ |  | 1,076,362 | 396,534 | 219,924 | 226,522 | 233,317 | 240,317 | 247,526 | 254,952 | 262,601 | 270,49 | 3,701,308 |
| EXPENsES | EGI |  | 1,998,958 | 2,653,28 | 2,921,847 | 3,00,502 | 3,099,87 | 3,192,781 | 3,288,564 | 3,387,221 | 3,488,838 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 3,593,503 } & \text { 3,701,308 } \\ & \end{array}$ |  |
|  | Common Area Maintenance |  | 311889 | 321,245 | 330.883 | 340.809 | 351,033 | 361.564 | 372.411 | 383,584 | 395,091 | 40,9,944389,503 |  |
|  | Real Estate Txes |  | 298,522 | 307,478 |  | 326,203 | 335,989 | 346,069 | 356.451 | 367.144 | 378,159 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{106,933}$ | 110,141 | 113,445 | ${ }_{1126849}$ | 120,354 | 123,965 | 127.684 | 131.514 | 1354.40 | ${ }^{139,524} 10{ }^{143,709}$ |  |
|  | Insurance |  | 222,778 | 229,461 | ${ }_{236,345}^{13,45}$ | 24,3,435 | ${ }_{250,738}^{120}$ | 255,260 | 266,008 | 27, ${ }^{1288}$ | 288,208 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 79,958 | 82,357 | 84,828 | 87,373 | 8,994 | 92,694 | 95,474 | 98,339 | 101,289 | 290,674 299,394 <br> 104,37 107,457 |  |
|  | ManagementRetail Expenses |  | 11,390 | 22,780 | 23,43 | 24,167 | 24,892 | 25,639 | 26,08 | 27,201 | 28,017 | $\begin{array}{lll}10,437 \\ 28,857 & 107,47 \\ 29,723\end{array}$ |  |
|  | $\frac{\text { ToTAL }}{\text { Expense Ratio }}$ |  | 1.031,469 | 1.073,462 | 1,105,666 | 1,138,836 | 1,173,001 | 1,208,919 | 1.244,436 | 1,281,769 | 1,320,223 | $1,359,829$ $1,400,624$ |  |
|  |  |  | 51.60\% | 40.45\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | 37.84\% | ${ }^{37.84 \%}$ |
| RESR2ves | Replacement ReservesCapex |  | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,20 | 30,250 | 30,5016,500 |  |
|  |  |  | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 |  |  |  |
|  | Nol |  | 967,489 | 1,580,267 | 1,816,181 | 1.870,666 | 1,926,786 | 1,984,590 | 2,044,128 | 2,105,451 | 2,168,615 | 2,233,673 | 2,30,684 |
|  | Replacement ReseresesCapEx |  | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,50 | 30,250 | 30,50 | 30,50 | 30,250 | 30,250 | 30,250 |
|  |  |  | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 | 16,500 |
|  | $\frac{\text { Capex }}{\text { Total }}$ |  | 46,750 | 46,750 | 46,750 | 46,750 | 46,750 | 46,750 | 46,750 | 46,750 | 4,7,50 | 4,7,50 | 46,750 |
|  | cbos |  | 920,739 | 1,533,517 | 1,769,431 | 1,823,916 | 1,880,036 | 1,937,840 | 1,997,378 | 2,058,701 | 2,121,865 | 2,186,923 | 2,253,934 |
|  | Debt Serice |  | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,490,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 | 1,990,857 |
|  | cfads |  | (570,119) | 42,659 | 278,573 | 333,059 | 389,179 | 446,983 | 500,520 | 567,844 | 631,008 | 699,066 | 763,076 |
|  | Value At Sale (Reversion) Transaction Cost Loan Repayment Net Gain on Sale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | IRR <br> SALE CASH FLOW NPV | (9,080,905) | (570,119) | 42,559 | 278,573 | 333,059 | 389,179 | 446,983 | 506,520 | 567,844 | 631,008 | 16,897,410 |  |
|  |  | 8.8.2\%\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 19.06\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (994,994) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX X: HOTEL DCF



APPENDIX XI: BACKDOOR APPROACH

| OFFICE "BACK DOOR" APPROACH |  | APARTMENT "BACK DOOR" APPROACH |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OFFICE RSF | 98,388 | APARTMENT RSF | 89,111 |
| BASE RENTS | 38.67 | RENTS | 2,940,815 |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | 4,808,843 | POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | 3,141,770 |
| VACANCY | 10.00\% | VACANCY | 7.00\% |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | 4,327,958 | EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | 2,921,847 |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | 42\% | OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | 38\% |
| NOI | 2,499,707 | NOI | 1,816,181 |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | 21,706,740 | DEVELOPMENT COSTS | 21,112,302 |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | 33,329,422 | SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | 30,269,682 |
| CAP RATE | 7.50\% | CAP RATE | 6.00\% |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | 11,622,682 | ACQUISITION AMOUNT | 9,157,380 |


| HOTEL "BACK DOOR" APPROACH |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| HOTEL RSF | 89,111 |
| AVERAGE DAILY RATE | 239 |
| POTENTIAL GROSS INCOME | $8,803,253$ |
| VACANCY (INCLUDED IN ADR) |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | $8,803,253$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSE RATIO | $65 \%$ |
| NOI | $2,772,205$ |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS | $23,519,873$ |
| SUPPORTABLE MORTGAGE AMOUNT | $32,614,172$ |
| CAP RATE | $8.50 \%$ |
| ACQUISITION AMOUNT | $9,094,298$ |



APPENDIX XIII: DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

|  | DURATION | START | FINISH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PARTNERSHIP FORMATION |  |  |  |
| Devleloper Proposal | 1 month | 10/1/2010 | 11/1/2010 |
| Market Study | 1 month | 10/1/2010 | 11/1/2010 |
| Research Hotel Brand | 1month | 10/1/2010 | 12/1/2010 |
| Select Developer | 2 month | 10/1/2010 | 12/1/2010 |
| Partnership Agreement | 2 month | 2/1/2011 | 3/1/2011 |
| Execute Franchise Agreement |  |  | 1/1/2011 |
| ARCHETECTURE/DESIGN |  |  |  |
| Re Draw plans | 1 month | 10/1/2010 | 11/1/2010 |
| New Schematic Drawings | 1 months | 12/1/2010 | 1/1/2011 |
| Design Development | 2 months | 1/1/2011 | 3/1/2011 |
| Construction Docs | 2 months | 4/1/2011 | 5/1/2011 |
| PERMITS AND APPROVALS |  |  |  |
| Conceptual Design Review |  |  | 12/1/2010 |
| Planning and Zoning Mtg. Approval |  |  | 2/1/2011 |
| Building Permit Review and Approval | 3 months | 2/1/2011 | 7/1/2011 |
| FINANCING |  |  |  |
| Obtain Permanent Financing |  |  | 2/1/2011 |
| Secure Construction Loan |  |  | 5/1/2011 |
| Construction Loan Begins |  |  | 5/1/2011 |
| Construction Take Out Begins |  |  | 5/1/2012 |
| CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |
| Solicit GC Pre-construction bids |  |  | 1/1/2011 |
| Distribute 80\% Construction Docs |  |  | 4/1/2011 |
| Distribute 100\% Construction Docs |  |  | 5/1/2011 |
| Sign GMP with GC |  |  | 5/1/2011 |
| Construction | 12 months |  | 5/1/2012 |
| Certificate of Occupancy |  |  | 5/1/2012 |
| Opening Clean \& Prep | 1 month | 5/1/2012 | 6/1/2012 |
| Grand Opening |  |  | 6/1/2012 |




|  | Msss | umary |  |  | tanausissum | Ssummar |  |  | senvec hotitanauss |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\substack{\text { csf } \\ \text { RsF }}}$ |  |  | , |  | $\underbrace{\text { c, }}_{\substack{126,91 \\ \text { 2,100 }}}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 6.655 \\ \mathrm{csf} \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\substack{126,91 \\ 89.11}}^{\text {and }}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 8,50\% } \\ 9.50 \%}}^{\text {en }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {offict }}{ }^{\text {Uss }}$ | untramur | L seavc нote |
| Patancis | ${ }_{38,5}{ }^{55}$ |  | 为越, |  |  |  |  | Toralkers | ${ }_{46,580}^{128}$ | costotsie |  | stamu |  |  |  |
| Retaliget | ${ }_{3}^{3000}$ | Ristremium | ${ }_{6}^{6,74 \%}$ | Retal ren | 34 | Restremenium | ${ }_{5.88 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {Rooms }}^{\text {Roccute }}$ | 35,900 | Rist prenium | ${ }^{120.00 \%}$ | Assmicost | 21,706,790 | ${ }^{21,112,302}$ |  |
|  |  | tent | , 5122 |  |  | ${ }^{\text {coser }}$ | ${ }^{302699688}$ |  | ${ }^{29}$ |  | ${ }^{13,338 \%}$ |  | , |  | ¢ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $32,614,172$ $9,094,298$ |
| orearance xxenss fatio | 42294 | ${ }_{\text {try }}$ | 65.00\% | opezarime expense ratio | 3, 3 7,898 | inv | 70.00\% | ofebatuc Exemses afio |  | ${ }_{\text {tu }}^{\text {tu }}$ | cosm |  |  |  |  |
| Nol ${ }_{\text {Neviopmenticost }}$ | (2,1,96,7700 |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { 1,001,201 } \\ 133,25}}{ }$ | Nol |  | ${ }_{\text {ammal }}$ Amonty | $\underset{\substack{1.490,857 \\ 122,238}}{ }$ | Nolliommentosis |  |  | (1, |  | ${ }_{\text {cher }}^{\text {7225\% }}$ | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{\substack{8.2 \% \\ 8.904 \%}}$ | (13.43\% |
| Supporatil moritage amount | 33,329,422 | ${ }_{\text {costant }}$ | ${ }^{1.601,1,01}$ | Supportall mortang amount | ${ }^{30,26,6,682}$ |  | $1,900,55$ | Supportable mortaga amount |  |  | 1,517,211 | cashfow |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ospl | ${ }_{\text {12356.640) }}^{12.50}$ |  | 9.157.30\% | $\substack{\text { poser } \\ \text { NpV }}$ | (194.994) |  | 9.092028 |  | 287,377 |  | ${ }^{(2,356,690)}$ |  |  |
|  | Upere Usasale | Usasale |  | full serice | Seleatsenice er | Ete |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {Alot }}^{\text {Alourtard }}$ |  | Fourseasors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hilion |  |  | whotel | $\xrightarrow{\text { Furur pont }}$ | Refeot try |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whore |  |  |  | , | Hpat fase | come |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sten |  |  | Wefit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Misale witr reis | Midesale winuoutse | (tany |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Motate of } \\ \text { Ref foot mn }}}{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\substack{\text { auality } \\ \text { Remada }}$ | La auina am |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



```
Individual Scissor Style
Parking Lift for Low Celling
```

Modelt. B Power Comime cial D.aty


TECHNICAL FEATURES:
WORKING, electro-hydraulic . three phase $220 / 380 \mathrm{~V} ., 1.5 \mathrm{Kw}$ CONTROLS, low voltage, 24 V ., "man present" system equipped with key.

Capacity, $44001 \mathrm{~b} . \mathrm{Kg} .2000$
Weight, $16541 \mathrm{~b} / 750 \mathrm{Kg}$.



SAFETY DEVICES
Mechanical safety device
Max loading valve
Operates through personal key only
Wheels stop knocker for the upper car
Dead Man safety lock present low voltage push-button Wheels stop knocker for the lower car
Manual Lowering valve in case of power failure.

For Additional Information Contact Us at: +1-800-422-5438
wown, parkmatic,com
E-mail: Info@parkmatic.com


WISCONSIN AVENUE

