Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study



September 8, 2016



DAVID PAUL ROSEN & ASSOCIATES DEVELOPMENT, FINANCE AND POLICY ADVISORS











SUBMITTED TO:

City of Denver Office of Economic Development 201 W. Colfax Ave. #907 Denver, CO 80202

SUBMITTED BY:

David Paul Rosen & Associates

3527 Mt. Diablo Blvd, #361 Lafayette, CA 94549 510-451-2552 510-451-2554 Fax david@draconsultants.com www.draconsultants.com

3941 Hendrix Street Irvine, CA 92614 949-559-5650 949-559-5706 Fax nora@draconsultants.com www.draconsultants.com













Table of Contents

Executive Summary1
Development Prototypes1
Findings of the Nexus Fee Analysis2
Findings of the Economic Feasibility Analysis
Introduction12
Contents of Report12
Target Income Levels
Development Prototypes14
Residential Nexus Analysis16
Nexus Methodology and Use of the IMPLAN Model
The IMPLAN Model17
Disposable Income of New Households
Projected Employment Generation
Projected Household Growth
Projected Low and Moderate Income Households20
Non-Residential Nexus Analysis23
Overview of Non-Residential Nexus Methodology23
Non-Residential Nexus Methodology and Assumptions24
Estimate Total New Employees in Prototype Buildings24
Estimate New Employees Living in the City of Denver25
Adjust for Potential Increase in Future Labor Force
Participation25
Adjust from Employees to Employee Households26
Distribute Employee Households By Occupation26
Estimate Wages by Occupation27
Estimate Low and moderate Income Households27
Affordability Gap Analysis29
Methodology29
Calculation of Per Unit Affordability Gaps



















Executive Summary

The City of Denver (City) retained David Paul Rosen & Associates (DRA) to prepare a nexus study addressing the relationship between market-rate residential and nonresidential development and the need for affordable housing in the City. The nexus analysis estimates the number of low and moderate income households associated with development of new market-rate housing and non-residential development in the City, and calculates the maximum legally justifiable nexus fee by land use, based on the cost to produce housing affordable to these households. The study also examines the potential effect of alternative levels of a nexus fee on the economic feasibility of new residential and non-residential development using a series of residential and non-residential development prototypes.

DRA worked with Residential and Commercial Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs) composed of local Denver area developers and real estate professionals to review and provide input on the development prototypes and economic assumptions used in the analysis.

Development Prototypes

DRA conducted the nexus fee and economic feasibility analyses using ten residential and non-residential development prototypes¹ developed in conjunction with City staff and the Residential and Commercial Technical Advisory Groups. These prototypes represent the type of projects that have been recently developed and are in the development pipeline in the City.

The prototypes analyzed include high-rise residential and office prototypes limited to the greater Downtown area and low- and mid-rise development prototypes that could be built under current zoning in different market areas across the City. The



¹ DRA evaluated an eleventh prototype (manufacturing) for the nexus analysis only.

tenure, number of units and building heights of the prototypes are summarized in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Summary of Development Prototypes Denver Nexus Housing Study									
Residential Prototypes	Total Hsg. Units	Residential Tenure	Appx. Bldg. Stories	Density (DUs/Acre)					
SFD Infill	1 Owner		2 Stories	7					
Townhomes	10	Owner	3 Stories	44					
12-Story Condominium	232 Owner		12 Stories	233					
5-Story Apartment	300 Rental		5 Stories	100					
20-Story Apartment	285	Rental	20 Stories	475					
Non-Residential Prototypes	Net B	ldg. SF	Appx. Bldg. Stories	Density (FAR)					
Mid-Rise Office	64,	,000	5 Stories	2.5					
High-Rise Office	128	3,000	12 Stories	5.0					
Hotel	50,	,000	4 Stories	0.7					
Stand-Alone Retail	25,	,000	1 Story	0.2					
Warehouse	250	250,000 1 Story		0.4					
Manufacturing*	100	100,000 1 Story		0.4					

*Used in nexus analysis only; not analyzed in the economic feasibility analysis. Source: City of Denver; DRA.

Findings of the Nexus Fee Analysis

The nexus fee analysis estimates the number of low and moderate income households associated with development of new market-rate housing and non-residential development in the City, and calculates the maximum legally justifiable nexus fee based on the cost to produce housing affordable to these households. **Table 2** summarizes the estimated maximum legally justifiable nexus fees for the residential prototypes and non-residential land uses.

Residential nexus fees were estimated under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios reflecting the range of estimated home prices and rents for the prototypes. For the



low- and mid-rise prototypes, these scenarios represent the range of market conditions found in different areas of the City. For the high-rise prototypes, these scenarios represent an estimated range of assumptions for the Downtown area. The nexus fees in Table 2 reflect the middle-cost scenario.

Table 2 Estimated Maximum Legally Justifiable Nexus Fees ¹ Residential and Non-Residential Development Prototypes ² Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Fee and Economic Impact Analysis										
	Nexus Fee per Gross Square Foot									
Prototype	Under 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	80% to 120% AMI	Total					
SFD Infill	\$3.17	\$5.31	\$1.12	\$0.00	\$9.60					
Townhomes	\$5.09	\$8.61	\$1.75	\$0.00	\$15.45					
12-Story Condominium	\$6.10	\$10.32	\$2.10	\$0.00	\$18.52					
Apartment	\$5.19	\$9.01	\$1.82	\$0.00	\$16.02					
20-Story Apartment	\$6.36	\$10.90	\$2.19	\$0.00	\$19.44					
Office	\$11.17	\$32.72	\$12.86	\$0.00	\$56.74					
Hotel	\$40.85	\$37.20	\$4.97	\$0.00	\$83.02					
Stand-Alone Retail	\$63.40	\$46.09	\$9.81	\$0.00	\$119.29					
Warehouse	\$6.59	\$17.47	\$4.45	\$0.00	\$28.51					
Manufacturing*	\$6.17	\$17.00	\$6.39	\$0.00	\$29.57					

¹For residential prototypes, nexus fees represent the middle-cost scenario.

²For primary use listed; some prototypes include ground floor retail.

*Used in nexus analysis only; not analyzed in economic feasibility analysis. Source: DRA

Findings of the Economic Feasibility Analysis

DRA prepared an economic feasibility analysis to assist the City in evaluating the potential impact of a nexus fee on new residential and non-residential development in Denver. DRA conducted the economic analysis using the residential and non-residential development prototypes described above. ¹

As noted above, DRA interviewed a number of residential and mixed-use developers active in Denver and participating in the Residential and Commercial



¹ No economic feasibility analysis was conducted for manufacturing uses.

Technical Advisory Groups to review the prototypes, revenue, operating cost and development cost assumptions used in the analysis, as well as target rates of return. DRA incorporated comments received from these developers into the analysis.

DRA evaluated the economic feasibility of the prototype developments using Return on Equity (ROE), Residual Land Value (RLV) and Return on Cost (ROC) approaches. The ROE approach calculates the value of a development based on its stabilized income potential and subtracts the costs of development (including land) to determine the net value of the investment, or developer/investor profit. Under the ROE approach, the financial feasibility of the prototypes is measured by the rate of the ROE that the resulting net investment value (or profit) represents. Land costs are held fixed at an estimated market land price and the economic impact of the program is shown as a change in the dollar amount of the net value of investment in the prototype and as a change in the ROE.

Residual Land Value analysis methodology calculates the value of a development based on its income potential and subtracts the costs of development (excluding land but including an assumed ROE), to yield the underlying value of the land. An alternative that generates a value to the land that is negative, or well below market land sales prices, is financially problematic.

Return on Cost is calculated by dividing net operating income by total development costs. It does not consider the benefits or risks of financial leverage and does not involve the use of cap rates.

All three approaches calculate the value of rental prototypes (residential and nonresidential) at a point in time based on the estimated stabilized net operating income of the prototype.

The analysis was conducted under two alternative capitalization ("cap") rate assumptions. The lower cap rate alternative is based on the low end of estimated current cap rates in Denver based on input from the TAGs, as well as a review of published cap rate data by land use for Denver. These current cap rates are close to the historically low levels seen in the development boom that has occurred in Denver and many metro areas across the country since the Great Recession. The high cap rate alternative is 50 basis points higher than the low cap rate assumed for each prototype.

The analysis examines the effect of nexus fees ranging from \$1.00 per gross building square foot to \$7.00 per gross square foot. The results of the analysis are



designed to inform the city as it evaluates a potential nexus fee and is one among other factors to consider in the public policy decision.

The results of the ROE and RLV analyses are summarized in **Table 3** under the low cap rate assumption and **Table 4** under the higher cap rate assumption. The findings are discussed below. Results are shown for all three scenarios (low-, middle- and high-cost), although it is expected that most development in Denver will occur in high-cost areas. Therefore, the discussion below focuses primarily on the high-cost scenario. All references to the ROE and the RLV are based on the results for the high cap rate assumption in Table 4. Given the relationship between the ROE and RLV calculations, the RLV exceeds the estimated land acquisition cost if the ROE is above the threshold rate of return. Therefore, the discussion focuses on the ROE and ROE measures.

The findings of the economic feasibility analysis are summarized as follows:

- 1. Returns for all three owner housing prototypes (single-family infill, townhomes and 12-story condos) exceed threshold returns for the ROC and ROE measures (15% and 10%, respectively) and the RLV exceeds estimated current land costs with no nexus fee. The ROC begins to fall below the threshold with a \$5.00 per square foot nexus fee under the low- and middle-cost scenarios and with a \$7.00 per square foot nexus fee under the high-cost scenario. The ROE measure exceeds the threshold and the RLV exceeds estimated land acquisition costs with fee levels up to \$7.00 per square foot at low-, middle-and high-cost scenarios.
- 2. For the 5-story rental prototype, the ROC measure is below the threshold of 6.5% with no fee and with all levels of the nexus fee tested. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 5.79% with no fee to 5.65% with a \$7.00 per square foot nexus fee, a reduction of 2% from the no fee alternative. With a \$2.00 per square foot nexus fee, the ROC is 5.75%, a decline of 0.3% from the no fee baseline. However, the ROE measure exceeds the threshold of 8% and the RLV exceeds estimated land acquisition costs at all fee levels up to \$7.00 under the low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios.
- 3. For the 20-story rental prototype, the ROC is below the threshold of 6.5% with no fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 6.24% with no fee to 6.20% with a nexus fee of \$2.00 per square foot and to 6.10% with a nexus fee of \$7.00 per square foot, reductions of 0.6% and 2%, respectively. The ROE measure exceeds the threshold of 8% and the RLV exceeds estimated land costs at all fee levels under low-, middle-, and high-cost scenarios.



- 4. The 5-story office prototype also does not meet the ROC threshold of 7.0% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 5.95% with no fee to 5.91% with a \$2.00 nexus fee and to 5.82% with a fee of \$7.00 per square foot, reductions of 0.7% and 2%, respectively. The ROE is also below the threshold of 8% for the low- and middle-cost scenarios. However, under the high-cost scenario, the ROE exceeds the threshold of 8% and the RLV exceeds estimated land acquisition costs at fee levels up to \$7.00 per square foot.
- 5. Similarly, the 12-story office prototype does not meet the ROC threshold of 7.0% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 5.93% with no fee to 5.90% with a fee of \$2.00 per square foot and to 5.80% with a fee of \$7.00 per square foot, reductions of 0.5% and 2%, respectively. This prototype performs best under the low-cost and middle-cost scenarios. For the high-rise office prototype, which is expected to be built only in high-cost areas such as the Downtown or Cherry Creek where rents are highest and higher density is allowed, the difference in these scenarios represents a sensitivity analysis of alternative cost and revenue assumptions that reflect specific site locational factors rather than larger geographic market variations. Under the low- and middle-cost scenarios, the ROE exceeds the threshold of 8% at all levels of a nexus fee up to \$7.00 per square foot. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROE falls below the threshold only with the \$7.00 fee.
- 6. For the 4-story hotel, the ROC exceeds the threshold of 9% only under the high-cost scenario. For this scenario, the ROC stays above the threshold at all fee levels up to \$7.00 per square foot, declining from 9.38% with no fee to 9.33% with a \$2.00 fee and to 9.21% with a \$7.00 fee, reductions of 0.5% and 2%, respectively.
- 7. The retail prototype does not meet the threshold ROC of 7.0% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 6.19% with not fee to 6.17% with a \$2.00 per square foot fee and to 6.05% with a \$7.00 per square foot fee, reductions of 0.3% and 2%, respectively. The ROE exceeds the threshold of 8.0% for all fee levels under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios.
- 8. The warehouse prototype also does not meet the threshold ROC of 7.5% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 6.68% with no fee to 6.58% with a \$2.00 per square foot fee and to 6.37% with a \$7.00 per square foot fee, reductions of 1% and 5%, respectively.



In summary, the analysis indicates that nexus fees up to \$7.00 per square foot have a relatively small effect on returns, with reductions in the ROC generally under 2%, based on the ROC, ROE and RLV measures for the prototypes analyzed. To the extent that fees at the levels analyzed do affect project feasibility, DRA expects that the market will adjust to fees at the moderate levels proposed over time. Regulation and development impact fees on residential development that increase the costs of development, including nexus fees, will ultimately be passed through to the landowner in the form of reduced land prices. In order for developers to profitably develop new projects, they will bid down land prices to the level that makes development feasible, given market economics and zoning regulations affecting the amount of development that can be built on a particular site. Land prices typically react quickly to factors that increase land prices, such as increases in rents and sales prices. Land prices tend to be slower to respond to factors that depress land prices, such as changing market conditions and increased regulation or fees, since owners who purchased the land recently may be reluctant to take a loss and others may be hesitant to adjust their expectations downward.

Land prices are also volatile in response to economic cycles and factors beyond the control of local government. For example, land will lose value in higher cap rate environments. If rates of return are far below target levels, or residual land values are very low or negative with little to no room for downward adjustment, it indicates that capitalized values are not sufficient to cover the other development costs besides land, and new development will be slowed or halted until market conditions change. This will be the case whether the loss in values is due to changing market conditions and cap rates or to governmental fees or regulations.



Table 3 Summary of Economic Feasibility Analysis Results Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Tenure	Owner	Owner	Owner	Renter	Renter					
Residential Units	1	10	232	300	285					
Residential Net SF	2,800	20,000	227,250	212,250	230,800	-	-	-	-	-
Site Area (SF)	6,250	10,000	43,560	130,680	26,136	32,000	32,000	89,734	121,968	696,960
Parking Spaces	2,600 2 Spaces	20,000 10 Spaces	243,250 292 Spaces	450 Spaces	239,600 257 Spaces	163 Spaces	128,000 175 Spaces	50,000 105 Spaces	25,000 83 Spaces	230,000 83 Spaces
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Assumed Land Price										
Low Scenario										
Per Unit (or Hotel Room)	\$200,000	\$70,000	\$20,000	\$26,250	\$13,500	N/A	N/A	\$12,000	N/A	N/A
Per SF Site Area	\$32	\$70	\$107	\$60	\$147	\$41	\$81	\$19	\$10	\$7
Per Unit (or Hotel Room)	\$275.000	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30.000	\$21,000	N/A	N/A	\$15,000	N/A	N/A
Per SF Site Area	\$44	\$90	\$160	\$69	\$229	\$45	\$90	\$24	\$15	\$10
High Scenario										
Per Unit (or Hotel Room)	\$350,000	\$200,000	\$40,000	\$45,000	\$28,500	N/A \$60	\$30	\$20,000	\$0 \$20	\$0 \$15
	\$50	\$200	\$215	\$105	\$511	\$00	\$120	\$52	\$20	\$15
Assumed Cap Rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.50%	4.50%	5.00%	5.00%	7.00%	5.00%	5.50%
Assumed Min. Unleveraged ROC (1)	15%	15%	15%	6.50%	6.50%	7.00%	7.00%	9.00%	7.00%	7.50%
Assumed Min. ROE (2)	10%	10%	10%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
Assumed Investment Period (Months)	15 Months	24 Months	48 Months	30 Months	48 Months	18 Months	21 Months	15 Months	9 Months	9 Months
Unleveraged Return on Cost (1)										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	16.53%	12.04%	8.22%	6.01%	5.38%	4.15%	6.39%	7.93%	6.28%	5.97%
High Scenario	17.00%	17.71%	26.21%	6.04% 5.79%	5.82%	5.09%	5.20%	0./5%	5.96%	6.30%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	17.5570	17.5770	21.12/0	5.7570	0.2170	5.5570	5.5570	5.5070	0.1970	0.00 /0
Low Scenario	16.04%	11.49%	7.84%	5.99%	5.36%	4.14%	6.37%	7.91%	6.26%	5.92%
Middle Scenario	16.58%	17.25%	25.78%	6.01%	5.80%	5.07%	6.17%	8.73%	5.94%	6.25%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	10.90 %	17.0078	24.0476	5.77 /0	0.22 /0	5.55 /6	5.91/0	9.3078	0.17 /6	0.05 /6
Low Scenario	15.56%	10.94%	7.46%	5.96%	5.34%	4.12%	6.34%	7.88%	6.23%	5.87%
Middle Scenario	16.16%	16.79%	25.36%	5.99%	5.78%	5.06%	6.15%	8.70%	5.91%	6.20%
High Scenario	16.61%	16.62%	23.66%	5.75%	6.20%	5.91%	5.90%	9.33%	6.15%	6.58%
Low Scenario	15.09%	10.40%	7.09%	5.94%	5.32%	4.11%	6.32%	7.86%	6.20%	5.82%
Middle Scenario	15.75%	16.34%	24.94%	5.97%	5.76%	5.04%	6.13%	8.67%	5.89%	6.15%
High Scenario	16.25%	16.25%	23.29%	5.73%	6.18%	5.89%	5.88%	9.30%	6.13%	6.54%
Low Scenario	14.14%	9.34%	6.34%	5.89%	5.28%	4.08%	6.27%	7.81%	6.15%	5.73%
Middle Scenario	14.93%	15.45%	24.11%	5.92%	5.72%	5.01%	6.09%	8.63%	5.85%	6.05%
High Scenario	15.53%	15.51%	22.55%	5.69%	6.14%	5.85%	5.84%	9.25%	6.09%	6.45%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	13 22%	8 30%	5 61%	5 85%	5 25%	4.05%	6.23%	7 77%	6.09%	5 63%
Middle Scenario	14.12%	14.56%	23.29%	5.88%	5.68%	4.98%	6.05%	8.58%	5.80%	5.96%
High Scenario	14.81%	14.78%	21.82%	5.65%	6.10%	5.82%	5.80%	9.21%	6.05%	6.37%
Return on Equity (ROE) (2)										
No Fee	44.10/	20.10	6.00/	11.00/	16.00/	20.20	20 70/	21.20/	(D E0/	22.00/
Low Scenario Middle Scenario	44.1% 45.3%	20.1%	6.9% 21.8%	44.8%	16.2%	-28.3%	39./%	21.3%	68.5% 51.1%	22.9%
High Scenario	46.3%	29.0%	20.3%	38.2%	32.3%	31.5%	26.7%	54.4%	63.3%	57.0%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	42.8%	19.1%	6.5%	44.1%	15.9%	-28.8%	39.0%	20.7%	67.0%	20.5%
High Scenario	45.3%	28.3%	20.0%	37.6%	31.9%	30.9%	26.1%	53.8%	62.3%	54.7%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										/*
Low Scenario	41.5%	18.2%	6.2%	43.4%	15.5%	-29.2%	38.4%	20.2%	65.5%	18.0%
High Scenario	43.1%	28.0%	21.1% 19.7%	44.2%	23.7%	30.3%	25.6%	53.3%	40.7% 61.2%	33.8% 52.5%
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF		27.17.70		57.070	5.1.570	00.070		55.570	0.1270	021070
Low Scenario	40.2%	17.3%	5.9%	42.7%	15.2%	-29.7%	37.7%	19.6%	64.0%	15.6%
Middle Scenario	42.0%	27.2%	20.8%	43.5%	23.3%	1.4%	32.3%	38.3%	47.5%	31.4% 50.4%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF	19.970	27.170	15.170	50.170	51.170	25.770	25.070	52.770	00.2 /0	50.170
Low Scenario	37.7%	15.6%	5.3%	41.3%	14.5%	-30.6%	36.4%	18.6%	61.1%	10.9%
Middle Scenario	39.8%	25.7%	20.1%	42.1%	22.6%	0.3%	31.1%	37.1%	45.2%	26.8%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	41.4%	25.9%	10.0%	35.3%	30.4%	28.5%	23.9%	51.5%	58.1%	46.1%
Low Scenario	35.2%	13.8%	4.7%	40.0%	13.8%	-31.5%	35.1%	17.5%	58.3%	6.4%
Middle Scenario	37.7%	24.3%	19.4%	40.8%	21.9%	-0.8%	29.9%	36.0%	42.9%	22.3%
High Scenario	39.5%	24.6%	18.2%	34.2%	29.6%	27.3%	22.8%	50.4%	56.1%	42.0%
Resid. Land Value (RLV) Per SF Site Are Low Scenario No Fee	ea									
Low Scenario	\$47.47	\$102.75	\$90.11	\$193.73	\$480.44	(\$115.90)	\$388.56	\$40.07	\$20.66	\$9.53
Middle Scenario	\$62.76	\$160.19	\$518.93	\$490.51	\$2,731.35	\$24.12	\$355.87	\$76.41	\$24.24	\$15.40
High Scenario	\$78.06	\$287.59	\$572.70	\$235.76	\$1,333.13	\$176.72	\$323.18	\$112.74	\$33.93	\$24.92
Low Scenario	\$47.02	\$100.75	\$83.13	\$191.84	\$468.97	(\$118.40)	\$383.56	\$39.33	\$20.45	\$9.17
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	-2%	-8%	-1%	-2%	2%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-4%
Middle Scenario	\$62.46	\$162.13	\$515.30	\$488.51	\$2,718.78	\$23.23	\$353.28	\$76.07	\$24.14	\$15.03

Table 3 Summary of Economic Feasibility Analysis Results Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family	Owner								
	Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
% Change from 100% Market	0%	1%	-1%	0%	0%	-4%	-1%	0%	0%	-2%
High Scenario	\$77.60	\$285.49	\$565.05	\$233.77	\$1,320.56	\$174.10	\$317.90	\$111.96	\$33.72	\$24.56
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-1%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$46.57	\$98.74	\$76.15	\$189.96	\$457.51	(\$120.90)	\$378.56	\$38.58	\$20.25	\$8.81
% Change from 100% Market	-2%	-4%	-15%	-2%	-5%	4%	-3%	-4%	-2%	-8%
Middle Scenario	\$62.00	\$160.03	\$507.65	\$486.52	\$2,706.21	\$20.61	\$348.00	\$75.29	\$23.92	\$14.66
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	0%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-15%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-5%
High Scenario	\$77.14	\$283.39	\$557.39	\$231.77	\$1,307.99	\$171.48	\$312.62	\$111.18	\$33.50	\$24.19
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	-1%	-3%	-2%	-2%	-3%	-3%	-1%	-1%	-3%
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$46.13	\$96.74	\$69.17	\$188.08	\$446.04	(\$123.40)	\$373.56	\$37.84	\$20.04	\$8.46
% Change from 100% Market	-3%	-6%	-23%	-3%	-7%	6%	-4%	-6%	-3%	-11%
Middle Scenario	\$61.38	\$153.90	\$495.98	\$484.52	\$2,693.64	\$16.26	\$340.03	\$74.07	\$23.60	\$14.29
% Change from 100% Market	-2%	-4%	-4%	-1%	-1%	-33%	-4%	-3%	-3%	-7%
High Scenario	\$76.68	\$281.30	\$549.74	\$229.77	\$1,295.42	\$168.86	\$307.34	\$110.40	\$33.29	\$23.82
% Change from 100% Market	-2%	-2%	-4%	-3%	-3%	-4%	-5%	-2%	-2%	-4%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$45.23	\$92.74	\$55.21	\$184.31	\$423.10	(\$128.40)	\$363.56	\$36.35	\$19.63	\$7.74
% Change from 100% Market	-5%	-10%	-39%	-5%	-12%	11%	-6%	-9%	-5%	-19%
Middle Scenario	\$60.46	\$149.70	\$480.68	\$480.53	\$2,668.50	\$11.02	\$329.47	\$72.51	\$23.18	\$13.55
% Change from 100% Market	-4%	-7%	-7%	-2%	-2%	-54%	-7%	-5%	-4%	-12%
High Scenario	\$75.75	\$277.10	\$534.44	\$225.78	\$1,270.28	\$163.62	\$296.78	\$108.84	\$32.87	\$23.08
% Change from 100% Market	-3%	-4%	-7%	-4%	-5%	-7%	-8%	-3%	-3%	-7%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$44.24	\$88.07	\$36.56	\$179.75	\$392.45	(\$134.24)	\$351.60	\$34.61	\$19.18	\$6.95
% Change from 100% Market	-7%	-14%	-59%	-7%	-18%	16%	-10%	-14%	-7%	-27%
Middle Scenario	\$59.53	\$145.51	\$465.37	\$476.53	\$2,643.36	\$5.78	\$318.91	\$70.94	\$22.76	\$12.82
% Change from 100% Market	-5%	-9%	-10%	-3%	-3%	-76%	-10%	-7%	-6%	-17%
High Scenario	\$74.83	\$272.91	\$519.14	\$221.79	\$1,245.14	\$158.38	\$286.22	\$107.28	\$32.45	\$22.34
% Change from 100% Market	-4%	-5%	-9%	-6%	-7%	-10%	-11%	-5%	-4%	-10%

(1) For owner housing, equals net profit/fee (net sales revenues less total development costs, excluding builder fee/profit). For all others, equals net operating income divided by total development costs. (2) Return on equity measured as net project value divided by the number of years equity investment divided by total equity investment. Source: DRA.

Table 4Summary of Economic Feasibility Analysis ResultsHigh Cap Rate AssumptionDenver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Tenure	Owner	Owner	Owner	Renter	Renter					
Residential Units	1	10	232	300	285					
Residential Net SF	2,800	20,000	227,250	212,250	230,800	-	-	- 89 734	-	-
Total Net SF	2,800	20,000	243,250	221,550	239,800	64,000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Parking Spaces	2 Spaces	10 Spaces	292 Spaces	450 Spaces	257 Spaces	163 Spaces	175 Spaces	105 Spaces	83 Spaces	83 Spaces
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Assumed Land Price										
Low Scenario	\$200,000	\$70,000	¢20.000	\$26 2E0	¢12 E00	N1/A	NI/A	¢12.000	N1/A	NI/A
Per SF Site Area	\$200,000	\$70,000	\$20,000	\$26,230	\$13,500	\$41	\$81	\$12,000	\$10	\$7
Middle Scenario		1 -	4 -							
Per Unit (or Hotel Room)	\$275,000	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$21,000	N/A	N/A	\$15,000	N/A	N/A
Per SF Site Area High Scenario	\$44	\$90	\$160	\$69	\$229	\$45	\$90	\$24	\$15	\$10
Per Unit (or Hotel Room)	\$350,000	\$200,000	\$40,000	\$45,000	\$28,500	N/A	\$30	\$20,000	\$0	\$0
Per SF Site Area	\$56	\$200	\$213	\$103	\$311	\$60	\$120	\$32	\$20	\$15
Assumed Cap Rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.00%	5.00%	5.50%	5.50%	7.50%	5.50%	6.00%
Assumed Min. Unleveraged ROC (1)	15%	15%	15%	6.50%	6.50%	7.00%	7.00%	9.00%	7.00%	7.50%
Assumed Min. ROE (2)	10%	10%	10%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
Assumed Investment Period (Months)	15 Months	24 Months	48 Months	30 Months	48 Months	18 Months	21 Months	15 Months	9 Months	9 Months
Unleveraged Return on Cost (1)										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	16.53%	12.04%	8.22%	6.01%	5.38%	4.15%	6.39%	7.93%	6.28%	5.97%
High Scenario	17.35%	17.37%	24.42%	5.79%	6.24%	5.95%	5.93%	9.38%	6.19%	6.68%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	16.04%	11.49%	7.84%	5.99%	5.36%	4.14%	6.37%	7.91%	6.26%	5.92%
High Scenario	16.98%	17.23%	23.78%	5.77%	6.22%	5.93%	5.91%	9.36%	6.17%	6.63%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	15.56%	10.94%	7.46%	5.96%	5.34%	4.12%	6.34%	7.88%	6.23%	5.87%
High Scenario	16.61%	16.62%	23.66%	5.75%	6.20%	5.91%	5.90%	9.33%	6.15%	6.58%
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	15.09%	10.40%	7.09%	5.94%	5.32%	4.11%	6.32%	7.86%	6.20%	5.82%
High Scenario	16.25%	16.34%	24.94%	5.73%	5.76%	5.89%	5.88%	8.67% 9.30%	5.89% 6.13%	6.15%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	14.14%	9.34%	6.34%	5.89%	5.28%	4.08%	6.27%	7.81%	6.15%	5.73%
High Scenario	14.93%	15.45%	24.11%	5.92%	6.14%	5.85%	5.84%	9.25%	5.85% 6.09%	6.05%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	13.22%	8.30%	5.61%	5.85%	5.25%	4.05%	6.23%	7.77%	6.09%	5.63%
High Scenario	14.81%	14.78%	21.82%	5.65%	6.10%	5.82%	5.80%	9.21%	6.05%	6.37%
Return on Equity (ROE) (2)										
No Fee	11.10	20.10	6.00/	27.00/	6.204	10.000	22.10/	0.20/	20.00/	1.00/
Middle Scenario	44.1%	20.1%	21.8%	27.0%	13.7%	-40.9%	23.1%	9.2% 26.7%	38.0% 22.2%	-1.2%
High Scenario	46.3%	29.0%	20.3%	21.0%	20.7%	13.5%	11.3%	40.1%	33.3%	30.0%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	42 99/	10.1%	6 59/	26.29/	E 09/	41.20/	22 59/	9 70/	26.69/	2 50/
Middle Scenario	44.2%	28.7%	21.5%	27.0%	13.3%	-12.9%	17.5%	26.1%	21.1%	10.9%
High Scenario	45.3%	28.3%	20.0%	20.5%	20.4%	12.9%	10.8%	39.6%	32.4%	28.0%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	41.5%	18.2%	6.2%	25 7%	5.6%	-41 7%	21.9%	8.2%	35 3%	-5 7%
Middle Scenario	43.1%	28.0%	21.1%	26.4%	13.0%	-13.4%	17.0%	25.6%	20.0%	8.7%
High Scenario	44.3%	27.7%	19.7%	20.0%	20.0%	12.4%	10.3%	39.0%	31.4%	25.9%
Low Scenario	40.2%	17.3%	5.9%	25.1%	5.3%	-42.2%	21.3%	7.7%	33.9%	-7.9%
Middle Scenario	42.0%	27.2%	20.8%	25.8%	12.7%	-13.9%	16.4%	25.1%	19.0%	6.6%
High Scenario	43.3%	27.1%	19.4%	19.5%	19.7%	11.8%	9.8%	38.5%	30.5%	23.9%
Low Scenario	37.7%	15.6%	5.3%	23.8%	4 7%	-43.0%	20.1%	6.7%	31.3%	-12.2%
Middle Scenario	39.8%	25.7%	20.1%	24.6%	12.0%	-14.9%	15.3%	24.0%	16.8%	2.3%
High Scenario	41.4%	25.9%	18.8%	18.5%	19.0%	10.8%	8.8%	37.4%	28.6%	20.0%
Low Scenario	35.2%	13.8%	4.7%	22.6%	4.1%	-43.8%	18.9%	5.7%	28.7%	-16.4%
Middle Scenario	37.7%	24.3%	19.4%	23.4%	11.4%	-15.9%	14.2%	23.0%	14.8%	-1.8%
High Scenario	39.5%	24.6%	18.2%	17.5%	18.3%	9.7%	7.8%	36.4%	26.8%	16.2%
Resid. Land Value (RLV) Per SF Site Are Low Scenario	ea 									
Low Scenario	\$47.47	\$102.75	\$90.11	\$130.73	\$93.23	(\$170.80)	\$229.86	\$21.79	\$15.44	\$5.78
Middle Scenario	\$62.76	\$160.19	\$518.93	\$397.84	\$2,119.04	(\$46.94)	\$195.53	\$55.08	\$18.35	\$11.16
High Scenario	\$78.06	\$287.59	\$572.70	\$163.77	\$860.65	\$89.50	\$161.21	\$88.37	\$26.70	\$19.71
Low Scenario	\$47.02	\$100.75	\$83.13	\$128.85	\$81.76	(\$173.30)	\$224.86	\$21.05	\$15.23	\$5.42
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	-2%	-8%	-1%	-12%	1%	-2%	-3%	-1%	-6%
ivildale Scenario	\$62.46	\$162.13	\$515.30	\$395.84	\$2,106.47	(\$47.83)	\$192.94	\$54.75	\$18.25	\$10.79

Table 4 Summary of Economic Feasibility Analysis Results High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family	Owner								
	Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
% Change from 100% Market	0%	1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	2%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-3%
High Scenario	\$77.60	\$285.49	\$565.05	\$161.78	\$848.08	\$86.88	\$155.93	\$87.59	\$26.49	\$19.34
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-3%	-3%	-1%	-1%	-2%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	. , .									_ / *
Low Scenario	\$46.57	\$98.74	\$76.15	\$126.97	\$70.29	(\$175.80)	\$219.86	\$20.30	\$15.03	\$5.06
% Change from 100% Market	-2%	-4%	-15%	-3%	-25%	3%	-4%	-7%	-3%	-12%
Middle Scenario	\$62.00	\$160.03	\$507.65	\$393.85	\$2,093.90	(\$50.45)	\$187.66	\$53.96	\$18.04	\$10.42
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	0%	-2%	-1%	-1%	7%	-4%	-2%	-2%	-7%
High Scenario	\$77.14	\$283.39	\$557.39	\$159.78	\$835.51	\$84.26	\$150.65	\$86.81	\$26.27	\$18.97
% Change from 100% Market	-1%	-1%	-3%	-2%	-3%	-6%	-7%	-2%	-2%	-4%
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$46.13	\$96.74	\$69.17	\$125.08	\$58.82	(\$178.30)	\$214.86	\$19.56	\$14.82	\$4.71
% Change from 100% Market	-3%	-6%	-23%	-4%	-37%	4%	-7%	-10%	-4%	-19%
Middle Scenario	\$61.38	\$153.90	\$495.98	\$391.85	\$2,081.33	(\$54.80)	\$179.69	\$52.74	\$17.71	\$10.05
% Change from 100% Market	-2%	-4%	-4%	-2%	-2%	17%	-8%	-4%	-3%	-10%
High Scenario	\$76.68	\$281.30	\$549.74	\$157.78	\$822.94	\$81.64	\$145.37	\$86.03	\$26.06	\$18.60
% Change from 100% Market	-2%	-2%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-9%	-10%	-3%	-2%	-6%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$45.23	\$92.74	\$55.21	\$121.32	\$35.88	(\$183.30)	\$204.86	\$18.07	\$14.41	\$3.99
% Change from 100% Market	-5%	-10%	-39%	-7%	-62%	7%	-11%	-17%	-7%	-31%
Middle Scenario	\$60.46	\$149.70	\$480.68	\$387.86	\$2,056.19	(\$60.04)	\$169.13	\$51.18	\$17.29	\$9.32
% Change from 100% Market	-4%	-7%	-7%	-3%	-3%	28%	-14%	-7%	-6%	-17%
High Scenario	\$75.75	\$277.10	\$534.44	\$153.79	\$797.80	\$76.40	\$134.81	\$84.47	\$25.64	\$17.86
% Change from 100% Market	-3%	-4%	-7%	-6%	-7%	-15%	-16%	-4%	-4%	-9%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$44.24	\$88.07	\$36.56	\$116.76	\$5.24	(\$189.14)	\$192.90	\$16.33	\$13.96	\$3.20
% Change from 100% Market	-7%	-14%	-59%	-11%	-94%	11%	-16%	-25%	-10%	-45%
Middle Scenario	\$59.53	\$145.51	\$465.37	\$383.86	\$2,031.05	(\$65.28)	\$158.57	\$49.62	\$16.87	\$8.58
% Change from 100% Market	-5%	-9%	-10%	-4%	-4%	39%	-19%	-10%	-8%	-23%
High Scenario	\$74.83	\$272.91	\$519.14	\$149.80	\$772.66	\$71.16	\$124.25	\$82.91	\$25.22	\$17.12
% Change from 100% Market	-4%	-5%	-9%	-9%	-10%	-20%	-23%	-6%	-6%	-13%

For owner housing, equals net profit/fee (net sales revenues less total development costs, excluding builder fee/profit). For all others, equals net operating income divided by total development costs.
Return on equity measured as net project value divided by the number of years equity investment divided by total equity investment.
Source: DRA.



Introduction

This report describes an affordable housing nexus study addressing the relationship between market-rate residential and non-residential development and the need for affordable housing in the City of Denver. The nexus analysis estimates the number of low and moderate income households associated with development of new market-rate housing and non-residential development in the City and calculates the maximum legally justifiable nexus fee based on the cost to produce housing affordable to these households. The study also examines the potential effect of alternative levels of a nexus fee on the economic feasibility of new residential and non-residential development using a series of residential and non-residential development prototypes.

Contents of Report

This report is presented in the following major sections:

Residential Nexus Analysis

The first section of the report calculates the estimated number of low and moderate income households generated by the development of market-rate residential uses.

Non-Residential Nexus Analysis

The second section of the report calculates the estimated number of low and moderate income households generated by the development of market-rate non-residential uses.

Affordability Gap Analysis

The third section of the report calculates the affordability gap between the cost of developing new affordable housing and the amount that households at various income levels can afford to pay for housing.

Estimated Maximum Justifiable Nexus Fees



The fourth section of the report estimates maximum justifiable nexus fees for residential and non-residential land uses by applying the per unit affordability gap to the number of households by income level generated by new market rate development as determined by the nexus analysis.

Economic Feasibility Analysis

The final section of the report presents an economic feasibility analysis of the impact of a potential affordable housing nexus fee on the economic feasibility of new residential and non-residential development in Denver using the development prototypes.

Target Income Levels

The nexus study uses income limits commonly defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program. This study estimates maximum justifiable nexus fees for the following income categories in Denver County in 2016:

- Households with incomes up to 30 percent of area median income (AMI), or approximately \$24,250 for a four-person household;
- Households with incomes between 31 percent and 60 percent of AMI, or between \$24,250 and \$48,060 for a four-person household;
- Households with incomes between 61 percent and 80 percent of AMI, or between \$48,060 and \$63,900 for a four-person household; and
- Households with incomes between 81 percent and 120 percent of AMI, or between \$63,900 and \$96,120 for a four-person household.

All of these income limits are based on the 2016 median family income (MFI) of \$80,100 for the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood HUD Metro FMR Area (HMFA)¹, adjusted by household size. **Table 5** shows 2016 income limits for the City of Denver for these income categories for household sizes of one to six persons.

¹FMR stands for Fair Market Rent. The Denver-Aurora-Lakewood HMFA is a HUD-defined metropolitan area comprised of Adams, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, Douglas, Elbert, Gilpin, Jefferson and Park Counties (same boundaries as the MSA).



Table 5 2016 Affordable Housing Income Limits by Household Size City of Denver Affordable Housing Impact and Inclusionary Housing Study										
Household Size30% AMI60% AMI80% AMI120% AMI										
One Person	\$16 <i>,</i> 800	\$33,640	\$44,750	\$67,280						
Two Persons	\$19,200	\$38,450	\$51,150	\$76,900						
Three Persons	\$21,600	\$43,250	\$57,550	\$86,510						
Four Persons	\$24,250	\$48,060	\$63,900	\$96,120						
Five Persons	\$28,410	\$51,910	\$69,050	\$103,810						
Six Persons	\$32,570	\$55,750	\$74,150	\$111,500						

Sources: Based on 2016 median household income for the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood HMFA of \$80,100. Equals published HUD limits for the extremely low income (30% AMI) and low income (80% AMI) categories. Limits for the other categories calculated using HUD household size adjustment factors, rounded to the nearest \$10; DRA.

Development Prototypes

The nexus analysis and economic feasibility analysis are conducted using prototypical residential and non-residential developments. The prototypes analyzed include high-rise residential and office prototypes appropriate to zoning in and around Downtown Denver, and several low- and mid-rise residential and non-residential prototypes that could be built in multiple locations within the City.

The development prototypes reflect the range of densities permitted by current zoning categories in the City, with a focus on the type and densities of projects currently being developed. Since the fee is calculated per square foot and the methodological assumptions do not vary by the height or size of the prototype buildings, the height or size of the buildings does not affect the resulting supportable nexus fees.

The development prototypes used in this analysis are described in **Table 6**.



	Prototype 1	Prototype 2 Residential Own	Prototype 3 er	Prototype 4 Resid.	Prototype 5 Rental	Prototype 6	Prototype 7	Prototype 8	Prototype 9	Prototype 10	Prototype 11
	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	4-Story Office	12-Story Office	Hotel	Retail	Warehouse	Manufacturing
Zoning											
Zip Code(s)											
Neighborhood/Geographic Subarea											
Primary Land Use Other Land Use	Residential	Residential	Residential Grnd. Floor Retail	Residential Grnd. Floor Retail	Residential	Office	Office Grnd. Floor Retail	Hotel	Retail	Warehouse	Manufacturing
Residential Tenure (Renter/Owner) Total Residential Units Total DU's/Acre	Owner 1 7	Owner 10 44	Owner 233 233	Renter 300 100	Renter 285 475						
Total Hotel Rooms Ave. Hotel Room Size (Net SF)								143 350			
Total Site Area (Acre) Total Site Area (SF)	0.14 Acres 6,250	0.23 Acres 10,000	1.00 Acres 43,560	3.00 Acres 130,680	0.60 Acres 26,136	0.73 Acres 32,000	0.73 Acres 32,000	2.06 Acres 89,734	2.80 Acres 121,968	16.00 Acres 696,960	6.40 Acres 278,784
Construction Time	Type V	Type V	Type 1	Type V over Type	Type 1	Type II	Type 1	Type V	Type V	Type V	Type V
Parking Type	Above Grade Garage	Garage	Subterranean/ Structured	I Structured	Subterranean/ Structured	Subterranean	Subterranean/ Structured	Surface	Surface	Surface	Surface
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Total Gross Building SF (Excluding Parking) FAR	2,800	20,010	304,063 7.0	246,167 1.9	299,750 11.5	80,000 2.5	160,000 5.0	66,700 0.7	25,000 0.2	250,000 0.4	100,000 0.4
Total Gross Building SF, Incl. Struct./Underg. Pkg (1)	2,800	20,000	420,863	381,167	389,700	84,900	221,250	66,700	25,000	250,000	100,000
Building Efficiency Ratio (%) Site Coverage (Bldg. Footprint) (%) Average Floor Plate	100% N/A	100% N/A	80% 85%	90% 72%	80% 80%	80% 81%	80% 81%	75% 19%	100% 20%	100% 36%	100% 36%
Net Rentable SF Office Net Rentable SF Hotel Net Rentable SF Retail Net Rentable SF Warehouse Net Rentable SF Warehouse Net Rentable SF Residential Net Rentable SF Residential Net SF Community Space Total Net Bldg. SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 2,800 SF 2,800 SF 0 SF 2,800 SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 20,000 SF 20,000 SF 0 SF 20,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 16,000 SF 0 SF 227,250 SF 243,250 SF 243,250 SF 243,250 SF	0 SF 0 SF 3,000 SF 0 SF 212,250 SF 215,250 SF 6,300 SF 221,550 SF	0 SF 0 SF 3,000 SF 0 SF 230,800 SF 233,800 SF 6,000 SF 239,800 SF	60,000 SF 0 SF 4,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 64,000 SF 64,000 SF 64,000 SF	120,000 SF 0 SF 8,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 128,000 SF 0 SF 128,000 SF 128,000 SF	0 SF 50,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 50,000 SF 50,000 SF 50,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 25,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 25,000 SF 0 SF 25,000 SF 25,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 250,000 SF 0 SF 250,000 SF 250,000 SF 250,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 100,000 SF 0 SF 100,000 SF 0 SF 100,000 SF
Gross SF Office Gross SF Hotel Gross SF Retail Gross SF Warehouse Gross SF Manufacturing Gross SF Residential Gross SF Community Space Total Gross Bldg, SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 2,800 SF 2,800 SF 2,800 SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 20,000 SF 20,000 SF 20,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 20,000 SF 0 SF 284,063 SF 0 SF 304,063 SF	0 SF 0 SF 3,333 SF 0 SF 235,833 SF 7,000 SF 246,167 SF	0 SF 0 SF 3,750 SF 0 SF 288,500 SF 7,500 SF 299,750 SF	75,000 SF 0 SF 5,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 80,000 SF	150,000 SF 0 SF 10,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 160,000 SF	0 SF 66,700 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 66,700 SF	0 SF 0 SF 25,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 25,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 250,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 250,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 100,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF 100,000 SF
Unit Bedroom Count Distribution Studio One Bedroom Two Bedroom Three Bedroom Total	0% 0% 0% 100% 100%	0% 0% 100% 100%	0% 55% 40% 5% 100%	20% 65% 15% 0% 100%	20% 55% 25% 0% 100%						
Units by BR Count Studio One Bedroom Two Bedroom Three Bedroom Total Residential Units Residential Density (units per acre) Unit Size (Net SF)	0 0 1 1 7 du/a	0 0 10 10 44 du/a	0 128 93 12 233 233 du/a	60 195 45 0 300 100 du/a	57 157 71 0 285 475 du/a						
Studio One Bedroom Two Bedroom Three Bedroom <i>Average Unit Size</i>	0 SF 0 SF 2,800 SF 2,800 SF	0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 2,000 SF	0 SF 0 SF 950 SF 1,200 SF <i>975 SF</i>	0 SF 550 SF 950 SF 950 SF 708 SF	0 SF 600 SF 950 SF 1,000 SF <i>810 SF</i>						
Parking Ratio - Residential (Spaces/Unit) Studio One Bedroom Two Bedrooms Three Bedrooms Parking Spaces Based on RatioResidential	1.00 1.00 1.50 2.00 2.00	1.00 1.00 1.50 2.00 2.00	1.00 1.00 1.50 2.00 2.00	1.00 1.00 1.50 2.00 2.00	1.00 1.00 1.50 2.00 2.00			N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	0.70 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0
Parking Ratio - Office or Warehouse (CSF/Space) Parking Spaces Based on Ratio-Office Parking Ratio - Retail (Spaces/1000 CSF) Parking Spaces Based on Ratio-Retail Parking Spaces - Total Based on Ratio						500 150 400 13 163	1,000 150 400 25 175	0 0 0 0 0	350 0 300 83 83	3,000 83 300 0 83	0 0 0 0
No. of Underground Parking Spaces No. of Structured Parking Spaces No. of Surdace/Garage Parking Spaces Total Parking Spaces Provided Total Parking Spaces Provided Per Unit or per 1000 SF Gross SF/Parking Space (Incl. Circulation) Total Parking SF Parking SF Underground Parking SF Structured	0 Spaces 0 Spaces 2 Spaces 2 Spaces 2 Spaces 200 SF 400 SF 0 SF 0 SF	0 Spaces 0 Spaces 10 Spaces 10 Spaces 10 Spaces 180 SF 1,800 SF 0 SF 0 SF	126 Spaces 166 Spaces 0 Spaces 292 Spaces 400 SF 116,800 SF 50,400 SF 66,400 SF	0 Spaces 450 Spaces 0 Spaces 450 Spaces 300 SF 135,000 SF 0 SF 135,000 SF	110 Spaces 147 Spaces 0 Spaces 257 Spaces 350 SF 89,775 SF 38,500 SF 51,450 SF	149 Spaces 14 Spaces 0 Spaces 163 Spaces 350 SF 57,050 SF 0 SF 4,900 SF	149 Spaces 26 Spaces 0 Spaces 175 Spaces 175 Spaces 350 SF 61,250 SF 52,150 SF 9,100 SF	0 Spaces 0 Spaces 150 Spaces 105 Spaces 105 Spaces 400 SF 42,000 SF 0 SF 0 SF	0 Spaces 0 Spaces 83 Spaces 83 Spaces 83 Spaces 350 SF 29,050 SF 0 SF 0 SF	0 Spaces 0 Spaces 83 Spaces 83 Spaces 83 Spaces 400 SF 33,200 SF 0 SF 0 SF	0 Spaces 0 Spaces 0 Spaces 0 Spaces 0 Spaces 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF 0 SF

Table 6 Development Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

Source: City of Denver; DRA

Residential Nexus Analysis

The methodology used by DRA for the residential nexus quantifies the estimated increase in low and moderate income households associated with new market-rate residential development, and estimates the costs of providing housing affordable to these new households. These costs are then translated into a maximum justifiable nexus fee on market-rate residential development that addresses or mitigates the impacts of the prototype.

Nexus Methodology and Use of the IMPLAN Model

This analysis uses a number of conservative assumptions that understate the number of low and moderate income households and maximum justifiable nexus fee amounts. Therefore, the housing impacts are likely even greater than indicated in the analysis.

The methodology used for the residential nexus analysis begins with the estimated sales prices of a prototypical single-family home or condominium development, or rents at an apartment complex, and moves through a series of linkages to the incomes of the households that purchase or rent the units, the annual expenditures of those households on goods and services, the jobs associated with the delivery of these goods and services, the income of the workers performing those jobs, the household income of those worker households, and finally to the affordability level of the housing needed by those worker households. The steps of the analysis are as follows:

- 1. Define a prototypical market-rate residential development.
- 2. Estimate the household income distribution of the households purchasing or renting these homes.
- 3. Estimate the disposable household income of those households.
- 4. Estimate the number of new full-time employees required to provide the goods and services purchased by these households.
- 5. Estimate the number of new households associated with this employment growth.
- 6. Estimate the income distribution of these new employee households.



7. Estimate the number of new households requiring affordable housing.

The result of these steps is the estimated number of households by prototype living in the City and qualifying as low and moderate income based on new market-rate residential development in the City. DRA uses the results of the housing affordability gap analysis to calculate the nexus fee required to make housing affordable to the low and moderate income households who will need to find housing in the City in connection with new market-rate residential development in the City.

For owner housing, DRA estimated the household income distribution of households purchasing the new homes based on the estimated minimum income necessary to afford the mortgage principal and interest, property taxes and property insurance required to purchase the home using typical underwriting standards. For renters, tenant household income is calculated from typical income to rent standards used by apartment owners. DRA estimated 2016 sales prices and rents estimated for each prototype and unit size.

The consumer expenditures of the new owner and renter households and the jobs generated by these expenditures are estimated using the IMPLAN model, a model widely used for the past 25 years to quantify employment impacts from personal income. Using the employment generation by industry from the IMPLAN model, DRA applies the results of the housing affordability gap analysis to calculate the nexus fee required to make housing affordable to the low and moderate income households who will need to find housing in the City in connection with new market-rate residential development.

THE IMPLAN MODEL

The IMPLAN model is an economic analysis software package now commercially available through the Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG). IMPLAN was originally developed by the U.S. Forest Service, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management. It has been in use since 1979 and refined over time. IMPLAN has become one of the industry standards widely used across the United States to predict economic impacts in a broad range of applications from major construction projects to natural resource programs. IMPLAN's clients include more than 20 federal government agencies, 60 state agencies across the country, and academic, local government, nonprofit and private sector clients numbering in the hundreds.



The IMPLAN model projects the number of employees needed to produce a given amount of goods and services, based on actual 2014 economic data for Denver County. More specifically, IMPLAN is based on an input-output accounting of commodity flows within an economy from producers to intermediate and final consumers. The model establishes a matrix of supply chain relationships between industries and also between households and the producers of household goods and services. The model tracks changes in purchases for final consumption through the supply chain. Industries that produce goods and services for final consumption must purchase inputs from other producers that, in turn, purchase goods and services. The model tracks these relationships through the economy to the point where leakages from the region stop the cycle.

IMPLAN's industry sectoring scheme is tied to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) Input-Output Study. The most recent 2007 BEA Benchmark study uses a 440sector scheme. This scheme approximates 6-digit North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) for manufacturing, and is more highly aggregated for service sectors. IMPLAN data sets are available for each county and state, so the model can be tailored to the specific economic conditions of the region being analyzed. This analysis uses the most current 2014 data set for Denver County.

Economic impacts are estimated using the change in household spending component of the IMPLAN model. The model estimates the induced impacts resulting from increased demand for local-serving retail and service businesses as the new households spend their income in the local economy.

Disposable Income of New Households

The nexus analysis uses estimated 2016 sales prices and rents for each unit size and prototype. The gross household income of the new households moving into these units is estimated based on the estimated average sales price or rent for each prototype.

To estimate the average gross household income for the buyers of new for-sale homes, this analysis assumes the average incomes are approximately equal to the minimum qualifying income criteria for a new home loan. This calculation assumes that buyers pay a 10 percent down payment and secure a mortgage equal to 90 percent of the home's sale price. Monthly principal and interest payments on the mortgage are calculated assuming a 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 5.0 percent interest. Qualifying gross household income is estimated assuming households pay



35 percent of gross household income for principal, income, taxes and insurance (PITI), a typical standard used by mortgage lenders.

For renters, the income distribution of tenants in the new apartments is estimated assuming tenants on average spend 33 percent of their household income for rent.

These are conservative assumptions, since many of the new buyers and renters will have incomes in excess of the required minimums.

The IMPLAN model uses disposable household income as the primary upfront input. To arrive at disposable income, gross income for residents of prototypical units must be adjusted downward to account for Federal and State income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and personal savings. Other taxes, including sales tax, gas tax and property tax, are handled internally within the model. Housing expenses are not deducted from disposable income as they are also handled internally with the IMPLAN model. Based on a review of data from the Tax Policy Center (a joint venture of the Brookings Institution and the Urban Institute), disposable income for households in the income levels projected for the buyers and renters of the prototypical market-rate housing units is estimated at 65 percent of total household income.

Tables 7, 8 and **9** project average household income, total household income, and total disposable household income of new homebuyers in the owner housing prototypes under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios, respectively. **Tables 10, 11** and **12** project the rent, total housing income, and disposable household income of tenants in the rental housing prototypes under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios. These tables, and many of the tables referred to below, are presented following the text.

Projected Employment Generation

The IMPLAN model has been used to link household disposable household income and consumption patterns to job growth occurring in the City. As noted above, the projected disposable household income of the new renters and homebuyers is the key input to the IMPLAN model. The IMPLAN model distributes spending from disposable household income among various types of goods and services, and therefore industry sectors, based on data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey and the Bureau of Economic Analysis Benchmark Input-Output study to estimate induced employment generated.



Table 13 summarizes the projected employment generation by industry for the residential prototypes under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios. **Table 14** details the projections of employment by industry for these prototypes under the middle-cost scenario.

Projected Household Growth

The next step in this analysis is to translate projected new employees into the number of new households that will be established in the City. The 2014 Five-Year ACS indicates that the City of Denver had an average of 1.61 workers per worker household.¹ Therefore, DRA divided the number of new employees by 1.61 to estimate the number of new households created.

Projected Low and Moderate Income Households

This step estimates the number of new employee households that will require affordable housing. The IMPLAN model provides estimates of the number of employees by occupational grouping. To estimate household incomes, DRA multiplied each payroll per employee figure by 1.61, the citywide average number of workers per worker household.

Next, occupation is translated to income based on May 2015 wage and salary information for the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood MSA from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data on mean, median, 10th percentile, 25th percentile and 90th percentile hourly wages by occupation were used to estimate the distribution of employee households by income category based on HUD income limits for the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood HMFA. This approach assumes that all workers in a household earn wages within the same income category.

Since household income is derived primarily from wages, particularly at lower income levels, these percentage distributions should remain relatively constant over short time frames. The wage data used in the analysis, detailed in **Table 15**, is for the metro area and thus is generalizable to locations across the City.



 $^{^1}$ 334,730 employed residents divided by 207,599 households with at least one worker.

The average household size in the City of Denver based on data from the 2010 to 2014 American Community Survey was 2.28 persons.¹ To estimate the percentage of employees in each occupational category qualifying for each income category, this analysis uses 2015 income limits (to match the year of the wage data) for a household size of two and one-half persons² of approximately \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI, and \$81,500 at 120% AMI.

Table 16 summarizes DRA's estimates of low and moderate income households that would be expected to move to the City as a result of the development of the original residential prototypes under the low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios. **Tables 17** through **21** detail the calculation of low and moderate income households for each residential prototype, respectively. These calculations are shown for the middle-cost scenario.

The number of low and moderate income housing units necessary to house the new households equals the performance requirement or build alternative for each prototype. The performance requirements that are equivalent to the maximum justifiable nexus fees, expressed as a percentage of total units in the prototype, are summarized in **Table 22** for the housing prototypes by income level.



¹ Total household population of 618,903 divided by 271,054 households.

 $^{^2}$ This is more conservative than using an average household size of two persons since

it results in higher income limits.

Table 22 Estimated Affordable Housing Performance Requirements Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Nexus and Inclusionary Housing Study									
Percent of Total Units in Prototype									
Prototype	Under 30%	30% AMI to	60% AMI to	80% AMI to					
	AMI	60% AMI	80% AMI	120% AMI					
Single-Family Infill	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Owner Townhomes	3%	8%	3%	3%					
12-Story Owner	2%	6%	2%	2%					
5-Story Rental	1%	4%	1%	1%					
20-Story Rental	2%	6%	2%	2%					

Source: DRA





Non-Residential Nexus Analysis

The methodology used by DRA in this report quantifies the estimated increase in low and moderate income households associated with new non-residential development, and estimates the costs of providing housing affordable to these new households. These costs are then translated into a nexus fee on non-residential development that addresses or mitigates the impacts of the prototype.

Overview of Non-Residential Nexus Methodology

This analysis uses a number of conservative assumptions that understate the number of low and moderate income households and nexus fee amounts. Therefore, the housing impacts are likely even greater than indicated in the analysis.

The non-residential nexus methodology employs the following steps:

- 1. Estimate total new employees in prototype buildings;
- 2. Estimate new employees living in the City;
- 3. Adjust for potential future increase in labor force participation, as appropriate;
- 4. Adjust from employees to employee households;
- 5. Distribute employee households by occupation for each prototype;
- 6. Estimate wages by occupation; and
- 7. Estimate low and moderate income households.

The result of these steps is the estimated number of households by prototype living in the City and qualifying as low and moderate income based on new non-



residential development in the City. DRA uses the results of the housing affordability gap analysis to calculate the nexus fee required to make housing affordable to the low and moderate income households who will need to find housing in the City in connection with new non-residential development.

Non-Residential Nexus Methodology and Assumptions

The nexus analysis requires a number of assumptions. DRA strives to consistently employ conservative assumptions that serve to understate the number of low and moderate income households and the nexus fee calculation. We expect that the cumulative effect of these assumptions is to understate the nexus fee calculation for each building type. We do not believe, therefore, that changing individual assumptions would fundamentally alter the conclusions of the analysis.

Each of the steps in the analysis is described below, along with corresponding assumptions.

ESTIMATE TOTAL NEW EMPLOYEES IN PROTOTYPE BUILDINGS

The first step estimates the total number of direct employees who will work at or in the prototype being analyzed. This step implicitly assumes that all employees are new employees to the City. When firms and their employees relocate from other buildings in the City, they will have vacated spaces that will likely be filled by other firms and employees.

The estimate of the number of employees that will be working in each prototype building is based on an employment density factor for each land use (i.e., number of gross square feet per employee). The gross square feet of building are is divided by the employment density factor to calculate employment.

The employment density factors used in this analysis are listed below by land use. These factors are based on industry standards, DRA's experience with prior nexus fee studies, and available data and surveys from the Urban Land Institute, the Institute of Transportation Engineers, the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Green Building Council, the Building Owners and Managers Association, and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). DRA considers these conservative assumptions, as the general trend is toward higher employment densities (or a smaller number of square feet per employee) across non-residential land uses.



Based on these data sources, DRA used the following employment densities by land use in the nexus analysis:

- **Office:** 333 gross square feet per employee, for a standard office building.
- **Hotel:** 0.75 employees per room and an average of 350 gross square feet per hotel room for a mid-range hotel.

A full service or luxury hotel would have a higher employee density.

Stand-Alone Retail: 300 gross square feet per employee.

The employment density would be higher for small retail shops, restaurants to fast food and lower for a grocery store.

Warehouse: 1,000 gross square feet per employee.

Manufacturing: 750 gross square feet per employee.

ESTIMATE NEW EMPLOYEES LIVING IN THE CITY OF DENVER

This step estimates the number of new employees associated with new employment growth in the City that would live in the City.

The 2008 to 2010 journey-to-work data from the ACS indicates that 40.5% percent of total workers in Denver aged 16 years and older lived in the City¹. For the purposes of this analysis, we have assumed that 50.6 percent of new City workers will reside in the City. This assumption understates the impacts, as it is likely that more employees would live in the City if they could afford it.

Adjust for Potential Increase in Future Labor Force Participation

In periods of economic recession, the typical pattern is for unemployment rates to increase as people lose their jobs or can't find work, and for labor force participation rates to decrease as some people give up looking for work altogether. In periods of high unemployment and low labor force participation, a significant share of new jobs may be filled by existing residents in the area who are currently unemployed or who are drawn back into the labor force. As of May 2016, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Local Area Unemployment



¹ Based on 451,562 total workers in the City of Denver, and 183,050 workers in the City of Denver that lived and worked in the same place.

Statistics, Denver's unemployment rate was at 3.3%. These rates indicate a relatively tight labor market, in which job growth will be accompanied by an influx of new workers. Therefore, no adjustment was made for increased labor force participation.

ADJUST FROM EMPLOYEES TO EMPLOYEE HOUSEHOLDS

The next step in the analysis converts the number of employees living in the City to the number of employee households that will work at or in the building type being analyzed. This step recognizes that there is, on average, more than one worker per household, and thus the number of housing units in demand for new workers must be reduced. The worker per worker household ratio also eliminates all nonworking households, including retired persons, students, and those on public assistance.

As noted above, the 2014 Five-Year ACS indicates that the City of Denver had an average of 1.61 workers per worker household.¹ Using the 1.61 workers per household figure in the nexus fee calculations is a conservative assumption because it includes part time and full-time workers. If only full-time workers were included, the ratio of workers per household would be smaller, leading to a larger estimate of new households created. In addition, wages by occupation and industry assume full-time employment. Household incomes will be lower for households with part-time workers, generating a larger impact than projected in this study.

DISTRIBUTE EMPLOYEE HOUSEHOLDS BY OCCUPATION

This step distributes households by occupational groupings for each land use. This step is necessary to estimate new workers' incomes. DRA used the most recent data available from the May 2012 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates to estimate the percentage distribution of employment by industry occupational category for the non-residential land uses. This data is based on national estimates, the best data available, and therefore is generalizable to locations across the City. These distributions are shown in **Table 23** for the non-residential uses analyzed. The projected numbers of new employee households by occupational category are shown in **Table 24** for the non-residential prototypes.



¹ 334,730 employed residents divided by 207,599 households with at least one worker.

ESTIMATE WAGES BY OCCUPATION

In this step, occupation is translated to income based on May 2015 wage and salary information for the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood Metropolitan Division from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data on mean, median, 10th percentile, 25th percentile, 75th percentile and 90th percentile hourly wages by occupation were used to estimate the percentage of employees earning salaries in the low and moderate income categories based on the 2015 HUD income limits (to match the year of the 2015 wage data) for the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood HMFA. Since household income is derived primarily from wages, particularly at lower income levels, these percentage distributions should remain relatively constant over short time frames. The wage data used in the analysis, summarized in **Table 15**, is for the Denver metro area and thus is generalizable to locations across the City.

ESTIMATE LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

The estimated percentage and number of households with incomes under 30 percent AMI, between 31 percent and 60 percent AMI, between 61 percent and 80 percent AMI, and between 81 percent and 120 percent are shown in **Tables 25** through **28**, respectively for the non-residential prototypes. To estimate the percentage of employees in each occupational category qualifying for each income category, this analysis uses 2015 income limits (to match the year of the wage data) for a household size of two and one-half persons¹ of approximately \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI, and \$81,500 at 120% AMI.

Individual employee income data was used to calculate the number of households that fall into these income categories by assuming that multiple earner households are, on average, formed of individuals with incomes within the same income category (very low income or low income).

It should be noted that there will be some overlap between the nexus calculations for residential and non-residential development, particularly in the retail and service categories. The employees needed to provide the goods and services to new residents will be based in non-residential buildings, such as retail stores. If proposed nexus fees are close to the justifiable maximums, this overlap should be taken into account to avoid double-charging for the same affordable housing



¹ This is more conservative than using an average household size of two persons since it results in higher income limits.

impacts. At fee levels well below justifiable maximums, this issue should not be a problem.

The number of low and moderate income housing units necessary to house the new households equals the performance requirement for each prototype. For non-residential land uses, the performance requirement can be expressed as the number and/or percentage of gross square feet of building area required, based on the average unit size of affordable units needed. The performance requirements that are equivalent to the maximum justifiable nexus fees, expressed as a percentage of the total square feet of land use, are summarized in **Table 29** for the non-residential land uses.¹

Table 29 Estimated Affordable Housing Performance Requirements Non-Residential Land Uses Denver Affordable Housing Nexus and Inclusionary Housing Study								
Nexus Fee per Gross Square Foot								
	Under 30%	30% to 60%	60% to 80%	80% to 120%				
Land Use	AMI	AMI	AMI	AMI				
Office	4%	17%	12%	12%				
Hotel	13%	19%	5%	3%				
Retail	20%	23%	9%	6%				
Warehouse	2%	9%	4%	3%				
Manufacturing	2%	9%	6%	7%				

Source: DRA



¹ Calculated by multiplying the estimated number of new low and moderate income households by an average unit size of 833 gross square feet (750 net square feet for an average of one- and two-bedroom units, divided by 90% efficiency ratio for the 5-story residential prototype used in the gap analysis), divided by total gross square feet.



Affordability Gap Analysis

The affordability gap analysis compares the cost of developing housing in the City with the amount low and moderate income households can afford to pay for housing. The affordability gap represents the capital subsidy required to develop housing affordable to families at target income levels. The methodology, key assumptions and findings of the affordability gap analysis are summarized below.

The gap analysis is based on the costs to build new mid-rise multifamily rental housing in Denver, which DRA considers the most cost-effective means of housing these low and moderate income employee households. The estimated nexus fees will understate the justifiable fee for high-rise construction of affordable housing in Downtown, since high-rise construction is more costly to build.

Methodology

The first step in the gap analysis establishes the amount a tenant or homebuyer can afford to contribute to the cost of renting or owning a dwelling unit. The second step estimates the costs of constructing or preserving affordable housing in the City. For the purposes of calculating nexus fees, DRA estimated total development costs of \$350 per net square foot and assumed average unit sizes of 600 square feet for a one-bedroom unit and 900 square feet for a two-bedroom unit based on a review of pro formas from the Denver Housing Authority for recent mid-rise affordable housing developments. Given the average household size of 2.28¹ persons in the City, the average affordability gap for a one-bedroom and a two-bedroom unit is used to calculate the nexus fees.



¹Based on a household population of 618,903 divided by 271,054 households in the City of Denver as of the 2010 to 2014 American Community Survey.

The third step in the gap analysis establishes the housing expenses borne by the tenants and owners. These costs can be categorized into operating costs, and financing or mortgage obligations. Operating costs are the maintenance expenses of the unit, including utilities, property maintenance, property taxes, management fees, property insurance, replacement reserve, and insurance. For the rental prototype used in this analysis, DRA assumed that the landlord pays all but certain tenant-paid utilities as an annual operating cost of the unit paid from rental income. Operating costs for the affordable unit are estimated at \$6,100 per unit, excluding reserves, based on recent pro formas from the Denver Housing Authority.

Financing or mortgage obligations are the costs associated with the purchase or development of the housing unit itself. These costs occur when all or a portion of the development cost is financed. This cost is always an obligation of the landlord or owner. Supportable financing is deducted from the total development cost, to determine the capital subsidy required to develop the prototypical housing unit affordable to an eligible family at each income level.

For the rental housing prototype used in this analysis, the gap analysis calculates the difference between total development costs and the conventional mortgage supportable by net operating income from restricted rents.

The results of the gap analysis are used to determine the fee amount that would be required to mitigate the impacts of market-rate development. Therefore, no other housing subsidies, or leverage, are assumed.

Calculation of Per Unit Affordability Gaps

The per unit costs to make new housing affordable to households at the target income levels were calculated by subtracting per unit development costs from the per unit mortgage supportable from affordable rents. No leverage (e.g., use of tax credits) is assumed. The resulting per unit subsidy requirements by income level and cost scenario are shown in **Table 30**. The results of the gap analysis show significant affordability gaps at income levels up to 80% of AMI. At 30% of AMI, affordable rents do not fully cover operating costs so the affordability gap is the full cost of the unit. No gap is indicated at 120% of AMI.



Table 30 Estimated Per Unit Affordability Gaps New Construction Multifamily Housing City of Denver Affordable Housing Nexus and Inclusionary Housing Study										
Per Unit Development										
Unit Size	Cost ¹	30% AMI	60% AMI	80% AMI	120% AMI					
One-Bedroom	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$129,400	\$62,200	\$0					
Two-Bedroom	\$315,000	\$315,000	\$197,500	\$116,800	\$0					
Average of One- and Two- Bedroom Units	\$262,500	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$179,000	\$0					

¹Assumes average unit size of 600 NSF for a one-bedroom unit and 900 NSF for a two-bedroom unit) and development costs of \$350 per net square foot (NSF).

²Based on per unit supportable mortgage by income level less total development cost, assuming affordable rents at 30% of gross income and utility allowances of \$79 for a one-bedroom unit and \$95 for a two-bedroom unit, annual operating costs of \$6,100 per unit, and a 30-year fixed mortgage at an interest rate of 4.0%.

Source: DRA.

Detailed affordability gap calculations for the mid-rise rental prototype are shown in **Table 31**.



Estimated Maximum Justifiable Nexus Fees

The maximum justifiable nexus fees for the residential and non-residential prototypes represent the estimated cost of mitigating their impact on the need for affordable housing in Denver. DRA multiplied the per unit housing affordability gaps by the estimated number of new low income households generated by each of the market-rate housing prototypes to estimate the total cost of mitigating each prototype. The total mitigation cost was then divided by the total gross square feet of residential space (excluding parking) in each prototype to calculate the maximum supportable nexus fee per gross square foot. Nexus fees are typically, but not always, assessed on a gross square foot basis because those are the measurements that are commonly included as part of the planning documents submitted to the City.

Residential Nexus Fees

Table 32 summarizes the estimated maximum supportable residential nexus fees per gross square foot of building area for the Downtown housing prototypes, under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios.

As noted above, the nexus fee estimates are based on the costs to build new midrise multifamily housing in Denver, the most cost-effective means of housing these low and moderate income employee households. Given the average household size of 2.06¹ persons in the City, the average per unit affordability gap for onebedroom and two-bedroom units is used to calculate the nexus fees. The results of the nexus analysis show significant supportable nexus fees for all prototypes and income levels up to 80% AMI. No fees are indicated at 120% of AMI.

Tables 33 through **35** show the calculations of the residential nexus fees under low-, middle- and high-cost areas, respectively.



¹Based on a household population of 583,735 divided by 283,510 households in the City of Denver as of the 2010 census.
		Table 32	Table 32						
Estimated Maximum Justifiable Residential Nexus Fees									
	Residential Prototypes								
Denver Afford	able Housing N	Nexus and Inc	lusionary Ho	using Study					
	- <u>-</u>								
		Nexus Fee	per Gross Sq	uare Foot					
Prototype Description/	Under	30% to	60% to	80% to					
Scenario	30% AMI	60% AMI	80% AMI	120% AMI	Total				
Single-Family Infill									
Low Scenario	\$2.71	\$4.55	\$0.96	\$0.00	\$8.23				
Middle Scenario	\$3.17	\$5.31	\$1.12	\$0.00	\$9.60				
High Scenario	\$3.60	\$6.04	\$1.28	\$0.00	\$10.92				
Owner Townhomes									
Low Scenario	\$3.89	\$6.58	\$1.34	\$0.00	\$11.81				
Middle Scenario	\$5.09	\$8.61	\$1.75	\$0.00	\$15.45				
High Scenario	\$6.17	\$10.43	\$2.12	\$0.00	\$18.72				
12-Story Owner									
Low Scenario	\$5.07	\$8.58	\$1.75	\$0.00	\$15.40				
Middle Scenario	\$6.10	\$10.32	\$2.10	\$0.00	\$18.52				
High Scenario	\$8.26	\$13.98	\$2.85	\$0.00	\$25.09				
5-Story Rental									
Low Scenario	\$4.87	\$8.45	\$1.70	\$0.00	\$15.02				
Middle Scenario	\$5.19	\$9.01	\$1.82	\$0.00	\$16.02				
High Scenario	\$6.49	\$11.26	\$2.27	\$0.00	\$20.02				
20-Story Rental									
Low Scenario	\$5.78	\$9.91	\$1.99	\$0.00	\$17.68				
Middle Scenario	\$6.36	\$10.90	\$2.19	\$0.00	\$19.44				
High Scenario	\$8.67	\$14.86	\$2.99	\$0.00	\$26.52				



Non-Residential Nexus Fees

Table 36 summarizes the estimated maximum supportable non-residential nexus fees per gross square foot of building area for the non-residential land uses examined. Like the residential nexus fees, the non-residential nexus fees are derived from the development costs for the five-story mid-rise rental prototype.

 Table 37 shows the calculation of estimated maximum non-residential mitigation fees per gross square foot.

Table 36 Estimated Maximum Justifiable Non-Residential Nexus Fees Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Nexus and Inclusionary Housing Study							
	Nexus Fee per Gross Square Foot						
	Under 30% 30% to 60% to 80% to						
Land Use	AMI	60% AMI	80% AMI	120% AMI	Total		
Office	\$11.17	\$32.72	\$12.86	\$0.00	\$56.74		
Hotel	\$40.85	\$37.20	\$4.97	\$0.00	\$83.02		
Retail	\$63.40	\$46.09	\$9.81	\$0.00	\$119.29		
Warehouse	\$6.59	\$17.47	\$4.45	\$0.00	\$28.51		
Manufacturing	\$6.17	\$17.00	\$6.39	\$0.00	\$29.57		



Economic Feasibility Analysis

DRA prepared an economic analysis to assist the City in evaluating the potential impact of a new nexus fee on residential and commercial development. In order for a project to be financially feasible, developers must achieve certain returns. Otherwise, the project will not go forward. Therefore, the analysis of the impacts of nexus fee levels housing on development prototypes uses expected returns in order to determine at what fee levels the prototypes are no longer financially feasible. For the nexus fee to be effective in raising funds for the production of affordable units, projects need to be economically feasible.

DRA conducted the economic analysis using the nine housing prototypes¹ described previously in this report. The prototypes include low-, mid- and high-rise residential developments appropriate to a range of current zoning designations in the City, and reflect the range of construction types from stick built, to podium to high-rise concrete and steel that have a major effect on the cost of construction.

The findings of the analysis will assist the City in evaluating alternative nexus fee levels that will generate funds for affordable housing (and potentially units), while being sensitive to current and potential future real estate market conditions.

DRA met with the Technical Advisory Groups and individually interviewed a number of residential and non-residential developers to review the prototypes, revenue, operating cost and development cost assumptions used in the analysis. DRA considered and incorporated comments received into the analysis as considered appropriate. DRA also reviewed available cost data and pro formas from the Denver Housing Authority.

Methodology and Definition of Key Terms

DRA evaluated the economic feasibility of the prototype developments using Return on Cost (ROC), Return on Equity (ROE) and Residual Land Value (RLV) analyses. The Return on Cost approach divides annual net cash flow (also known as net operating income), by the total development cost of the project. This method does not consider the financial benefits or risks of leverage.



¹ Excluding the manufacturing prototype. Economic feasibility was not evaluated for manufacturing uses.

The ROE approach calculates the value of a development based on its stabilized income potential and subtracts the costs of development (including land) to determine the net value of the investment, or developer/investor profit. Under the ROE approach, the financial feasibility of the prototypes is measured by the rate of the ROE that the resulting net investment value (profit or loss) represents. Land costs are held fixed at an estimated market land price and the economic impact of the program is shown as a change in the dollar amount of the net value of investment in the prototype and as a change in the ROE.

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

All three approaches calculate the value of rental prototypes at a point in time based on the estimated stabilized net operating income of the prototype (see definition below). A development and stabilization/sales period of 9 to 48 months is assumed, depending on the prototype.

DRA estimated the costs of developing each prototype, including land, site improvement, building and parking construction, and soft costs, based on a review of available pro forma data, meetings with the Technical Advisory Groups, and one-on-one interviews with developers and others active in the Denver market.

DRA calculated the net operating income (NOI) from each prototype based on estimated market rents and operating costs for the rental units and condominium sales prices for the owner units. Net operating income for the apartment uses is capitalized at estimated capitalization rates to determine the value of the developed property. Net operating income and net sales income were calculated for the prototypes with no nexus fee, and under alternative nexus fee levels. This allows a comparison of the relative impact of alternative levels of nexus fees on the financial performance of the prototypes.

Key terms and assumptions used in this analysis are as follows:

<u>Stabilized net operating income</u>: Stabilized net operating income is used in the analysis of the rental housing and non-residential prototypes. During the lease-up period, a rental development will see a gradual increase in occupancy until



the development is almost fully occupied and considered stabilized. Even after initial lease-up is completed, the development will experience some level of vacancy on an annual basis as the turnover of existing tenants occurs. DRA analyzed the prototypes' estimated net operating income (which equals total possible gross rental income at full occupancy less an assumed vacancy less operating costs) assuming a stabilized vacancy rate of 7% for the residential apartment prototypes, 28% for the hotel prototype, and 10% for the other nonresidential uses.

<u>Return on Cost (ROC)</u>: ROE is defined as stabilized net operating income divided by total development costs. Minimum ROC thresholds are estimated at 15% for the owner housing prototypes and 1.5% above the assumed cap rate for the remaining prototypes.

<u>Return on Equity (ROE)</u>: ROE is defined as net project value (capitalized net operating income for the rental prototypes or net sales proceeds for the condo prototypes, less total development costs), divided by the total amount of the equity investment, which is then divided by the estimated term of the equity investment, equity (including developer equity, investor equity, and mezzanine debt) is assumed to finance 50% to 70% of total development costs, depending on the prototype. For the ROE analysis, feasibility threshold returns are estimated at 10% for the owner housing prototypes and 8% for the remaining prototypes.

<u>Residual Land Value (RLV):</u> Land residual analysis calculates the value of a development based on its income potential and subtracts the costs of development and an assumed Return on Equity to yield the underlying value of the land. RLV is generally measured as the dollar value per square foot of site area. For the land residual analysis, feasibility is measured by residual land values that approach or exceed current market land sales prices after deducting development costs and an assumed Return on Equity of 8%. Equity is again assumed to finance 30% of total development costs.

<u>Cap rate</u>: A capitalization (or "cap") rate is the ratio of net operating income to project fair market value, or project sales price, exhibited in the market and reflects the rate of return required by investors in rental property. Cap rates are tracked by land use and market area based on observed property sales. This analysis uses cap rates to estimate the fair market value of the rental prototypes. Net operating income for the apartment and non-residential uses is capitalized at an estimated cap rate to determine the estimated fair market value of the developed and stabilized property.



The analysis was conducted under two capitalization ("cap") rate scenarios representing a "low" rate and a "high" rate" for each prototype. The "low" cap rate represents the estimated current rate for each prototype based on developer interviews and input at the TAG meetings. The low and high rates also correspond to the range of cap rates for each product type from the CBRE Cap Rate Survey for Denver for the Second Half of 2015. Developer input generally agreed that current rates are at the higher end of the range.

Estimated Prototype Development Costs

DRA estimated development costs for each of the prototypes, including land acquisition costs, hard construction costs, soft or indirect costs, and sales/marketing costs.

DRA worked with the Technical Advisory Groups to develop "baseline" assumptions regarding land and development costs representing current 2016 costs. Development projects coming on line today started construction several months to several years ago, and land and construction costs have increased substantially since that time period. Therefore, the "final" cost assumptions used in the analysis adjusted land costs down by 25% for the prototypes with the longest development periods, namely the 5-story rental apartment, 20-story rental apartment, 5-story office building and 12-story office building prototypes. This adjustment was based on input from the Technical Advisory Groups. In addition, TAG members agreed that construction costs have risen rapidly in recent years, by as much as 7% to 8% per year. Therefore, DRA adjusted the hard construction costs for the same four prototypes listed above downward by 20%. Since the prototypes are intended to reflect projects being completed in today's market, no escalation of rents and operating costs is assumed.

The "baseline" development cost assumptions used in this analysis and the resulting development cost budgets for each prototype are detailed in **Table 38**. The "final" development cost assumptions and budgets used in this analysis are shown in **Table 39**.

LAND ACQUISITION COSTS

Land acquisition costs were estimated for the prototypes based on a review of data from the County Assessor's Office and interviews with the TAGs and local developers. The costs are intended to reflect recent purchases in the market. Land costs are shown on an estimated per housing unit and a per site square foot basis.



Since both residential and commercial development is allowed on many sites, residential and commercial developers compete for some of the same sites.

Data from the Assessor's Office on recent land sales was broken out by zoning (commercial, residential, industrial) and divided into thirds with the median of each third representing a low-, medium and high-cost figure. A second analysis was conducting separating out the top 3% of sales before dividing the remainder by thirds into low, medium and high cost. The analysis was also done separately for vacant, improved and combined vacant and improved properties.

The results of the analysis generated land values that are significantly lower than the assumptions developed in conjunction with the TAGs. Partly, this is due to the lag in the data, which represent sales from several years ago. For example, the top 3% of sales ranged from \$80 per square foot to \$250 per square foot, while the high commercial land value was \$37.50 per square foot. Therefore, the analysis relied more heavily on the assumptions generated in association with the TAGs. As noted above, estimated "baseline" land costs were adjusted downwards by 25% for selected prototypes to represent the costs for projects that started constructed several years ago and are being completed currently.

HARD CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Hard construction costs were estimated for the prototypes based on a review of recent pro formas, input from the TAGs and developer interviews. As noted above, the "baseline" assumptions for hard building construction costs are assumed to reflect costs for projects beginning construction in the current market. These were reduced by 20% for selected prototypes with long development time frames to reflect the costs for projects that began construction several years ago and are coming on the market today. Hard costs include on-site improvements, building and parking costs.

SOFT (INDIRECT) DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Soft or indirect costs were estimated based on DRA's experience with development nationwide, as well as information on local development projects. Soft costs include:

- Architectural, engineering and design fees;
- Legal and closing costs;
- Taxes and insurance (during the construction period);



- Interest during construction (land and construction loans);
- Financing fees;
- Marketing and leasing (for the rental prototypes); and
- Marketing costs (for the owner prototypes).

Total soft costs are estimated to equal 20% of hard costs.

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Total development costs equal the sum of the above categories of development costs.

NEXUS FEES

Alternative levels of nexus fees, ranging from \$1.00 to \$7.00 per square foot of gross building area excluding parking, are added to total development costs to test the impact of a fee on financial feasibility.

Estimated Market Rents and Sales Prices

APARTMENT RENTS, VACANCY RATES AND OPERATING COSTS

DRA developed residential rents, non-residential lease rates, and operating cost assumptions for the rental prototypes (based on an analysis of market data, review of available pro formas, and interviews with local developers and other professionals involved in the Denver rental market. Estimated rental income is calculated based on an average rent per net square foot that varies by prototype. Assumptions were developed for low-, middle-and high-cost scenarios. Rent assumptions were derived from input from the TAGs, as well as a review of published sources. For rental apartments, DRA reviewed data from Apartment Insights for the first quarter of 2016, with a focus on rents for unfurnished units, no utilities for projects in the lease-up phase. For the office prototypes, DRA reviewed data from Office Insight for the first quarter of 2016. For the warehouse prototype, DRA reviewed advertised asking rents for projects listed on loopnet.com.

The net operating income calculations assume a 7% vacancy rate on the rental apartment units, 28% for the hotel prototypes, and 10% for the remaining non-residential prototypes.



DRA developed estimated per unit stabilized operating costs for the rental properties. Operating costs vary depending upon the level of services and amenities expected with a certain rent level and the property taxes associated with the location of the property. The highest operating costs are for the high-rise properties, which offer a high level of services and amenities and have the highest property taxes because of their high property values.

Net operating income assumptions and calculations for the market-rate housing units and for the non-residential prototypes are shown in **Tables 40** and **41**, respectively.

OWNER SALES PRICES

DRA estimated sales prices for new single-family infill homes and new townhomes based on TAG and developer input.

Due to construction defect litigation issues and a lack of available financing for condominiums, most of the higher density residential development since 2010 has served the rental market. Therefore, little data is available on recent condo sales.

Condominium sales costs are estimated at 7% of the gross sales price for single-family homes and 9% for townhomes and condos.

Estimated condominium sales prices and projected net sales income are shown in **Table 42.**

Return on Equity and Residual Land Value Analysis Results

Tables 43 and **44** detail the Return on Equity analysis calculations for the prototypes assuming different levels of a nexus fee, at lower and higher cap rates, respectively.

Tables 45 and **46** detail the Residual Land Value analysis calculations for the prototypes by nexus fee level, at lower and higher cap rates, respectively. Residual land value is shown per square foot of site area and per housing unit.

Tables 47 and **48** show the unleveraged Return on Cost calculations.

The findings of the economic feasibility analysis are summarized as follows:



- 1. Returns for all three owner housing prototypes (single-family infill, townhomes and 12-story condos) exceed threshold returns for the ROC and ROE measures (15% and 10%, respectively) and the RLV exceeds estimated current land costs with no nexus fee. The ROC begins to fall below the threshold with a \$5.00 per square foot nexus fee under the low- and middle-cost scenarios and with a \$7.00 per square foot nexus fee under the high-cost scenario. The ROE measure exceeds the threshold and the RLV exceeds estimated land acquisition costs with fee levels up to \$7.00 per square foot at low-, middle-and high-cost scenarios.
- 2. For the 5-story rental prototype, the ROC measure is below the threshold of 6.5% with no fee and with all levels of the nexus fee tested. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 5.79% with no fee to 5.65% with a \$7.00 per square foot nexus fee, a reduction of 2% from the no fee alternative. With a \$2.00 per square foot nexus fee, the ROC is 5.75%, a decline of 0.3% from the no fee baseline. However, the ROE measure exceeds the threshold of 8%, and the RLV exceeds estimated land acquisition costs at all fee levels up to \$7.00 under the low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios.
- 3. For the 20-story rental prototype, the ROC is below the threshold of 6.5% with no fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 6.24% with no fee to 6.20% with a nexus fee of \$2.00 per square foot and to 6.10% with a nexus fee of \$7.00 per square foot, reductions of 0.6% and 2%, respectively. The ROE measure exceeds the threshold of 8% and the RLV exceeds estimated land costs at all fee levels under low-, middle-, and high-cost scenarios.
- 4. The 5-story office prototype also does not meet the ROC threshold of 7.0% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 5.95% with no fee to 5.91% with a \$2.00 nexus fee and to 5.82% with a fee of \$7.00 per square foot, reductions of 0.7% and 2%, respectively. The ROE is also below the threshold of 8% for the low- and middle-cost scenarios. However, under the high-cost scenario, the ROE exceeds the threshold of 8% and the RLV exceeds estimated land acquisition costs at fee levels up to \$7.00 per square foot.
- 5. Similarly, the 12-story office prototype does not meet the ROC threshold of 7.0% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 5.93% with no fee to 5.90% with a fee of \$2.00 per square foot and to 5.80% with a fee of \$7.00 per square foot, reductions of 0.5% and 2%, respectively. This prototype performs best under the low-cost and middle-cost scenarios. For the high-rise office prototype, which is expected to be built only



in high-cost areas such as the Downtown or Cherry Creek where rents are highest and higher density is allowed, the difference in these scenarios represents a sensitivity analysis of alternative cost and revenue assumptions that reflect specific site locational factors rather than larger geographic market variations. Under the low- and middle-cost scenarios, the ROE exceeds the threshold of 8% at all levels of a nexus fee up to \$7.00 per square foot. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROE falls below the threshold only with the \$7.00 fee.

- 6. For the 4-story hotel, the ROC exceeds the threshold of 9% only under the high-cost scenario. For this scenario, the ROC stays above the threshold at all fee levels up to \$7.00 per square foot, declining from 9.38% with no fee to 9.33% with a \$2.00 fee and to 9.21% with a \$7.00 fee, reductions of 0.5% and 2%, respectively.
- 7. The retail prototype does not meet the threshold ROC of 7.0%, even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 6.19% with not fee to 6.17% with a \$2.00 per square foot fee and to 6.05% with a \$7.00 per square foot fee, reductions of 0.3% and 2%, respectively. The ROE exceeds the threshold of 8.0% for all fee levels under low-, middle- and high-cost scenarios.
- 8. The warehouse prototype also does not meet the threshold ROC of 7.5% even without a nexus fee. Under the high-cost scenario, the ROC declines from 6.68% with no fee to 6.58% with a \$2.00 per square foot fee and to 6.37% with a \$7.00 per square foot fee, reductions of 1% and 5%, respectively.

In summary, the analysis indicates that nexus fees up to \$7.00 per square foot have a relatively small effect on returns, with reductions in the ROC generally under 2%, based on the ROC, ROE and RLV measures for the prototypes analyzed. To the extent that fees at the levels analyzed do affect project feasibility, DRA expects that the market will adjust to fees at the moderate levels proposed over time. Regulation and development impact fees on residential development that increase the costs of development, including nexus fees, will ultimately be passed through to the landowner in the form of reduced land prices. In order for developers to profitably develop new projects, they will bid down land prices to the level that makes development feasible, given market economics and zoning regulations affecting the amount of development that can be built on a particular site. Land prices typically react quickly to factors that increase land prices, such as increases in rents and sales prices. Land prices tend to be slower to respond to factors that depress land prices, such as changing market conditions and increased regulation or fees,



since owners who purchased the land recently may be reluctant to take a loss and others may be hesitant to adjust their expectations downward.

Land prices are also volatile in response to economic cycles and factors beyond the control of local government. For example, land will lose value in higher cap rate environments. If rates of return are far below target levels, or residual land values are very low or negative with little to no room for downward adjustment, it indicates that capitalized values are not sufficient to cover the other development costs besides land, and new development will be slowed or halted until market conditions change. This will be the case whether the loss in values is due to changing market conditions and cap rates or to governmental fees or regulations.

Policy Recommendations

DRA's policy recommendations with regards to the adoption of nexus fees to support the production of affordable housing in Denver are as follows:

- 1. Set affordable housing impact fees (nexus fees) for residential and non-residential development below the maximum supportable nexus fees.
- 2. Review fee levels annually to reflect the actual costs for the City to produce affordable units.
 - a. Adjust nexus fees annually based on a readily available index, such as the Consumer Price Index, a construction cost index, or the median home price in the City of Denver. Using an index will adjust for changes in the local economy over time.
 - b. Update the nexus and feasibility analysis approximately every five years to ensure the necessary relationship between market-rate real estate development and affordable housing is maintained. If fee levels are low relative to maximum justifiable fees, regular update of the nexus analysis may not be required. DRA recommends that the City update the feasibility assessment prior to implementing fee increases that are materially greater than the annual adjustment for inflation.
- 3. Development impact fee programs may include the cost of administering the program that funds affordable housing, including:
 - a. The administrative costs of assessing, collecting, cost accounting, and public reporting of the fee;



- b. The cost of justification analyses, legal support, and other costs of annual and/or periodic updates to the fee; and
- c. Costs of capital planning and programming, including project management costs associated with the share of projects funded by the fee.

Administration charges typically range from 1.0 percent up to 5.0 percent and may be added to the maximum fee level.

- 4. To incentivize the building of housing units in lieu of paying the fee, the City may adopt a performance requirement or build alternative that requires residential projects to provide fewer affordable units on site than the economic equivalent of paying the fee.
- 5. The relationship between non-residential development and the need for affordable housing varies by land use, as demonstrated by the range of justifiable nexus fees. Some jurisdictions adopt lower fees with broader applicability across non-residential land uses, while others adopt higher fees that vary by non-residential land use. If fee levels are adopted that are low relative to the maximum justifiable fee, the City may find that the ease of administration of a uniform fee for all types of non-residential development outweighs the benefit of assessing different fees for subcategories of non-residential development. If fees are adopted closer to the maximum justifiable fees, a fee that varies by type of non-residential development may better allow the City to maximum fee revenue.
- 6. Many local jurisdictions adopt project size thresholds below which fees are not levied. These thresholds range from as low as 500 square feet or two residential units to as high as 100,000 square feet. Typically, the rationale for thresholds is that a fee may have a greater effect on the economic feasibility of smaller projects. The downside of the use of thresholds is that it may result in projects being redesigned or phased to keep the project size below threshold levels. Thresholds are less important if fee levels are low.
- 7. Some local jurisdictions levy fees on single-family and duplex home construction and expansion of existing units, while others exempt such residential uses from the fee. In Denver, most larger single-family tract developments are currently under inclusionary housing agreements, and would not be subject to the fee. Therefore, a fee on single-family and duplex homes would mainly fall on infill development/redevelopment, as would a fee on residential additions. DRA is not aware of any economic or other factors that



warrant excluding such residential uses from the fee. DRA is not aware of any jurisdictions that have adopted fees on renovation projects that do not expand the size of the unit.

8. The most common practice with nexus fees is to charge a uniform citywide fee that does not vary by geography. A few jurisdictions have adopted nexus fees that vary by geographic subarea. For example, the City of Pasadena, California varies residential fees for four geographic subareas, in order to incentivize development in more economically challenged areas of the City by setting lower fees there relative to stronger market areas within the City. The City of Seattle, Washington varies commercial nexus fees for low-, medium- and highcost areas of the City to maximize potential fee revenue by setting fees closer to the maximum justifiable fees in each type of geographic area. If fees are varied by geography, DRA recommends increased monitoring of changing market conditions and boundaries of geographic subareas to avoid unintended consequences on the location of new development. Where adopted fees are low relative to maximum justifiable fees, the ease of administration of a citywide fee may well outweigh the advantages of varying fees by geography.



Table 7Projected Disposable Household Income of New Owner HouseholdsOwner Housing PrototypesLow Cost ScenarioDenver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner
Average Unit Size (SF)	2,800	1,500	975
Average Sales Price Per SF (1)	\$300	\$333	\$450
Average Sales Price Per Unit (2)	\$840,000	\$500,000	\$438,900
Mortgage Amount (3)	\$756,000	\$450,000	\$395,010
Monthly Principal and Interest Payment (4)	\$4,058	\$2,416	\$2,120
Monthly Property Taxes (5)	\$420	\$250	\$219
Monthly HOA Dues Plus Insurance	\$75	\$75	\$250
Total Monthly Housing Cost	\$4,553	\$2,741	\$2,590
Estimated Average Annual Income (6)	\$156,000	\$94,000	\$89,000
Sales Price to Income Ratio	5.38	5.32	4.93
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (7)	65%	65%	65%
Ave. Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$101,400	\$61,100	\$57,850
Number of Units in Prototype	1	10	233
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$101,400	\$611,000	\$13,479,050

(1) Based on market data.

(2) Average sales price per SF multiplied by average unit size.

(3) At a 90% loan to value (price) ratio, assuming a 10% buyer downpayment.

(4) Monthly mortgage principal and interest payment assuming a 5.0% fixed-rate loan for 30 years.

(5) Monthly property taxes estimated at 0.6% annual tax rate.

(6) Assumes principal, interest, taxes and insurance (PITI) at 35% of gross annual household income.

(7) After deductions for federal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and personal savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing

Table 8Projected Disposable Household Income of New Owner HouseholdsOwner Housing PrototypesMiddle Cost ScenarioDenver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner
Average Unit Size (SF)	2,800	2,000	975
Average Sales Price Per SF (1)	\$350	\$330	\$550
Average Sales Price Per Unit (2)	\$980,000	\$660,000	\$536,400
Mortgage Amount (3)	\$882,000	\$594,000	\$482,760
Monthly Principal and Interest Payment (4)	\$4,735	\$3,189	\$2,592
Monthly Property Taxes (5)	\$490	\$330	\$268
Monthly HOA Dues Plus Insurance	\$75	\$75	\$250
Total Monthly Housing Cost	\$5,300	\$3,594	\$3,110
Estimated Average Annual Income (6)	\$182,000	\$123,000	\$107,000
Sales Price to Income Ratio	5.38	5.37	5.01
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (7)	65%	65%	65%
Ave. Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$118,300	\$79,950	\$69,550
Number of Units in Prototype	1	10	233
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$118,300	\$799,500	\$16,205,150

(1) Based on market data.

(2) Average sales price per SF multiplied by average unit size.

(3) At a 90% loan to value (price) ratio, assuming a 10% buyer downpayment.

(4) Monthly mortgage principal and interest payment assuming a 5.0% fixed-rate loan for 30 years.

(5) Monthly property taxes estimated at 0.6% annual tax rate.

(6) Assumes principal, interest, taxes and insurance (PITI) at 35% of gross annual household income.

(7) After deductions for federal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and personal savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing

Table 9 Projected Disposable Household Income of New Owner Households Owner Housing Prototypes High Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner
Average Unit Size (SF)	2,800	2,300	975
Average Sales Price Per SF (1)	\$400	\$348	\$600
Average Sales Price Per Unit (2)	\$1,120,000	\$800,000	\$585,200
Mortgage Amount (3)	\$1,008,000	\$720,000	\$526,680
Monthly Principal and Interest Payment (4)	\$5,411	\$3,865	\$2,827
Monthly Property Taxes (5)	\$560	\$400	\$293
Monthly HOA Dues Plus Insurance	\$75	\$75	\$250
Total Monthly Housing Cost	\$6,046	\$4,340	\$3,370
Estimated Average Annual Income (6)	\$207,000	\$149,000	\$116,000
Sales Price to Income Ratio	5.41	5.37	5.04
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (7)	65%	65%	65%
Ave. Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$134,550	\$96,850	\$75,400
Number of Units in Prototype	1	10	233
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$134,550	\$968,500	\$17,568,200

(1) Based on market data.

(2) Average sales price per SF multiplied by average unit size.

(3) At a 90% loan to value (price) ratio, assuming a 10% buyer downpayment.

(4) Monthly mortgage principal and interest payment assuming a 5.0% fixed-rate loan for 30 years.

(5) Monthly property taxes estimated at 0.6% annual tax rate.

(6) Assumes principal, interest, taxes and insurance (PITI) at 35% of gross annual household income.

(7) After deductions for federal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and personal savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing prototypes. Source: DRA.

Table 10 Projected Disposable Household Income of New Renter Households Rental Housing Prototypes Low Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental
Average Unit Size (SF)	708	810
Average Monthly Rent Per SF	\$2.15	\$2.50
Average Monthly Rent Per Unit (1)	\$1,500	\$2,000
Average Household Income (2)	\$60,000	\$80,000
Annual Household Income to Rent Ratio	3.3	3.3
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (3)	65%	65%
Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$39,000	\$52,000
Number of Units in Prototype	300	285
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$11,700,000	\$14,820,000

(1) Based on market data.

(2) Assumes rent at 33% of household income.

(3) After deductions forfederal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and person savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing prototypes.

Table 11Projected Disposable Household Income of New Renter HouseholdsRental Housing PrototypesMiddle Cost ScenarioDenver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental
Average Unit Size (SF)	708	810
Average Monthly Rent Per SF	\$2.25	\$2.75
Average Monthly Rent Per Unit (1)	\$1,600	\$2,200
Average Household Income (2)	\$64,000	\$88,000
Annual Household Income to Rent Ratio	3.3	3.3
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (3)	65%	65%
Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$41,600	\$57,200
Number of Units in Prototype	300	285
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$12,480,000	\$16,302,000

(1) Based on market data.

(2) Assumes rent at 33% of household income.

⁽³⁾ After deductions forfederal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and person savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing prototypes.

Table 12 Projected Disposable Household Income of New Renter Households Rental Housing Prototypes High Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental
Average Unit Size (SF)	708	810
Average Monthly Rent Per SF	\$2.50	\$3.00
Average Monthly Rent Per Unit (1)	\$1,800	\$2,400
Average Household Income (2)	\$72,000	\$96,000
Annual Household Income to Rent Ratio	3.3	3.3
Percent of Income Available for Expenditures (3)	65%	65%
Disposable Income Available for Expenditures	\$46,800	\$62,400
Number of Units in Prototype	300	285
Total Disposable Household Income of Resident HHs	\$14,040,000	\$17,784,000

(1) Based on market data.

(2) Assumes rent at 33% of household income.

(3) After deductions forfederal and state income taxes, Social Security and Medicare (FICA) taxes, and person savings. Based on data from the Tax Policy Center for households at the income levels projected for the housing prototypes.

Table 13Projected Employment GenerationResidential PrototypesLow, Middle and High Cost ScenariosDenver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Prototype Tenure	Total Employees Generated
Single-Family Infill	Owner	
Low Scenario		0.31
Middle Scenario		0.36
High Scenario		0.41
Owner Townhomes	Owner	
Low Scenario		3.10
Middle Scenario		4.05
High Scenario		4.91
12-Story Owner	Owner	
Low Scenario		57.39
Middle Scenario		69.00
High Scenario		74.80
5-Story Rental	Renter	
Low Scenario		46.71
Middle Scenario		49.83
High Scenario		56.05
20-Story Rental	Renter	
Low Scenario	Kenter	66.86
Middle Scenario		73.55
High Scenario		80.23
0		

Table 14Projected Employment Generation by IndustryResidential PrototypesMiddle Cost ScenarioDenver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental
Total Household Expenditures	\$118,300	\$799,500	\$16,205,150	\$12,480,000	\$16,302,000
Total Jobs Generated by Industry (1)					
Manufacturing	0.0071	0.0845	1.4365	1.1062	1.6206
Wholesale Trade	0.0113	0.1261	2.1439	1.4776	2.1676
Retail Trade	0.0490	0.5432	9.2352	6.2647	9.1984
Transportation	0.0077	0.0771	1.3111	0.8759	1.3267
Warehousing and Storage	0.0015	0.0165	0.2806	0.1934	0.2847
Information and Communication	0.0057	0.0695	1.1818	0.9564	1.3477
Finance and Insurance	0.0312	0.3432	5.8358	4.0018	6.0216
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.0128	0.1557	2.6479	2.6302	3.3426
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.0153	0.1727	2.9356	2.1149	3.1099
Management and Administrative	0.0207	0.2390	4 0641	3 0319	4 4417
Educational Convices	0.0207	0.1802	2.0622	1 5417	2,6902
	0.0237	0.1802	5.0055	1.3417	2.0005
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.0713	0.8871	15.0831	11.5712	16.7416
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.0098	0.1028	1.7474	1.2569	1.8493
Other Services	0.0874	1.0241	17.4132	12.3225	18.7839
Government	0.0033	0.0333	0.6183	0.4810	0.6309
Total	0.3577	4.0550	68.9979	49.8261	73.5475

(1) Includes total employment, full-time and part-time.

Source: IMPLAN Input/Output Model; DRA.

SOC Code Prefix (1)	Occupational Category	Employment	% of Total Employ-ment	Mean Hourly Wage	Mean Annual Wage	10th Percentile Hourly Wage	25th Percentile Hourly Wage	Median (50th Percentile) Hourly Wage	75th Percentile Hourly Wage	90th Percentile Hourly Wage
11	Management	65,770	5%	\$60.88	\$126,640	\$27.07	\$38.89	\$55.98	\$77.61	N/A
13	Business and Financial Operations	111,080	8%	\$36.80	\$76,550	\$19.63	\$25.54	\$34.08	\$44.99	\$59.14
15	Computer and Mathematical	63,100	5%	\$43.47	\$90,410	\$23.77	\$32.33	\$43.43	\$55.61	\$67.32
17	Architecture and Engineering	36,740	3%	\$42.46	\$88,320	\$22.19	\$30.21	\$39.46	\$52.41	\$68.00
19	Life, Physical and Social Science	14,500	1%	\$35.41	\$73,640	\$16.40	\$22.46	\$32.13	\$46.99	\$61.37
21	Community and Social Services	16,480	1%	\$22.85	\$47,530	\$13.30	\$16.66	\$21.76	\$28.53	\$36.27
23	Legal	15,660	1%	\$50.25	\$104,520	\$18.67	\$25.45	\$38.17	\$66.16	N/A
25	Education, Training, and Library	72,830	5%	\$25.62	\$53,280	\$11.83	\$16.15	\$22.71	\$32.04	\$42.49
27	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, Media	20,710	2%	\$25.53	\$53,100	\$9.57	\$14.79	\$22.88	\$32.65	\$45.17
29	Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	72,500	5%	\$38.27	\$79,590	\$17.34	\$24.75	\$33.49	\$44.35	\$61.56
31	Healthcare Support	33,610	2%	\$15.95	\$33,180	\$10.32	\$12.43	\$15.25	\$18.51	\$23.78
33	Protective Service	28,340	2%	\$22.51	\$46,830	\$9.65	\$11.71	\$17.37	\$31.80	\$40.59
35	Food Preparation and Serving-Related	122,870	9%	\$10.82	\$22,510	\$8.45	\$8.79	\$9.36	\$11.55	\$16.33
37	Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	41,980	3%	\$12.46	\$25,920	\$8.79	\$9.62	\$11.58	\$14.49	\$19.14

SOC Code Prefix (1) 39	Occupational Category Personal Care and	Employment 44,510	% of Total Employ-ment 3%	Mean Hourly Wage \$12.70	Mean Annual Wage \$26,420	10th Percentile Hourly Wage \$8.60	25th Percentile Hourly Wage \$9.15	Median (50th Percentile) Hourly Wage \$10.68	75th Percentile Hourly Wage \$13.76	90th Percentile Hourly Wage \$19.89
	Service									
41	Sales and Related	155,440	11%	\$21.62	\$44,980	\$8.79	\$9.83	\$14.63	\$26.88	\$45.51
43	Office and Administrative Support	206,720	15%	\$18.53	\$38,550	\$10.64	\$13.72	\$17.80	\$23.15	\$28.61
45	Farming, Fishing, Forestry	1,600	0%	\$13.45	\$27,970	\$8.62	\$9.21	\$12.31	\$14.87	\$18.78
47	Construction and Extraction	64,880	5%	\$21.64	\$45,020	\$12.91	\$15.94	\$20.17	\$26.75	\$34.41
49	Installation, Maintenance and Repair	50,910	4%	\$23.62	\$49,120	\$12.52	\$16.45	\$22.70	\$30.05	\$37.19
51	Production	51,110	4%	\$17.54	\$36,490	\$9.67	\$11.72	\$15.69	\$21.57	\$29.15
53	Transportation and Material Moving	82,930	6%	\$19.06	\$39,640	\$9.13	\$11.19	\$15.79	\$22.13	\$29.92

TOTAL

1,374,270 100%

(1) The first two digits of the six digit Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) code.(2) Based on the 2015 income limits for the Denver, adjusted for a 2.5 person household.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2015 Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Area Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates; DRA.

SOC Code Prefix (1)	Occupational Category	Employment	10th Percentile Annual Wage	25th Percentile Annual Wage	Median (50th Percentile) Annual Wage	75th Percentile Annual Wage	90th Percentile Annual Wage	Est. % of Jobs Below 30% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 30%-60% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 60%-80% AMI (2)	Est. % of Jobs Between 80%-120% AMI (2)
11	Management	65,770	\$56,300	\$80,900	\$116,440	\$161,440	N/A	0%	0%	10%	15%
13	Business and Financial Operations	111,080	\$40,830	\$53 <i>,</i> 120	\$70,880	\$93,580	\$123,010	0%	10%	15%	37%
15	Computer and Mathematical	63,100	\$49,440	\$67,240	\$90,330	\$115,660	\$140,030	0%	5%	12%	23%
17	Architecture and Engineering	36,740	\$46,150	\$62 <i>,</i> 850	\$82,070	\$109,000	\$141,430	0%	5%	12%	33%
19	Life, Physical and Social Science	14,500	\$34,120	\$46,720	\$66,830	\$97,740	\$127,650	0%	17%	20%	25%
21	Community and Social Services	16,480	\$27,660	\$34,660	\$45,270	\$59,330	\$75,450	5%	32%	30%	92%
23	Legal	15,660	\$38,830	\$52,930	\$79,390	\$137,620	N/A	0%	10%	17%	39%
25	Education, Training, and Library	72,830	\$24,600	\$33 <i>,</i> 590	\$47,230	\$66,640	\$88,370	6%	29%	26%	25%
27	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, Media	20,710	\$19,900	\$30,770	\$47,590	\$67,900	\$93,950	10%	25%	25%	23%
29	Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	72,500	\$36,070	\$51,480	\$69,660	\$92,240	\$128,050	0%	10%	19%	34%
31	Healthcare Support	33,610	\$21,470	\$25,850	\$31,710	\$38,500	\$49,470	9%	69%	17%	5%
33	Protective Service	28,340	\$20,080	\$24,350	\$36,130	\$66,140	\$84,420	10%	32%	23%	21%
35	Food Preparation and Serving-Related	122,870	\$17,580	\$18,280	\$19,470	\$24,020	\$33,970	55%	40%	5%	0%
37	Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	41,980	\$18,280	\$20,010	\$24,090	\$30,140	\$39,800	31%	60%	5%	4%

					Median				Est. % of	Est. % of	
			10th Percentile	25th Percentile	(50th Percentile)	75th Percentile	90th Percentile	Est. % of Jobs Below	Jobs Between	Jobs Between	Est. % of Jobs Between
SOC Code	Occupational	F	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	30% AMI	30%-60%	60%-80%	80%-120%
39	Personal Care and Service	44,510	\$17,890	\$19,040	\$22,220	\$28,610	\$41,360	33%	AMI (2) 53%	AMI (2) 10%	AMI (2) 4%
41	Sales and Related	155,440	\$18,280	\$20,440	\$30,440	\$55,900	\$94,650	25%	31%	18%	12%
43	Office and Administrative Support	206,720	\$22,130	\$28,530	\$37,030	\$48,140	\$59,510	9%	47%	28%	13%
45	Farming, Fishing, Forestry	1,600	\$17,940	\$19,160	\$25,610	\$30,940	\$39,050	25%	70%	3%	2%
47	Construction and Extraction	64,880	\$26,840	\$33,160	\$41,960	\$55,640	\$71,570	5%	42%	27%	20%
49	Installation, Maintenance and Repair	50,910	\$26,030	\$34,210	\$47,220	\$62,510	\$77,360	6%	31%	25%	30%
51	Production	51,110	\$20,100	\$24,390	\$32,630	\$44,860	\$60,630	14%	53%	17%	12%
53	Transportation and Material Moving	82,930	\$18,990	\$23,270	\$32,840	\$46,030	\$62,230	13%	56%	14%	12%

TOTAL 1,374,270

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 16 Summary of Estimated Very Low and Low Income Households Residential Prototypes Middle Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Less than 30% 30% to 60% AMI AMI		60% to 80% AMI	80% to 120% AMI	Total	HH Expend
Single-Family Infill						
Low Scenario	0.029	0.078	0.030	0.026	0.163	\$101,400 0.8571429
Middle Scenario	0.034	0.091	0.035	0.030	0.190	\$118,300 1
High Scenario	0.038	0.103	0.040	0.034	0.216	\$134,550 1.1373626
Owner Townhomes						
Low Scenario	0.296	0.805	0.299	0.253	1.654	\$611,000 0.7642276
Middle Scenario	0.388	1.054	0.392	0.331	2.164	\$799,500 1
High Scenario	0.470	1.277	0.475	0.401	2.622	\$968,500 1.2113821
12-Story Owner						
Low Scenario	5.487	14.916	5.548	4.683	30.633	\$13,479,050 0.8317757
Middle Scenario	6.596	17.932	6.670	5.630	36.828	\$16,205,150 1
High Scenario	7.151	19.441	7.231	6.103	39.926	\$17,568,200 1.0841121
5-Story Rental						
Low Scenario	4.372	12.187	4.490	3.820	24.868	\$11,700,000 0.9375
Middle Scenario	4.663	13.000	4.789	4.075	26.526	\$12,480,000 1
High Scenario	5.246	14.624	5.387	4.584	29.842	\$14,040,000 1.125
20-Story Rental						
Low Scenario	6.351	17.486	6.419	5.421	35.678	\$14,820,000 0.9090909
Middle Scenario	6.986	19.235	7.061	5.964	39.246	\$16,302,000 1
High Scenario	7.621	20.984	7.703	6.506	42.813	\$17,784,000 1.0909091

Source: IMPLAN Input/Output Model; DRA.

Household Expenditures

Table 17 Estimated Very Low and Low Income Households Single-Family Infill Middle Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

			Estimat	ed Percent of HH	Earning Incomes		Estimated Households Earning Incomes:						
	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development	No. of New Households	Below 30% AMI	Between 31% and 60% AMI	Between 61% and 80% AMI	Between 81% and 120% AMI	Below 30%	Between 31%	Between 61%	Between 81% and 120%			
Economic Sector	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	AMI	and 60% AMI	and 80% AMI	AMI	Total		
Manufacturing Wholesale Trade	0.0071 0.0113	0.0044 0.0070	14% 13%	53% 56%	17% 14%	12% 12%	0.0006 0.0009	0.0023 0.0039	0.0007 0.0010	0.0005 0.0008	0.0042 0.0067		
Retail Trade	0.0490	0.0304	25%	31%	18%	12%	0.0076	0.0094	0.0055	0.0036	0.0262		
Transportation	0.0077	0.0048	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0006	0.0027	0.0007	0.0006	0.0045		
Warehousing and Storage	0.0015	0.0009	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0001	0.0005	0.0001	0.0001	0.0009		
Information and Communication	0.0057	0.0036	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0003	0.0017	0.0010	0.0005	0.0035		
Finance and Insurance	0.0312	0.0194	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.0019	0.0029	0.0072	0.0120		
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.0128	0.0079	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.0008	0.0012	0.0029	0.0049		
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.0153	0.0095	0%	17%	20%	25%	0.0000	0.0016	0.0019	0.0024	0.0059		
Management and Administrative Services	0.0207	0.0129	0%	0%	10%	15%	0.0000	0.0000	0.0013	0.0019	0.0032		
Educational Services	0.0237	0.0147	6%	29%	26%	25%	0.0009	0.0043	0.0038	0.0037	0.0127		
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.0713	0.0443	9%	69%	17%	5%	0.0040	0.0306	0.0075	0.0022	0.0443		
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.0098	0.0061	10%	25%	25%	23%	0.0006	0.0015	0.0015	0.0014	0.0050		
Other Services	0.0874	0.0543	33%	53%	10%	4%	0.0179	0.0288	0.0054	0.0022	0.0543		
Government	0.0033	0.0020	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0002	0.0010	0.0006	0.0003	0.0020		
Total/Average	0.3577	0.2222					0.0338	0.0910	0.0352	0.0303	0.1902		

 Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.
 Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.61 employees per worker household.
 Based on 2015 income limits for a 2.5 person household of \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI and \$81,500 at 120% AMI. Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Table 18 Summary of Estimated Very Low and Low Income Households Owner Townhomes Middle Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

			Estima	ted Percent of HH	Earning Incomes:		Estimated Households Earning Incomes:				
	Total New FTE Employees	No. of New		Between 31%	Between 61%	Between 81%					
	Generated by	Households	Below 30%	and 60% AMI	and 80% AMI	and 120% AMI	Below 30%	Between 31%	Between 61%	Between 81%	
Economic Sector	Development (1)	(2)	AMI (3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	AMI	and 60% AMI	and 80% AMI	and 120% AMI	lotal
Manufacturing	0.0845	0.0525	1.40/	F 20/	170/	1.20/	0.0073	0.0279	0.0080	0.0003	0.0504
Manufacturing	0.0645	0.0525	14%	53%	1/70	12%	0.0073	0.0276	0.0089	0.0063	0.0504
Wholesale Irade	0.1261	0.0783	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0102	0.0439	0.0110	0.0094	0.0744
Retail Trade	0.5432	0.3374	25%	31%	18%	12%	0.0843	0.1046	0.0607	0.0405	0.2901
Transportation	0.0771	0.0479	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0062	0.0268	0.0067	0.0057	0.0455
Warehousing and Storage	0.0165	0.0102	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0013	0.0057	0.0014	0.0012	0.0097
Information and Communication	0.0695	0.0432	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0039	0.0203	0.0121	0.0056	0.0419
Finance and Insurance	0.3432	0.2132	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.0213	0.0320	0.0789	0.1322
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	0.1557	0.0967	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.0097	0.0145	0.0358	0.0600
Professional, Scientific and Technical	0.1727	0.1072	0%	17%	20%	25%	0.0000	0.0182	0.0214	0.0268	0.0665
Management and Administrative Services	0.2390	0.1485	0%	0%	10%	15%	0.0000	0.0000	0.0148	0.0223	0.0371
Educational Services	0.1802	0.1119	6%	29%	26%	25%	0.0067	0.0325	0.0291	0.0280	0.0962
Health Care and Social Assistance	0.8871	0.5510	9%	69%	17%	5%	0.0496	0.3802	0.0937	0.0275	0.5510
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	0.1028	0.0638	10%	25%	25%	23%	0.0064	0.0160	0.0160	0.0147	0.0530
Other Services	1.0241	0.6361	33%	53%	10%	4%	0.2099	0.3371	0.0636	0.0254	0.6361
Government	0.0333	0.0207	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0019	0.0097	0.0058	0.0027	0.0201
Total/Average	4.0550	2.5186					0.3878	1.0538	0.3917	0.3309	2.1642

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

Number of FTE conversion employees from the twir LAN input/output induct.
 Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.61 employees per worker household.
 Based on 2015 income limits for a 2.5 person household of \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI and \$81,500 at 120% AMI. Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey. Source: IMPLAN; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2015; DRA.

Table 19 Summary of Estimated Very Low and Low Income Households 12-Story Owner Middle Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

			Estimat	ted Percent of HI	I Earning Incom	es:	Estimated Households Earning Incomes:					
	Total New FTE											
	Employees	No. of New		Between 31%	Between 61%	Between 81%						
	Generated by	Households	Below 30%	and 60% AMI	and 80% AMI	and 120% AMI		Between 31%	Between 61%	Between 81%		
Economic Sector	Development (1)	(2)	AMI (3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	Below 30% AMI	and 60% AMI	and 80% AMI	and 120% AMI	Total	
Manufacturing	1.4365	0.8923	14%	53%	17%	12%	0.1249	0.4729	0.1517	0.1071	0.8566	
Wholesale Trade	2.1439	1.3316	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.1731	0.7457	0.1864	0.1598	1.2651	
Retail Trade	9.2352	5.7362	25%	31%	18%	12%	1.4340	1.7782	1.0325	0.6883	4.9331	
Transportation	1.3111	0.8144	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.1059	0.4560	0.1140	0.0977	0.7736	
Warehousing and Storage	0.2806	0.1743	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0227	0.0976	0.0244	0.0209	0.1656	
Information and Communication	1.1818	0.7340	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0661	0.3450	0.2055	0.0954	0.7120	
Finance and Insurance	5.8358	3.6247	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.3625	0.5437	1.3411	2.2473	
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	2.6479	1.6447	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.1645	0.2467	0.6085	1.0197	
Professional, Scientific and Technical	2.9356	1.8234	0%	17%	20%	25%	0.0000	0.3100	0.3647	0.4558	1.1305	
Management and Administrative Services	4.0641	2.5243	0%	0%	10%	15%	0.0000	0.0000	0.2524	0.3786	0.6311	
Educational Services	3.0633	1.9027	6%	29%	26%	25%	0.1142	0.5518	0.4947	0.4757	1.6363	
Health Care and Social Assistance	15.0831	9.3684	9%	69%	17%	5%	0.8432	6.4642	1.5926	0.4684	9.3684	
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.7474	1.0854	10%	25%	25%	23%	0.1085	0.2713	0.2713	0.2496	0.9008	
Other Services	17.4132	10.8157	33%	53%	10%	4%	3.5692	5.7323	1.0816	0.4326	10.8157	
Government	0.6183	0.3840	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0346	0.1805	0.1075	0.0499	0.3725	
Total/Average	68.9979	42.8558					6.5962	17.9324	6.6698	5.6297	36.8282	

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.61 employees per worker household.
(3) Based on 2015 income limits for a 2.5 person household of \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI and \$81,500 at 120% AMI.

Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Table 20
Summary of Estimated Very Low and Low Income Households
5-Story Rental
Middle Cost Scenario
Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

			Estimat	ted Percent of HI	H Earning Incor	nes:	Estimated Households Earning Incomes:						
	Total New FTE					Between							
	Employees	No. of New		Between 31%	Between	81% and				Between 81%			
	Generated by	Households	Below 30%	and 60% AMI	61% and	120% AMI	Below 30%	Between 31%	Between 61%	and 120%			
Economic Sector	Development (1)	(2)	AMI (3)	(3)	80% AMI (3)	(3)	AMI	and 60% AMI	and 80% AMI	AMI	Total		
Manufacturing	1.1062	0.6871	14%	53%	17%	12%	0.0962	0.3642	0.1168	0.0825	0.6596		
Wholesale Trade	1.4776	0.9178	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.1193	0.5139	0.1285	0.1101	0.8719		
Retail Trade	6.2647	3.8911	25%	31%	18%	12%	0.9728	1.2062	0.7004	0.4669	3.3463		
Transportation	0.8759	0.5440	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0707	0.3047	0.0762	0.0653	0.5168		
Warehousing and Storage	0.1934	0.1201	13%	56%	14%	12%	0.0156	0.0673	0.0168	0.0144	0.1141		
Information and Communication	0.9564	0.5940	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0535	0.2792	0.1663	0.0772	0.5762		
Finance and Insurance	4.0018	2.4856	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.2486	0.3728	0.9197	1.5411		
Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing	2.6302	1.6336	0%	10%	15%	37%	0.0000	0.1634	0.2450	0.6044	1.0129		
Professional, Scientific and Technical	2.1149	1.3136	0%	17%	20%	25%	0.0000	0.2233	0.2627	0.3284	0.8144		
Management and Administrative Services	3.0319	1.8831	0%	0%	10%	15%	0.0000	0.0000	0.1883	0.2825	0.4708		
Educational Services	1.5417	0.9576	6%	29%	26%	25%	0.0575	0.2777	0.2490	0.2394	0.8235		
Health Care and Social Assistance	11.5712	7.1871	9%	69%	17%	5%	0.6468	4.9591	1.2218	0.3594	7.1871		
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.2569	0.7807	10%	25%	25%	23%	0.0781	0.1952	0.1952	0.1796	0.6479		
Other Services	12.3225	7.6537	33%	53%	10%	4%	2.5257	4.0565	0.7654	0.3061	7.6537		
Government	0.4810	0.2988	9%	47%	28%	13%	0.0269	0.1404	0.0837	0.0388	0.2898		
Total/Average	49.8261	30.9479					4.6631	12.9995	4.7889	4.0747	26.5262		

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.61 employees per worker household.

(3) Based on 2015 income limits for a 2.5 person household of \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI and \$81,500 at 120% AMI.

Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Table 21 Summary of Estimated Very Low and Low Income Households 20-Story Rental Middle Cost Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

			Estima	ted Percent of HH	Earning Incomes:		Estimated Households Earning Incomes:					
Economic Sector	Total New FTE Employees Generated by Development (1)	No. of New Households (2)	Below 30% AMI (3)	Between 31% and 60% AMI (3)	Between 61% and 80% AMI (3)	Between 81% and 120% AMI (3)	Below 30% AMI	Between 31% and 60% AMI	Between 61% and 80% AMI	Between 81% and 120% AMI	Total	
Manufacturing Wholesale Trade Retail Trade Transportation Warehousing and Storage Information and Communication Finance and Insurance Real Estate, Rentals and Leasing Professional, Scientific and Technical Management and Administrative Services Educational Services Health Care and Social Assistance Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.6206 2.1676 9.1984 1.3267 0.2847 1.3477 6.0216 3.3426 3.1099 4.4417 2.6803 16.7416 1.8493	1.0066 1.3463 5.7133 0.8241 0.1768 0.8371 3.7401 2.0761 1.9316 2.7588 1.6648 10.3985 1.1486	14% 13% 25% 13% 9% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 10%	53% 56% 31% 56% 47% 10% 10% 17% 0% 29% 69% 25%	17% 14% 18% 14% 28% 15% 20% 10% 26% 17% 25%	12% 12% 12% 12% 13% 37% 37% 25% 15% 25% 5% 25% 25% 25%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1409\\ 0.1750\\ 1.4283\\ 0.1071\\ 0.0230\\ 0.0753\\ 0.0000\\ 0.0000\\ 0.0000\\ 0.0000\\ 0.0000\\ 0.0909\\ 0.9359\\ 0.1149 \end{array}$	0.5335 0.7539 1.7711 0.4615 0.0990 0.3934 0.3740 0.2076 0.3284 0.0000 0.4828 7.1750 0.2872	0.1711 0.1885 1.0284 0.1154 0.0248 0.2344 0.5610 0.3114 0.3863 0.2759 0.4328 1.7677 0.2872	0.1208 0.1616 0.6856 0.0989 0.0212 0.1088 1.3838 0.7682 0.4829 0.4138 0.4162 0.5199 0.2642	0.9663 1.2790 4.9134 0.7829 0.1680 0.8120 2.3189 1.2872 1.1976 0.6897 1.4317 10.3985 0.9534	
Other Services Government	18.7839 0.6309	11.6670 0.3919	33% 9%	53% 47%	10% 28%	4% 13%	3.8501 0.0353	6.1835 0.1842	1.1667 0.1097	0.4667 0.0509	11.6670 0.3801	
Total/Average	73.5475	45.6817					6.9857	19.2351	7.0613	5.9635	39.2457	

(1) Includes full-time equivalent employees from the IMPLAN input/output model.

(2) Number of FTE conversion employees divided by 1.61 employees per worker household.
(3) Based on 2015 income limits for a 2.5 person household of \$20,400 at 30% AMI, \$40,750 at 60% AMI, \$54,300 at 80% AMI and \$81,500 at 120% AMI.

Percentage of employees by income category estimated based on IMPLAN average payroll figures, and BLS wage by occupation survey.

Table 23 Projected Occupational Distribution of New Employee Households Non-Residential Uses

Industry/Occupation Category	Office	Hotel	Retail	Warehouse	Manufacturing
Management	8.9%	5.0%	3.7%	5.7%	6.0%
Business and Financial Operations	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Computer and Mathematical	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Architecture and Engineering	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%
Life, Physical and Social Science	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Community and Social Services	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Legal	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Education, Training, and Library	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Healthcare Support	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Protective Service	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Food Preparation and Serving Related	0.0%	27.2%	33.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	0.0%	29.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Personal Care and Service	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sales and Related	6.6%	3.0%	35.2%	5.8%	3.0%
Office and Administrative Support	37.4%	16.8%	11.0%	13.1%	10.0%
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Construction and Extraction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.1%	5.0%
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	3.8%	3.9%	3.4%	9.1%	50.0%
Production	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%	9.0%
Transportation and Material Moving	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	20.4%	0.0%
All Other Office Related Occupations	8.4%	7.9%	7.5%	3.0%	0.0%
Industry Total	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%

Notes: Based on 2012 national industry occupation distributions from the BLS for office and retail workers. The retail distribution is used for grocery store, restaurant and entertainment uses. The office distribution is used for R&D laboratory and medical office uses.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2012 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates; DRA.

Table 24 Projected New Employee Households Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

			Office			Hotel			Retail			Warehouse		м	anufacturing	
Steps	Factor	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units	%	No.	Units
1. Gross Square Feet			75,000			66,700			25,000			250,000			100,000	
2. Employment Density Factor			333	GSF/Emp.		0.75 350 (Emp./Rm. GSF/Room		300	GSF/Emp.		1,000	GSF/Emp.		750 (GSF/Emp.
Number of Employees			225	Emp.		143	Emp.		83	Emp.		250	Emp.		133	Emp.
3. Employees Living in Denver (1)	40.5%		91	Emp.		58	Emp.		34	Emp.		101	Emp.		54	Emp.
4. Adjustment for Number of Employees Per Household (2)	1.61 Emp/HH		57	ΗH		36	ΗH		21	ΗH		63	ΗH		33	ΗH
5. Household Occupational Distribution (3)																
Management		8.9%	5.0	HH	5.0%	1.8	HH	3.7%	0.8	HH	5.7%	3.6	HH	6.0%	2.0	HH
Business and Financial Operations		9.7%	5.5	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	4.0%	1.3	HH
Computer and Mathematical		3.4%	1.9	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	2.0%	0.7	HH
Architecture and Engineering		4.9%	2.8	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	6.0%	2.0	HH
Life, Physical and Social Science		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	1.0%	0.3	HH
Community and Social Services		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Legal		3.6%	2.1	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Education, Training, and Library		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and																
Media		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	1.0%	0.3	HH
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical		8.9%	5.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Healthcare Support		4.4%	2.5	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Protective Service		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Food Preparation and Serving-Related		0.0%	0.0	HH	27.2%	9.8	HH	33.2%	6.9	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Building/Grounds Cleaning and																
Maintenance		0.0%	0.0	HH	29.0%	10.4	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	1.0%	0.6	HH	1.0%	0.3	HH
Personal Care and Service		0.0%	0.0	HH	7.3%	2.6	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Sales and Related		6.6%	3.7	HH	3.0%	1.1	HH	35.2%	7.3	HH	5.8%	3.6	HH	3.0%	1.0	HH
Office and Administrative Support		37.4%	21.2	HH	16.8%	6.1	HH	11.0%	2.3	HH	13.1%	8.2	HH	10.0%	3.3	HH
Farming, Fishing and Forestry		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	2.0%	0.7	HH
Construction and Extraction		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	22.1%	13.9	HH	5.0%	1.7	HH
Installation, Maintenance and Repair		3.8%	2.2	HH	3.9%	1.4	HH	3.4%	0.7	HH	9.1%	5.7	HH	50.0%	16.7	HH
Production		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	19.8%	12.5	HH	9.0%	3.0	HH
Iransportation and Material Moving		0.0%	0.0	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH	6.0%	1.3	HH	20.4%	12.8	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
All Other Occupations		8.4%	4.7	HH	7.9%	2.8	HH	7.5%	1.6	HH	3.0%	1.9	HH	0.0%	0.0	HH
Total		100.0%	56.6		100.0%	36.0		100.0%	20.9		100.0%	62.8		100.0%	33.3	

Legend: HH = households; SF = square feet; Emp = employees.

Source: American Community Survey, five-year estimates, 2010-2014.
 Source: American Community Survey, five-year estimates, 2010-2014.

(3) From Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2012 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.

Source: American Community Survey; Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA.

Table 25 Estimated Households Earning Up to 30% AMI Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	% of Employees										
	Earning Up to	Offi	ce	Hot	el	Ret	ail	Wareł	nouse	Manufa	cturing
Steps	30% AMI	Percent (1)	No. (2)								
6. Households Earning Up to 30% AMI											
Management	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Business and Financial Operations	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Computer and Mathematical	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Architecture and Engineering	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Life, Physical and Social Science	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Community and Social Services	5%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Legal	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Education, Training, and Library	6%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	10%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.03
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Healthcare Support	9%	0%	0.23	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Protective Service	10%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	55%	0%	0.00	15%	5.39	18%	3.80	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	31%	0%	0.00	9%	3.22	0%	0.00	0%	0.19	0%	0.09
Personal Care and Service	33%	0%	0.00	2%	0.86	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Sales and Related	25%	2%	0.93	1%	0.28	9%	1.83	1%	0.90	1%	0.25
Office and Administrative Support	9%	3%	1.91	2%	0.55	1%	0.21	1%	0.74	1%	0.30
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	25%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.18
Construction and Extraction	5%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.70	0%	0.09
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	6%	0%	0.13	0%	0.08	0%	0.04	1%	0.34	3%	1.00
Production	14%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	3%	1.75	1%	0.42
Transportation and Material Moving	13%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.17	3%	1.66	0%	0.00
Total		6%	3.19	29%	10.38	29%	6.04	10%	6.28	7%	2.35

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning less than 30% AMI.
 (2) Percent of occupation earning less than 30% AMI by land use multiplied by total employee households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 26 Estimated Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	% of Employees											
	Earning 31% Office		ice	Hotel			Retail		Warehouse		Manufacturing	
Steps	to 60% AMI	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)							
6. Households Earning Between 31% AMI												
and 60% AMI												
Management	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Business and Financial Operations	10%	1%	0.55	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.13	
Computer and Mathematical	5%	0%	0.10	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.04	
Architecture and Engineering	5%	0%	0.14	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.10	
Life, Physical and Social Science	17%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.05	
Community and Social Services	32%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Legal	10%	0%	0.21	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Education, Training, and Library	29%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	25%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.08	
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	10%	1%	0.50	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Healthcare Support	69%	3%	1.73	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Protective Service	32%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	40%	0%	0.00	11%	3.92	13%	2.76	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	60%	0%	0.00	17%	6.24	0%	0.00	1%	0.36	1%	0.18	
Personal Care and Service	53%	0%	0.00	4%	1.38	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	
Sales and Related	31%	2%	1.15	1%	0.34	11%	2.26	2%	1.12	1%	0.31	
Office and Administrative Support	47%	18%	9.96	8%	2.87	5%	1.08	6%	3.85	5%	1.55	
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	70%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.49	
Construction and Extraction	42%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	9%	5.84	2%	0.71	
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	31%	1%	0.68	1%	0.43	1%	0.22	3%	1.77	16%	5.18	
Production	53%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	10%	6.63	5%	1.59	
Transportation and Material Moving	56%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	3%	0.73	11%	7.17	0%	0.00	
Total		26%	15.01	42%	15.18	34%	7.05	43%	26.73	31%	10.40	

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 31% and 60% AMI.
 (2) Percent of occupation earning between 31% and 60% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.
 Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA
Table 27 Estimated Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	% of Employees										
	Earning 61%	Off	ice	Hot	el	Ret	ail	Wareh	nouse	Manufa	cturing
Steps	to 80% AMI	Percent (1)	No. (2)								
 Households Earning Between 61% AMI and 80% AMI 											
Management	10%	1%	0.50	0%	0.18	0%	0.08	1%	0.36	1%	0.20
Business and Financial Operations	15%	1%	0.83	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.20
Computer and Mathematical	12%	0%	0.23	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.08
Architecture and Engineering	12%	1%	0.34	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.24
Life, Physical and Social Science	20%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.06
Community and Social Services	30%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Legal	17%	1%	0.36	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Education, Training, and Library	26%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	25%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.08
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	19%	2%	0.95	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Healthcare Support	17%	1%	0.43	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Protective Service	23%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	5%	0%	0.00	1%	0.49	2%	0.35	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	5%	0%	0.00	1%	0.52	0%	0.00	0%	0.03	0%	0.02
Personal Care and Service	10%	0%	0.00	1%	0.26	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Sales and Related	18%	1%	0.67	1%	0.20	6%	1.31	1%	0.65	1%	0.18
Office and Administrative Support	28%	10%	5.94	5%	1.71	3%	0.64	4%	2.30	3%	0.92
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	3%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.02
Construction and Extraction	27%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	6%	3.75	1%	0.46
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	25%	1%	0.55	1%	0.35	1%	0.18	2%	1.43	13%	4.18
Production	17%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	3%	2.13	2%	0.51
Transportation and Material Moving	14%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.18	3%	1.79	0%	0.00
Total		19%	10.77	10%	3.71	13%	2.74	20%	12.43	21%	7.14

(1) Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 61% and 80% AMI.
 (2) Percent of occupation earning between 61% and 80% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.
 Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 28 Estimated Households Earning Between 81% and 120% AMI Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	% of Employees Exeming 91%	Off	ico	Hot	al	Poi	ail	W/arak		Manufa	cturing
Steps	to 120% AMI	Percent (1)	$\frac{1}{No}$ (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)	Percent (1)	$\frac{1}{No}$ (2)	Percent (1)	No (2)	Percent (1)	No. (2)
5445				<u>rereent (1)</u>				<u>rereent (1)</u>			
 Households Earning Between 61% AMI and 80% AMI 											
Management	15%	1%	0.75	1%	0.27	1%	0.12	1%	0.54	1%	0.30
Business and Financial Operations	37%	4%	2.04	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.48
Computer and Mathematical	23%	1%	0.44	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.16
Architecture and Engineering	33%	2%	0.92	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	2%	0.66
Life, Physical and Social Science	25%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.08
Community and Social Services	92%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Legal	39%	1%	0.82	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Education, Training, and Library	25%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media	23%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.07
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	34%	3%	1.70	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Healthcare Support	5%	0%	0.13	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Protective Service	21%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	0%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Building/Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	4%	0%	0.00	1%	0.42	0%	0.00	0%	0.02	0%	0.01
Personal Care and Service	4%	0%	0.00	0%	0.10	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Sales and Related	12%	1%	0.44	0%	0.13	4%	0.88	1%	0.43	0%	0.12
Office and Administrative Support	13%	5%	2.76	2%	0.79	1%	0.30	2%	1.07	1%	0.43
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	2%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.01
Construction and Extraction	20%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	4%	2.78	1%	0.34
Installation, Maintenance and Repair	30%	1%	0.66	1%	0.42	1%	0.21	3%	1.71	15%	5.01
Production	12%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	2%	1.50	1%	0.36
Transportation and Material Moving	12%	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	1%	0.16	2%	1.54	0%	0.00
Total		19%	10.65	6%	2.14	8%	1.66	15%	9.59	24%	8.03

Percent distribution of households by occupation by land use multiplied by estimated percent of occupation earning between 81% and 120% AMI.
 Percent of occupation earning between 81% and 120% AMI by land use multiplied by total households generated by land use.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; DRA

Table 31 Rental Affordability Gap Calculations New Construction Mid-Rise Rental Prototype Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Assumptions HUD Median Household Income, Denver, 2016

HUD Median Household Income, Denver, 201 Affordable Housing Expense As a % of Income	16 (1)		\$80,100 33%		
No. of Bedrooms	Studio	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Household Size	1.0 Persons	1.5 Persons	3.0 Persons	4.5 Persons	6.0 Persons
Household Size Income Adjust. Factor	70%	75%	90%	104%	116%
Renter Utility Allowance, City of Cambridge (2)	\$75	\$94	\$114	\$133	\$152
Mid-Rise/High-Rise (5+ Stories)	\$65	\$79	\$95	\$109	\$123
Miscellaneous Income Per Unit Per Year	\$100				
Vacancy Rate	3.00%				
Operating Cost Per Unit Per Year Mid Rise High Rise	\$6,100				
Mortgage Interest Rate	4.00%				
Mortgage Amortization (Years)	30				
Debt Coverage Ratio	1.00				
Prototype TDC Per Net SF	\$350	600	900	1 000	1 100
Average Onit Size (Net Sr) Average Per Unit Development Cost	\$157,500	\$210,000	\$315,000	\$350,000	\$385,000
Weldge ter om betenspillen and	¢,	1 D- droom	2 D- ducom	2 B- droom	4 Dadwoom
	Studio	1 Bearoom	2 Bearoom	3 Bedroom	4 Bearoom
Affordability Gap Calculations					
30% of Median	¢16 001	¢10 000	¢01.607	¢24.001	¢37.075
Annual Income Limit Affordable Monthly Housing Expense	\$10,021 \$463	\$10,023 \$496	\$21,627 \$595	\$24,991 \$687	\$27,075 \$767
Less: Monthly Utility Allowance	(\$65)	(\$79)	(\$95)	(\$109)	(\$123)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$398	\$417	\$500	\$578	\$644
Annual Gross Rental Income Per Unit	\$4,776	\$5,004	\$6,000	\$6,936	\$7,728
Plus: Miscellaneous Income	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
Less: Vacancy	(\$143)	(\$150)	(\$180)	(\$208)	(\$232)
Less: Annual Unit Operating Costs	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)
Net Operating Income Per Unit	(\$1,367)	(\$1,146)	(\$180)	\$728	\$1,496
Available for Debt Service	(\$1,367)	(\$1,146)	(\$180)	\$728	\$1,496
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit	(\$23,900)	(\$20,000)	(\$3,100)	\$12,700	\$26,100
Per Unit Affordability Gap	\$157,500	\$210,000	\$315,000	\$337,300	\$358,900
60% of Median					
Annual Income Limit	\$33,642	\$36,045	\$43,254	\$49,982	\$55,750
Affordable Monthly Housing Expense	\$925	\$991	\$1,189	\$1,375	\$1,533
Less: Monthly Utility Allowance	(\$65)	(\$79)	(\$95)	(\$109)	(\$123)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$860	\$912	\$1,094	\$1,266	\$1,410
Annual Gross Kental Income Per Unit	\$10,320	\$10,944 \$100	\$13,120 \$100	\$15,192 \$100	\$10,920
Less: Vacancy	(\$310)	(\$328)	(\$394)	(\$456)	(\$508)
Less: Annual Unit Operating Costs	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)
, ,					
Net Operating Income Per Unit	\$4,010	\$4,616	\$6,734	\$8,736	\$10,412
Available for Debt Service	\$4,010	\$4,616	\$6,/34	\$8,/36	\$10,412
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit Per Unit Affordability Gap	\$70,000	\$80,600	\$117,500 \$197,500	\$152,500 \$197,500	\$181,700
Tel Oliczaroldzbilty Cap	40, 1500	<i>φ</i> 123,100	<i>φ</i> 1 <i>31,</i> 300	<i>4137,</i> 300	\$203,300
80% of Median					
Annual Income Limit	\$44,856	\$48,060	\$57,6/2	\$66,643	\$74,333
Affordable Monthly Housing Expense	\$1,234 (\$65)	\$1,322 (\$79)	\$1,500 (\$95)	\$1,033 (\$109)	\$2,044 (\$123)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$1.169	\$1.243	\$1.491	\$1.724	\$1,921
Annual Gross Rental Income Per Unit	\$14,028	\$14,916	\$17,892	\$20,688	\$23,052
Plus: Miscellaneous Income	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
Less: Vacancy	(\$421)	(\$447)	(\$537)	(\$621)	(\$692)
Less: Annual Unit Operating Costs	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)
Net Operating Income Per Unit	\$7.607	\$8.469	\$11,355	\$14.067	\$16.360
Available for Debt Service	\$7,607	\$8,469	\$11,355	\$14,067	\$16,360
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit	\$132,800	\$147,800	\$198,200	\$245,500	\$285,600
Per Unit Affordability Gap	\$24,700	\$62,200	\$116,800	\$104,500	\$99,400
1000/ -f AM					
120% OF AMI Appual Income Limit	\$67.284	\$72.090	\$86 508	¢99 965	\$111,499
Affordable Monthly Housing Expense	\$1,850	\$1,982	\$2,379	\$2,749	\$3,066
Less: Monthly Utility Allowance	(\$65)	(\$79)	(\$95)	(\$109)	(\$123)
Affordable Monthly Rent	\$1,785	\$1,903	\$2,284	\$2,640	\$2,943
Annual Gross Rental Income Per Unit	\$21,420	\$22,836	\$27,408	\$31,680	\$35,316
Plus: Miscellaneous Income	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
Less: Vacancy	(\$643) (\$6.100)	(\$685) (\$6.100)	(\$822)	(\$950)	(\$1,059) (\$6,100)
Less: Annual Onic Operating Costs	(\$0,100)	(\$0,100)	(\$0,100)	(\$6,100)	(90,100)
Net Operating Income Per Unit	\$14,777	\$16,151	\$20,586	\$24,730	\$28,257
Available for Debt Service	\$14,777	\$16,151	\$20,586	\$24,730	\$28,257
Supportable Mortgage Per Unit Por Unit Affordability Gap	\$257,900 \$0	\$281,900 \$0	\$359,300 \$0	\$431,700 \$0	\$493,200 \$0
rel Ulit Anordability Gap	40	40	40	40	40
Summary of Affordable Rents		1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
30% of Median		\$417	\$500	\$578	\$644
60% of Median		\$860	\$912	\$1,094	\$1,266
80% of Median		\$1,169	\$1,243	\$1,491	\$1,724
120% of Median		\$1,785	\$1,903	\$2,284	\$2,640
Summary of Per Unit Affordability Gap	Ave. 1 and 2 BR	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
30% of Median	\$262,500	\$210,000	\$315,000	\$337,300	\$358,900
60% of Median	\$163,450	\$129,400	\$197,500	\$197,500	\$203,300
80% of Median	\$89,500	\$62,200	\$116,800	\$104,500	\$99,400
1120% of Median	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

(1) Source: Denver Housing Authority, effective October 1, 2015.

Table 33 Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees Residential Prototypes Low Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Less than 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	80% to 120% AMI	Total
Single Family Infill					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.029	0.078	0.030	0.026	0.163
Performance Requirement (%) of Total Hsg. Units)	0.029	0.076	0.030	0.026	0.165
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262 500	\$162.450	\$80,500	\$0	
Total Can	\$202,500	\$103,430	\$09,500	\$0 \$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	\$7,399	\$12,747 1	\$2,057	۶0 1	
Cap Per Unit in Prototype – Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$7 599	\$12 747	\$2.697	\$0	\$23.043
Average Gross Square Feet Per Linit in Prototype	2 800	2 800	2,007	2 800	\$25,045
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$2.71	\$4.55	\$ 0.96	\$0.00	\$8.23
Owner Townhomes					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.296	0.805	0.299	0.253	1.654
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	3%	8%	3%	3%	17%
Gan Per Household (1)	\$262 500	\$163.450	\$89.500	\$0	
Total Gan	\$202,500	\$131.632	\$26,795	\$0 \$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	φ <i>ττ,τ 32</i> 10	\$151,052 10	\$20,755 10	.	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$7 779	\$13 163	\$2 679	\$0	\$23.622
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2 000	2 000	2 000	2 000	<i>Q</i> 23/022
Gan Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$3.89	\$6.58	\$1.34	\$0.00	\$11.81
	4010 3	\$0.00	φ1101	<i>Q</i> 0100	4
12-Story Owner					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	5.487	14.916	5.548	4.683	30.633
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	2%	6%	2%	2%	13%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,440,230	\$2,437,983	\$496,527	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	233	233	233	233	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$6,181	\$10,463	\$2,131	\$0	\$18,776
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,219	1,219	1,219	1,219	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$5.07	\$8.58	\$1.75	\$0.00	\$15.40
5-Story Rental					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	4.372	12.187	4.490	3.820	24.868
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	1%	4%	1%	1%	8%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,147,549	\$1,991,977	\$401,817	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	300	300	300	300	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$3,825	\$6,640	\$1,339	\$0	\$11,804
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	786	786	786	786	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$4.87	\$8.45	\$1.70	\$0.00	\$15.02
20 Story Pontal					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	6 251	17 486	6 410	5 421	25.678
Performance Requirement (% of Total Heg. Units)	0.331	69/	0.419	20/	120/
Cap Per Household (1)	\$262 500	\$163.450	\$89,500	2 /0 \$0	1370
Total Gan	\$1 667 047	\$2,858,161	\$574 524	ቁ0 \$በ	
No. of Units in Prototype	91,007,047 285	92,030,101	997 - ,554 285	285	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$5 849	\$10.029	\$2.016	\$0 \$0	\$17 894
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1 012	1 012	1 012	1 012	φ17,00 ⁻
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$5.78	\$9.91	\$1.99	\$0.00	\$17.68

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap by income level, average for one- and two-bedroom units.

(2) Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.

(3) Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Table 34 Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees Residential Prototypes Middle Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Less than 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	80% to 120% AMI	Total
Single_Family Infill					
Est No. of New Employee Households	0.034	0.091	0.035	0.030	0 190
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	0.034 N/A	0.031 N/A	0.033 N/A	0.030 N/A	0.150
Gan Per Household (1)	\$262 500	\$163 450	\$89 500	\$0	
Total Gan	\$8,865	\$14 872	\$3 147	\$0 \$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	\$0,003 1	\$11,07 <u>2</u> 1	\$3,117 1	\$0 1	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8 865	\$14 872	\$3 147	\$0	\$26.883
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2 800	2 800	2 800	2 800	\$20,000
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$3.17	\$5.31	\$1.12	\$0.00	\$9.60
Owner Townhomes					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.388	1.054	0.392	0.331	2.164
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	4%	11%	4%	3%	22%
Gan Per Household (1)	\$262 500	\$163 450	\$89 500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$101.792	\$172.241	\$35.061	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	10	10	10	10	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$10,179	\$17,224	\$3,506	\$0	\$30,909
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$5.09	\$8.61	\$1.75	\$0.00	\$15.45
12-Story Owner					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	6.596	17.932	6.670	5.630	36.828
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	3%	8%	3%	2%	16%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,731,512	\$2,931,058	\$596,948	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	233	233	233	233	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$7,431	\$12,580	\$2,562	\$0	\$22,573
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,219	1,219	1,219	1,219	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$6.10	\$10.32	\$2.10	\$0.00	\$18.52
5-Story Rental					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	4.663	13.000	4.789	4.075	26.526
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	2%	4%	2%	1%	9%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,224,052	\$2,124,775	\$428,605	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	300	300	300	300	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$4,080	\$7,083	\$1,429	\$0	\$12,591
Average Gross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	786	786	786	786	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$5.19	\$9.01	\$1.82	\$0.00	\$16.02
20-Story Rental					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	6.99	19.24	7.06	5.96	39.25
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	2%	7%	2%	2%	14%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,833,752	\$3,143,977	\$631,988	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	285	285	285	285	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$6,434	\$11,031	\$2,218	\$0	\$19,683
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	1,012	1,012	1,012	1,012	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$6.36	\$10.90	\$2.19	\$0.00	\$19.44

Based on per unit affordability gap by income level, average for one- and two-bedroom units.
 Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.
 Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Table 35 Calculation of Estimated Maximum Residential Nexus Fees Residential Prototypes High Scenario Denver Affordable Housing Residential Nexus Study

	Less than 30% AMI	30% to 60% AMI	60% to 80% AMI	80% to 120% AMI	Total
Single-Family Infill					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.038	0 103	0.040	0.034	0.216
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.210
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262 500	\$163 450	\$89 500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$10.083	\$16.915	\$3.579	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	1	1	1	1	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$10.083	\$16.915	\$3,579	\$0	\$30,576
AverageGross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2,800	2,800	2.800	2,800	1/-
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$3.60	\$6.04	\$1.28	\$0.00	\$10.92
Owner Townhomes					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	0.470	1.277	0.475	0.401	2.622
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	5%	13%	5%	4%	26%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262.500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$123,309	\$208,650	\$42,473	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	10	10	10	10	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$12.331	\$20,865	\$4.247	\$0	\$37,443
AverageGross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	2,000	2.000	2.000	2,000	1- / -
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$6.17	\$10.43	\$2.12	\$0.00	\$18.72
12-Story Owner					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	7.151	19.441	7.231	6.103	39.926
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	3%	8%	3%	3%	17%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,877,153	\$3,177,595	\$647,159	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	233	233	233	233	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$8,056	\$13,638	\$2,778	\$0	\$24,472
AverageGross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	975	975	975	975	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$8.26	\$13.98	\$2.85	\$0.00	\$25.09
5-Story Rental					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	5.246	14.624	5.387	4.584	29.842
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	2%	5%	2%	2%	10%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$1,377,059	\$2,390,372	\$482,181	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	300	300	300	300	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$4,590	\$7,968	\$1,607	\$0	\$14,165
AverageGross Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	708	708	708	708	
Gap Per Net Square Foot = Supportable Nexus Fee (3)	\$6.49	\$11.26	\$2.27	\$0.00	\$20.02
20-Story Rental					
Est. No. of New Employee Households	7.621	20.984	7.703	6.506	42.813
Performance Requirement (% of Total Hsg. Units)	3%	7%	3%	2%	15%
Gap Per Household (1)	\$262,500	\$163,450	\$89,500	\$0	
Total Gap	\$2,000,457	\$3,429,793	\$689,441	\$0	
No. of Units in Prototype	285	285	285	285	
Gap Per Unit in Prototype = Supportable Nexus Fee (2)	\$7,019	\$12,034	\$2,419	\$0	\$21,473
Average Square Feet Per Unit in Prototype	810	810	810	810	
Gap Per Net Square Foot (3)	\$8.67	\$14.86	\$2.99	\$0.00	\$26.52

(1) Based on per unit affordability gap by income level, average for one- and two-bedroom units.

(2) Equals total gap divided by the number of units in each prototype.

(3) Equals gap per unit divided by average square feet per unit for each prototype.

Table 37 Calculation of Estimated Maximum Non-Residential Mitigation Fees Per Gross Square Foot Non-Residential Land Uses

		Office	Hotel	Retail	Warehouse	Manufacturing
Gross Square Feet of Land Use Net Leaseable Square Feet of Land Use		75,000 60,000	66,700 50,000	25,000 25,000	250,000 250,000	100,000 100,000
TOTAL EMPLOYEE HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME LEVEL						
Households Earning Up to 30% AMI Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI Households Earning Between 81% and 120% AMI		3.19 15.01 10.77 10.65	10.38 15.18 3.71 2.14	6.04 7.05 2.74 1.66	6.28 26.73 12.43 9.59	2.35 10.40 7.14 8.03
Total		39.63	31.40	17.49	55.02	27.92
Households Earning Up to 30% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1) Justifiable Fee Per Gross Square Foot Bldg. Area Performance Requirement	\$262,500	\$837,375 \$11.17	\$2,724,750 \$40.85	\$1,584,975 \$63.40	\$1,647,188 \$6.59	\$617,400 \$6.17
Gross SF of Building Area % of Total Gross Building SF		2,657 4%	8,647 13%	5,030 20%	5,227 2%	1,959 2%
Households Earning Between 31% and 60% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1) Justifiable Fee Per Gross Square Foot Bldg. Area Performance Requirement	\$163,450	\$2,453,875 \$32.72	\$2,481,171 \$37.20	\$1,152,159 \$46.09	\$4,368,692 \$17.4 7	\$1,700,370 \$17.00
Gross SF of Building Area % of Total Gross Building SF		12,506 17%	12,645 19%	5,872 23%	22,264 9%	8,666 9%
Households Earning Between 61% and 80% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1) Justifiable Fee Per Gross Square Foot Bldg. Area Performance Requirement	\$89,500	\$964,184 \$12.86	\$331,687 \$4.97	\$245,230 \$9.81	\$1,112,396 \$4.45	\$638,851 \$6.39
Gross SF of Building Area % of Total Gross Building SF		8,974 12%	3,087 5%	2,282 9%	10,353 4%	5,946 6%
Households Earning Between 81% and 120% AMI						
Est.Total Housing Gap at Per Unit Gap of: (1) Justifiable Fee Per Gross Square Foot Bldg. Area Performance Requirement	\$0	\$0 \$0.00	\$0 \$0.00	\$0 \$0.00	\$0 \$0.00	\$0 \$0.00
Gross SF of Building Area % of Total Gross Building SF		8,871 12%	1,778 3%	1,384 6%	7,987 3%	6,690 7%
Total Fee Per Gross Square Foot (Excluding Parking) Total Fee Per Net Square Foot		\$56.74 \$70.92	\$83.02 \$110.75	\$119.29 \$119.29	\$28.51 \$28.51	\$29.57 \$29.57

(1) Based on the per unit affordability gap (average for one- and two-bedroom units) at each income level. Source: DRA

Table 38 Development Cost Assumptions and Budgets Development Prototypes Baseline Assumptions Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
PROTOTYPE ASSUMPTIONS				,		, ,					
Total Residential Linits		1	10	233	300	285	0	0	0	0	0
Average Linit Size (Net SE)		2 800	10	975	708	810	0	0	0	0	0
Low Scenario		2,000	1 500	5/5	, 00	010		0	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	0	Ŭ
Middle Scenario			2,000								
High Scenario			2,000								
Posidontial Not SE		2 900	2,500	227.250	212 250	220 800	0	0	0	0	0
Listel Booms		2,000	20,000	227,230	212,230	230,000	0	0	142	0	0
Augusta Listal Baava Gina (Nia	-+ (())	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	0	0
Average Hotel Room Size (Ne	et SF)	0	20.000	242.250	221.550	220.000	0	120.000	350	25.000	250.000
Total Net SF (Rentable/Salear	SIE SF)	2,800	20,000	243,250	221,550	239,800	64,000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SF Building Area (Excluding Parking)	2,800	20,010	304,063	246,167	299,750	80,000	160,000	66,700	25,000	250,000
Iotal Gross SF Building Area (Including Str/Und Parking)	2,800	20,000	420,863	381,16/	389,700	84,900	221,250	66,700	25,000	250,000
Underground Parking Spaces		0	0	126	0	110	149	149	0	0	0
Structured Parking Spaces		0	0	166	450	147	14	26	0	0	0
Surface Parking Spaces		2	10	0	0	0	0	0	150	83	83
Total Parking Spaces		2	10	292	450	257	163	175	105	83	83
Total Parking SF		400	1,800	116,800	135,000	89,775	57,050	61,250	42,000	29,050	33,200
Site Area (SF)		6,250	10,000	43,560	130,680	26,136	32,000	32,000	89,734	121,968	696,960
Approximate Building Stories		2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
DEVELOPMENT COST ASSU	MPTIONS										
Land Price											
Low Scenario	Per Hsg. Unit/Hotel Room	\$200.000	\$70,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$18,000	\$27 Per SE FAR	\$27 Per SE FAR	\$12,000		
Low Sechario	Per Site SE	\$32	\$70	\$107	\$80	\$196	\$54	\$108	\$12,000	\$10	\$7
Middle Scenario	Per Hsg. Unit/Hotel Room	\$275,000	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$28,000	\$30 Por SE EAR	\$30 Por SE FAR	\$15,000	\$10	
windule Scenario	Per Site SE	\$44	\$90	\$160	\$92	\$305	\$50101511/44	\$120	\$15,000	\$15	\$10
High Scenario	Per Hsg. Unit/Hotel Room	\$350,000	\$200,000	\$40,000	\$60,000	\$38,000	\$40 Por SE EAR	\$40 Por SE FAR	\$20,000	\$15	\$10
Tign Scenario	Per Site SF	\$550,000	\$200,000	\$214	\$138	\$414	\$80	\$160	\$20,000	\$20	\$15
Hard Cost/NSF											
Low Scenario		\$140	\$140	\$195	\$175	\$250	\$145	\$170	\$250	\$135	\$80
Middle Scenario		\$150	\$175	\$200	\$175	\$250	\$150	\$170	\$260	\$135	\$80
High Scenario		\$160	\$175	\$220	\$200	\$250	\$150	\$170	\$270	\$135	\$85
Tenant Improvements (Per Ne	t SF)										
Low Scenario							\$50	\$50		\$10	
Middle Scenario							\$60	\$60		\$25	
High Scenario							\$70	\$70		\$45	
Is Parking Cost Included in Ha	ard Cost? (1)	Yes	Yes	No	No	NO	NO	NO	Yes	Yes	Yes
Underground Parking - Cost P	Per Space			\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000			
Above-Grade Structured Parki	ing - Cost Per Space			\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000			
On-Grade Surface Parking - C	Lost Per Space			\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500			
Soft Costs (2)	% of Hard Costs	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Marketing/Closing/Sales Costs	s (% of Sales Price)	7%	9%	9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Debt as a % of TDC		70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	60%	60%	50%	50%	50%
Equity as a % of TDC		30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%	40%	50%	50%	50%
Minimum Return Assumption	nc .										
Can Rate (High Can Rate See	nario)	N1/A	NI/A	NI/A	5 0.0%	5.00%	5 50%	5 50%	7 50%	5 50%	6.00%
Minimum Unlowerpard Potum	n on $Cost(2)$	15.0%	15.0%	15.09/	5.00%	5.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.50%	7.00%	7 509/
Adinimum Daturn on E-wity /P		10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.50%	0.50%	10.00%	10.00%	9.00%	7.00%	10.00
Garateutian and Cala (Cr. 11)	(OE)	15 14- 1	24 44- 1	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	21 14.	15 \.4.	10.0%	0.14==:1
Construction and Sales/Stabili	ization Period (Months)	15 Months	24 Months	48 Months	30 Months	48 Months	18 Months	21 Months	15 Months	9 Months	9 Months

Table 38 **Development Cost Assumptions and Budgets Development Prototypes Baseline Assumptions** Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
		Tormitomes		o story nemar	20 5001 / 10110		in story enter		Retuin	marchouse
DEVELOPMENT BUDGET										
Low Scenario			• · · · · · · · · ·							
Land Acquisition	\$200,000	\$700,000	\$4,661,000	\$10,454,000	\$5,123,000	\$1,728,000	\$3,456,000	\$1,705,000	\$1,220,000	\$4,879,000
Tenant Improvements	\$392,000	\$2,801,000	\$59,292,000	\$43,079,000	\$74,938,000	\$11,600,000	\$27,200,000	\$16,675,000	\$3,375,000	\$20,000,000
Underground Parking (1)	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$4 662 000	\$0	\$4 070 000	\$5,200,000	\$5,513,000	\$0 \$0	\$2,50,000	\$0 \$0
Above Grade Structured Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$3,818,000	\$10,350,000	\$3,381,000	\$322,000	\$598,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-Grade Surface Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soft Costs (2)	\$78,400	\$560,200	\$13,554,400	\$10,685,800	\$16,477,800	\$4,127,000	\$7,942,200	\$3,335,000	\$725,000	\$4,000,000
Total Development Costs, Including Land	\$670,400	\$4,061,200	\$85,987,400	\$74,568,800	\$103,989,800	\$26,490,000	\$51,109,200	\$21,715,000	\$5,570,000	\$28,879,000
TDC Per Housing Unit	\$670,400	\$406,120	\$369,045	\$248,563	\$364,876	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TDC per NSF Rentable/Saleable Area	\$239	\$203	\$353	\$337	\$434	\$414	\$399	\$434	\$223	\$116
TDC per Gross SF, Excluding Parking	\$239	\$203	\$283	\$303	\$347	\$331	\$319	\$326	\$223	\$116
TDC per Gross SF, Including Parking	\$239	\$203	\$204	\$196	\$267	\$312	\$231	\$326	\$223	\$116
Total Development Costs, Excluding Land	\$470,400	\$3,361,200	\$81,326,400	\$64,114,800	\$98,866,800	\$24,762,000	\$47,653,200	\$20,010,000	\$4,350,000	\$24,000,000
Middle Scenario										
Land Acquisition	\$275.000	\$900.000	\$6,970,000	\$12,023,000	\$7.971.000	\$1,920,000	\$3,840,000	\$2,154,000	\$1,830,000	\$6.970.000
Hard Construction Costs	\$420,000	\$3,502,000	\$60,813,000	\$43,079,000	\$74,938,000	\$12,000,000	\$27,200,000	\$17,342,000	\$3,375,000	\$20,000,000
Tenant Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,840,000	\$7,680,000	\$0	\$625,000	\$0
Underground Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$4,662,000	\$0	\$4,070,000	\$5,513,000	\$5,513,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Above Grade Structured Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$3,818,000	\$10,350,000	\$3,381,000	\$322,000	\$598,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-Grade Surface Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soft Costs (2)	\$84,000	\$700,400	\$13,858,600	\$10,685,800	\$16,477,800	\$4,335,000	\$8,198,200	\$3,468,400	\$800,000	\$4,000,000
Total Development Costs, Including Land	\$779,000	\$5,102,400	\$90,121,600	\$76,137,800	\$106,837,800	\$27,930,000	\$53,029,200	\$22,964,400	\$6,630,000	\$30,970,000
TDC Per Housing Unit	\$779,000	\$510,240	\$386,788	\$253,793	\$374,869	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TDC per NSF Rentable/Saleable Area	\$278	\$255	\$370	\$344	\$446	\$436	\$414	\$459	\$265	\$124
TDC per Gross SF, Excluding Parking	\$278	\$255	\$296	\$309	\$356	\$349	\$331	\$344	\$265	\$124
TDC per Gross SF, Including Parking	\$278	\$255	\$214	\$200	\$274	\$329	\$240	\$344	\$265	\$124
Total Development Costs, Excluding Land	\$504,000	\$4,202,400	\$83,151,600	\$64,114,800	\$98,866,800	\$26,010,000	\$49,189,200	\$20,810,400	\$4,800,000	\$24,000,000
High Scenario										
Land Acquisition	\$350,000	\$2,000,000	\$9,322,000	\$18,034,000	\$10,820,000	\$2,560,000	\$5,120,000	\$2,871,000	\$2,439,000	\$10,454,000
Hard Construction Costs	\$448,000	\$3,502,000	\$66,894,000	\$49,233,000	\$74,938,000	\$12,000,000	\$27,200,000	\$18,009,000	\$3,375,000	\$21,250,000
Tenant Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,480,000	\$8,960,000	\$0	\$1,125,000	\$0
Underground Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$4,662,000	\$0	\$4,070,000	\$5,513,000	\$5,513,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Above Grade Structured Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$3,818,000	\$10,350,000	\$3,381,000	\$322,000	\$598,000	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0
Soft Costs (2)	\$0 \$89,600	\$0 \$700,400	\$0 \$15,074,800	\$0 \$11,916,600	\$0 \$16,477,800	\$0 \$4,463,000	\$8,454,200	\$0 \$3,601,800	\$0 \$900,000	\$0 \$4,250,000
Total Development Costs, Including Land	\$887,600	\$6,202,400	\$99,770,800	\$89,533,600	\$109,686,800	\$29,338,000	\$55,845,200	\$24,481,800	\$7,839,000	\$35,954,000
TDC Per Housing Unit	\$887.600	\$620.240	\$428 201	\$298 445	\$384 866	N/A	NI/A	NI/A	NI/A	N/A
TDC ner NSE Rentable/Saleable Area	\$007,000	\$020,240	\$ <u>4</u> 10	\$2,0,445	\$307,000	\$458	\$436	\$490	\$31/	\$144
TDC per Gross SF. Excluding Parking	\$317	\$310	\$328	\$364	\$366	\$367	\$349	\$367	\$314	\$144
TDC per Gross SF, Including Parking	\$317	\$310	\$237	\$235	\$281	\$346	\$252	\$367	\$314	\$144
Total Development Costs, Excluding Land	\$537,600	\$4,202,400	\$90,448,800	\$71,499,600	\$98,866,800	\$26,778,000	\$50,725,200	\$21,610,800	\$5,400,000	\$25,500,000

If parking cost shown as \$0, parking cost is included in building construction cost.
 Soft costs include A&E, consultants, construction financing costs, permits and fees, legal, accounting, insurance and developer overhead.
 For owner housing, equals net profit/fee (net sales revenues less total development costs, excluding builder fee/profit). For all others, equals net operating income divided by total development costs.

Sources: Interviews with Denver area residential and commercial developers; DRA.

Table 39 Development Cost Assumptions and Budgets Development Prototypes Final Assumptions Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
PROTOTYPE ASSUMPTIONS					,	,					
Total Residential Units		1	10	232	300	285	0	0	0	0	0
Average Unit Size (Net SE)		2.800		975	708	810	0	0	0	0	Ő
Low Scenario		_,	1.500				Ť				Ť
Middle Scenario			2.000								
High Scenario			2,300								
Residential Net SF		2,800	20.000	227,250	212.250	230,800	0	0	0	0	0
Hotel Rooms		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	0	0
Average Hotel Room Size (Ne	et SF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	0	0
Total Net SF (Rentable/Saleab	ole SF)	2,800	20,000	243,250	221,550	239,800	64,000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SF Building Area	(Excluding Parking)	2,800	20,010	304,063	246,167	299,750	80,000	160,000	66,700	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SF Building Area	(Including Str/Und Parking)	2,800	20,000	420,863	381,167	389,700	84,900	221,250	66,700	25,000	250,000
Underground Parking Spaces	0 0.	0	0	126	0	110	149	149	0	0	0
Structured Parking Spaces		0	0	166	450	147	14	26	0	0	0
Surface Parking Spaces		2	10	0	0	0	0	0	150	83	83
Total Parking Spaces		2	10	292	450	257	163	175	105	83	83
Total Parking SF		400	1,800	116,800	135,000	89,775	57,050	61,250	42,000	29,050	33,200
Site Area (SF)		6,250	10,000	43,560	130,680	26,136	32,000	32,000	89,734	121,968	696,960
Approximate Building Stories		2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
DEVELOPMENT COST ASSU	MPTIONS										
	Escalation from Baseline:	0%	0%	0%	-25%	-25%	-25%	-25%	0%	0%	0%
Land Price											
Low Scenario	Per Hsg. Unit/Hotel Room	\$200,000	\$70,000	\$20,000	\$26,250	\$13,500	\$20 Per SF FAR	\$20 Per SF FAR	\$12,000		
	Per Site SF	\$32	\$70	\$107	\$60	\$147	\$41	\$81	\$19	\$10	\$7
Middle Scenario	Per Hsg. Unit/Hotel Room	\$275,000	\$90,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$21,000	\$23 Per SF FAR	\$23 Per SF FAR	\$15,000		
	Per Site SF	\$44	\$90	\$160	\$69	\$229	\$45	\$90	\$24	\$15	\$10
High Scenario	Per Hsg. Unit/Hotel Room	\$350,000	\$200,000	\$40,000	\$45,000	\$28,500	\$30 Per SF FAR	\$30 Per SF FAR	\$20,000		
	Per Site SF	\$56	\$200	\$213	\$103	\$311	\$60	\$120	\$32	\$20	\$15
	Escalation from Baseline:	0%	0%	0%	-20%	-20%	-20%	-20%	0%	0%	0%
Hard Cost/NSF											
Low Scenario		\$140	\$140	\$195	\$140	\$200	\$116	\$136	\$250	\$135	\$80
Middle Scenario		\$150	\$175	\$200	\$140	\$200	\$120	\$136	\$260	\$135	\$80
High Scenario		\$160	\$175	\$220	\$160	\$200	\$120	\$136	\$270	\$135	\$85
Tenant Improvements (Per Ne	et SF)										
Low Scenario							\$50	\$50		\$10	
Middle Scenario							\$60	\$60		\$25	
High Scenario							\$70	\$70		\$45	
Is Parking Cost Included in Ha	ard Cost? (1)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Underground Parking - Cost F	Per Space			\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000			
Above-Grade Structured Parki	ing - Cost Per Space			\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,000			
On-Grade Surface Parking - C	Cost Per Space			\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500			
Soft Costs (2)	% of Hard Costs	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Marketing/Closing/Sales Costs	s (% of Sales Price)	7%	9%	9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Debt as a % of TDC		70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	60%	60%	50%	50%	50%
Equity as a % OF IDC		30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%	40%	50%	50%	50%
Minimum Return Assumption	15										
Cap Rate (High Cap Rate Sce	nario)	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.00%	5.00%	5.50%	5.50%	7.50%	5.50%	6.00%
Minimum Unleveraged Retur	n on Cost (3)	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	6.50%	6.50%	7.00%	7.00%	9.00%	7.00%	7.50%
Minimum Return on Equity (F	ROE)	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%
Construction and Sales/Stabil	ization Period (Months)	15 Months	24 Months	48 Months	30 Months	48 Months	18 Months	21 Months	15 Months	9 Months	9 Months

Table 39 Development Cost Assumptions and Budgets Development Prototypes Final Assumptions Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
DEVELOPMENT BUDGET										
Low Scenario										
Land Acquisition	\$200.000	\$700.000	\$4.661.000	\$7.841.000	\$3,842,000	\$1.296.000	\$2,592,000	\$1,705,000	\$1,220,000	\$4.879.000
Hard Construction Costs	\$392,000	\$2,801,000	\$59,292,000	\$34,463,000	\$59,950,000	\$9,280,000	\$21,760,000	\$16,675,000	\$3,375,000	\$20,000,000
Tenant Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,200,000	\$6,400,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$0
Underground Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$4,662,000	\$0	\$4,070,000	\$5,513,000	\$5,513,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Above Grade Structured Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$3,818,000	\$10,350,000	\$3,381,000	\$322,000	\$598,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-Grade Surface Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soft Costs (2)	\$78,400	\$560,200	\$13,554,400	\$8,962,600	\$13,480,200	\$3,663,000	\$6,854,200	\$3,335,000	\$725,000	\$4,000,000
Total Development Costs, Including Land	\$670,400	\$4,061,200	\$85,987,400	\$61,616,600	\$84,723,200	\$23,274,000	\$43,717,200	\$21,715,000	\$5,570,000	\$28,879,000
TDC Per Housing Unit	\$670,400	\$406,120	\$370,635	\$205,389	\$297,274	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TDC per NSF Rentable/Saleable Area	\$239	\$203	\$353	\$278	\$353	\$364	\$342	\$434	\$223	\$116
TDC per Gross SF, Excluding Parking	\$239	\$203	\$283	\$250	\$283	\$291	\$273	\$326	\$223	\$116
TDC per Gross SF, Including Parking	\$239	\$203	\$204	\$162	\$217	\$274	\$198	\$326	\$223	\$116
Total Development Costs, Excluding Land	\$470,400	\$3,361,200	\$81,326,400	\$53,775,600	\$80,881,200	\$21,978,000	\$41,125,200	\$20,010,000	\$4,350,000	\$24,000,000
Middle Scenario										
Land Acquisition	\$275.000	\$900.000	\$6.970.000	\$9.017.000	\$5,985,000	\$1.440.000	\$2,880,000	\$2,154,000	\$1.830.000	\$6.970.000
Hard Construction Costs	\$420,000	\$3,502,000	\$60,813,000	\$34,463,000	\$59,950,000	\$9,600,000	\$21,760,000	\$17,342,000	\$3,375,000	\$20,000,000
Tenant Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,840,000	\$7,680,000	\$0	\$625,000	\$0
Underground Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$4,662,000	\$0	\$4,070,000	\$5,513,000	\$5,513,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Above Grade Structured Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$3,818,000	\$10,350,000	\$3,381,000	\$322,000	\$598,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-Grade Surface Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soft Costs (2)	\$84,000	\$700,400	\$13,858,600	\$8,962,600	\$13,480,200	\$3,855,000	\$7,110,200	\$3,468,400	\$800,000	\$4,000,000
Total Development Costs, Including Land	\$779,000	\$5,102,400	\$90,121,600	\$62,792,600	\$86,866,200	\$24,570,000	\$45,541,200	\$22,964,400	\$6,630,000	\$30,970,000
TDC Per Housing Unit	\$779,000	\$510,240	\$388,455	\$209,309	\$304,794	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TDC per NSF Rentable/Saleable Area	\$278	\$255	\$370	\$283	\$362	\$384	\$356	\$459	\$265	\$124
TDC per Gross SF, Excluding Parking	\$278	\$255	\$296	\$255	\$290	\$307	\$285	\$344	\$265	\$124
TDC per Gross SF, Including Parking	\$278	\$255	\$214	\$165	\$223	\$289	\$206	\$344	\$265	\$124
Total Development Costs, Excluding Land	\$504,000	\$4,202,400	\$83,151,600	\$53,775,600	\$80,881,200	\$23,130,000	\$42,661,200	\$20,810,400	\$4,800,000	\$24,000,000
High Scenario										
Land Acquisition	\$350,000	\$2,000,000	\$9,278.000	\$13,460.000	\$8,128.000	\$1,920.000	\$3,840.000	\$2,871.000	\$2,439,000	\$10,454,000
Hard Construction Costs	\$448,000	\$3,502,000	\$66,894,000	\$39,387,000	\$59,950,000	\$9,600,000	\$21,760,000	\$18,009,000	\$3,375,000	\$21,250,000
Tenant Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,480,000	\$8,960,000	\$0	\$1,125,000	\$0
Underground Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$4,662,000	\$0	\$4,070,000	\$5,513,000	\$5,513,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Above Grade Structured Parking (1)	\$0	\$0	\$3,818,000	\$10,350,000	\$3,381,000	\$322,000	\$598,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-Grade Surface Parking (1) Soft Costs (2)	\$0	\$0 \$700,400	\$0 \$15.074.800	\$0 \$0 047 400	\$0	\$0 \$2 082 000	\$0 \$7 266 200	\$0 \$2,601,800	\$0 \$000,000	\$0
		\$700,400	\$15,074,000	\$9,947,400	\$13,400,200	\$3,983,000	\$7,500,200	\$3,001,000	\$900,000	\$4,230,000
Total Development Costs, Including Land	\$887,600	\$6,202,400	\$99,726,800	\$73,144,400	\$89,009,200	\$25,818,000	\$48,037,200	\$24,481,800	\$7,839,000	\$35,954,000
TDC Per Housing Unit	\$887,600	\$620,240	\$429,857	\$243,815	\$312,313	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IDC per NSF Rentable/Saleable Area	\$317	\$310	\$410	\$330	\$371	\$403	\$375	\$490	\$314	\$144
TDC per Gross SF, Excluding Parking	\$317	\$310	\$328	\$297	\$297	\$323	\$300	\$367	\$314	\$144
IDC per Gross SF, Including Parking	\$317	\$310	\$237	\$192	\$228	\$304	\$217	\$367	\$314	\$144
Total Development Costs, Excluding Land	\$537,600	\$4,202,400	\$90,448,800	\$59,684,400	\$80,881,200	\$23,898,000	\$44,197,200	\$21,610,800	\$5,400,000	\$25,500,000

(1) If parking cost shown as \$0, parking cost is included in building construction cost.

(2) Soft costs include A&E, consultants, construction financing costs, permits and fees, legal, accounting, insurance and developer overhead.

(3) For owner housing, equals net profit/fee (net sales revenues less total development costs, excluding builder fee/profit). For all others, equals net operating income divided by total development costs.

Sources: Interviews with Denver area residential and commercial developers; DRA.

Table 40Net Operating Income from Market-Rate Apartments100% Market Rate UnitsDenver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental
Тарика	Renter	Renter
Net Rentable SE of Anartment Snace	212 250	230 800
Parking Spaces	450	257
Net Rentable SF of Retail Space	3,000	3,000
Approximate Building Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories
Number of Apartment Units		
Studio/Loft/Shotgun 1 BR	60	57
One Bedroom	195	157
Two Bedroom	45	71
Three Bedroom	0	0
Total	300	285
Unit Size (Square Feet)		
Studio/Loft/Shotgun 1 BR	550	600
One Bedroom	700	800
Two Bedroom	950	1,000
Three Bedroom	-	-
Average	708	810
Average Monthly Rent Per Square Foot		
Low Scenario	\$2.15	\$2.50
Middle Scenario	\$2.25	\$2.75
High Scenario	\$2.50	\$3.00
Miscellaneous Income (\$/Unit/Year)	\$120	\$120
Rental Vacancy Rate	7.0%	7.0%
Rental Operating Cost/Unit (2)		
Low Scenario	\$5,000	\$7,000
Middle Scenario	\$5,500	\$7,500
High Scenario	\$6,000	\$8,000
Retail Income (\$/NSF/Year)		
Low Scenario	\$28.00	\$28.00
Middle Scenario	\$32.00	\$32.00
High Scenario	\$36.00	\$36.00
Retail Vacancy Rate (% Gross Retail Income)	10%	10%
Retail Operating Cost (% of Gross Retail Income)	40%	40%

Table 40Net Operating Income from Market-Rate Apartments100% Market Rate UnitsDenver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental
LOW SCENARIO		
Total Monthly Gross Rental Income	\$456,338	\$577,000
Annual Gross Income	\$5,476,050	\$6,924,000
Less: Vacancy	(\$383,324)	(\$484,680)
Plus: Misc. Income	\$36,000	\$34,200
Plus: Retail Income	\$84,000	\$84,000
Adjusted Annual Gross Income	\$5,212,727	\$6,557,520
Operating Costs		
Apartment Operating Costs	(\$1,500,000)	(\$1,995,000)
Retail Operating Costs	(\$8,400)	(\$8,400)
Net Operating Income	\$3,704,327	\$4,554,120
MIDDLE SCENARIO		
Total Monthly Gross Income	\$477.563	\$634.700
Annual Gross Income	\$5.730.750	\$7.616.400
Less: Vacancy	(\$401,153)	(\$533,148)
Plus: Misc. Income	\$36,000	\$34,200
Plus: Retail Income	\$84,000	\$84,000
Adjusted Annual Gross Income	\$5,449,598	\$7,201,452
Operating Costs		
Apartment Operating Costs	(\$1,650,000)	(\$2,137,500)
Retail Operating Costs	(\$8,400)	(\$8,400)
Net Operating Income	\$3,791,198	\$5,055,552
HIGH SCENARIO		
Total Monthly Gross Income	\$530.625	\$692 400
Annual Gross Income	\$6 367 500	\$8 308 800
Less: Vacancy	(\$445,725)	(\$581.616)
Plus: Misc. Income	\$36.000	\$34.200
Plus: Retail Income	\$84,000	\$84,000
Adjusted Annual Gross Income	\$6,041,775	\$7,845,384
Operating Costs		
Apartment Operating Costs	(\$1,800,000)	(\$2,280,000)
Retail Operating Costs	(\$8,400)	(\$8,400)
Net Operating Income	\$4,233,375	\$5,556,984

Table 41Net Sales Proceeds from Market-Rate Owner Housing100% Market Rate UnitsDenver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner
Net Saleable SE of Living Area	2 800		227 250
Low Scenario	2,000	15,000	227,230
Middle Scenario		20,000	
High Scenario		23,000	
Number of Owner Hsg. Units			
Studio/Loft/Shotgun 1 BR	0	0	0
One Bedroom	0	0	128
Iwo Bedroom	0	0	93
Total	1	10	233
		10	200
Average Unit Size (Square Feet)	2,800	1 500	975
Middle Scenario		2,000	
High Scenario		2,300	
Average Sales Price Per Square Foot			
Low Scenario	\$300.00	\$333.35	\$450.00
Middle Scenario	\$350.00	\$330.00	\$550.00
High Scenario	\$400.00	\$347.83	\$600.00
Average Sales Price Per Unit			
Low Scenario	\$840,000	\$500,000	\$438,900
Middle Scenario	\$980,000	\$660,000	\$536,400
High Scenario	\$1,120,000	\$800,000	\$585,200
Sales Costs (% of Gross Sales Income)	7%	9%	9%
LOW SCENARIO			
Total Gross Sales Proceeds	\$840,000	\$5,000,000	\$102,262,500
Less: Sales Costs	(\$58,800)	(\$450,000)	(\$9,203,625)
Net Sales Proceeds	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875
Net Sales Proceeds Per Net Saleable SF	\$279	\$303	\$410
MIDDLE SCENARIO			
Total Gross Sales Income	\$980 000	\$6 600 000	\$124 987 500
Less: Sales Costs	(\$68,600)	(\$594,000)	(\$11.248.875)
Net Sales Income	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,738,625
Net Sales Income Per Net Saleable SF	\$326	\$300	\$501
HIGH SCENARIO			
Total Gross Sales Income	\$1 120 000	\$8,000,000	\$136 350 000
Less: Sales Costs	(\$78.400)	(\$720.000)	(\$12,271.500)
Net Sales Income	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500
Net Sales Income Per Net Saleable SF	\$372	\$317	\$546

Table 42 Net Operating Income from Non-Residential Uses Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

				Stand-Alone	
	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Net SF Office	60,000	120,000	0	0	0
Ner SF Hotel	0	0	50,000	0	0
Net SF Retail	4,000	8,000	0	25,000	0
Net SF Warehouse	0	0	0	0	250,000
Net SF Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0
Total Net SF Non-Residential	64,000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Hotel Rooms	0	0	143	0	0
Parking Spaces	163	175	105	83	83
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories
OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS					
Office/Warehouse Operating Assumptions					
Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN)					
Low Scenario	\$26.00	\$36.00			\$11.00
Middle Scenario	\$31.00	\$36.00			\$12.00
High Scenario	\$36.00	\$36.00			\$14.00
Vacancy Rate	10.0%	10.0%			10.0%
Operating Expenses (Annual Cost/NSF)	\$13.00	\$13.00			\$3.00
(Excluding BID/Met. District costs)					
Hotel Operating Assumptions					
Average Daily Room Rate					
Low Scenario			\$150.00		
Middle Scenario			\$175.00		
High Scenario			\$200.00		
Vacancy Rate			28.0%		
Operating Expenses As % of Gross Income			50.0%		
Retail Operating Assumptions					
Annual Rent Per NSF (NNN)					
Low Scenario	\$28.00	\$28.00	\$28.00	\$30.00	
Middle Scenario	\$32.00	\$32.00	\$32.00	\$32.00	
High Scenario	\$36.00	\$36.00	\$36.00	\$36.00	
Vacancy Rate	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	
Operating Expenses (Annual Cost/NSF)	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13	
Parking Income/Operating Assumptions					
Parking Income (\$/Space/Month)					
Low Scenario	\$100.00	\$150.00			
Middle Scenario	\$150.00	\$175.00			
High Scenario	\$200.00	\$200.00			
Parking Vacancy Rate	0.0%	0.0%			

Table 42 Net Operating Income from Non-Residential Uses Non-Residential Prototypes Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Stand-Alone Retail	Warehouse
					-
Net SF Office	60,000	120,000	0	0	0
Net SF Hotel Not SF Rotail	4 000	0 8 000	50,000	25.000	0
Net SF Warehouse	4,000	8,000	0	23,000	250.000
Net SF Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	230,000
Total Net SF Non-Residential	64.000	128.000	50.000	25.000	250.000
Hotel Rooms	0	0	143	0	0
Parking Spaces	163	175	105	83	83
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories
STABILIZED NET OPERATING INCOME					
LOW SCENARIO					
Annual Gross Office/Warehouse Rental Income	\$1,560,000	\$4,320,000	\$0	so	\$2,750,000
Annual Gross Hotel Income	\$0	\$0	\$7.829.250	\$0	\$0
Annual Gross Retail Rental Income	\$112,000	\$224,000	\$0	\$750,000	\$0
Annual Gross Parking Income	\$293,400	\$367,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Annual Gross Non Residential Rental Income	\$1 965 400	\$4 911 500	\$7 829 250	\$750.000	\$2 750 000
Less: Office/Warehouse Vacancy	(\$156.000)	(\$432.000)	\$7,023,230 \$0	\$/ 30,000 \$0	(\$275,000)
Less: Hotel Vacancy	(\$150,000) \$0	(\$452,000) \$0	(\$2.192.190)	\$0	(#27.5,000) \$0
Less: Retail Vacancy	(\$11,200)	(\$22,400)	\$0	(\$75.000)	\$0
Less: Parking Vacancy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Adjusted Annual Gross Income	\$1,798,200	\$4,457,100	\$5,637,060	\$675,000	\$2,475,000
Less: Office/Warehouse Operating Expenses	(\$780,000)	(\$1,560,000)	\$0	\$0	(\$750,000)
ess: Hotel Operating Expenses	\$0	\$0	(\$3,914,625)	\$0	\$0 \$0
ess: Retail Operating Expenses	(\$52,000)	(\$104,000)	\$0 \$0	(\$325,000)	\$0
Less: Parking Operating Expenses	\$0 \$966 200	\$0 \$2 793 100	\$0 \$1 722 435	\$350,000	\$0 \$1 725 000
Net Operating Income Per NSF	\$15.10	\$2,7 53,100 \$21.82	\$34.45	\$14.00	\$6.90
MIDDLE SCENARIO	\$1.960,000	\$4,220,000	¢0	¢0	\$2,000,000
Annual Gross Hotel Income	\$1,000,000	\$4,320,000	\$9 134 125	\$0 \$0	\$3,000,000
Annual Gross Retail Rental Income	\$128,000	\$256,000	\$0	\$800,000	\$0
Annual Gross Parking Income	\$293,400	\$367,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Annual Gross Non-Residential Rental Income	\$2 281 400	\$4 943 500	\$9 134 125	\$800.000	\$3,000,000
_ess: Office Vacancy	(\$186,000)	(\$432,000)	\$0	\$000,000	(\$300,000)
ess: Hotel Vacancy	\$0	\$0	(\$2,557,555)	\$0	\$0
Less: Retail Vacancy	(\$12,800)	(\$25,600)	\$0	(\$80,000)	\$0
.ess: Parking Vacancy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Adjusted Annual Gross Income	\$2,082,600	\$4,485,900	\$6,576,570	\$720,000	\$2,700,000
.ess: Office/Warehouse Operating Expenses	(\$780,000)	(\$1,560,000)	\$0	\$0	(\$750,000)
.ess: Hotel Operating Expenses	(\$52,000)	\$0 (\$104.000)	(\$4,567,063)	(\$225,000)	\$0 \$0
ess: Parking Operating Expenses	(\$32,000)	(\$104,000) \$0	\$0 \$0	(\$525,000) \$0	\$0 \$0
Annual Total Net Operating Income	\$1,250,600	\$2,821,900	\$2,009,508	\$395,000	\$1,950,000
Net Operating Income Per NSF	\$19.54	\$22.05	\$40.19	\$15.80	\$7.80
IIGH SCENARIO					
Annual Gross Office/Warehouse Rental Income	\$2,160,000	\$4,320,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,500,000
Annual Gross Hotel Income	\$0	\$0	\$10,439,000	\$0	\$0 60
Annual Gross Retail Rental Income	\$144,000 \$293,400	\$288,000 \$367,500	\$0 \$0	\$900,000	\$0 \$0
Annual Cross Nam Basidential Day (11)	#2,55,400	\$307,500	00		\$0 500 000
Annual Gross Non-Kesidential Kental Income	\$2,597,400	\$4,975,500 (\$432.000)	\$10,439,000 ¢0	\$900,000	\$3,500,000
ess: Hotel Vacancy	(\$210,000) \$0	(\$452,000) \$0	(\$2.922.920)	\$0	(\$550,000) \$0
ess: Retail Vacancy	(\$14,400)	(\$28,800)	\$0	(\$90,000)	\$0
ess: Parking Vacancy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Adjusted Annual Gross Income	\$2,367,000	\$4,514,700	\$7,516,080	\$810,000	\$3,150,000
.ess: Office/Warehouse Operating Expenses	(\$780,000)	(\$1,560,000)	\$0	\$0	(\$750,000)
ess: Hotel Operating Expenses	\$0	\$0	(\$5,219,500)	\$0	\$0
ess: Retail Operating Expenses	(\$52,000)	(\$104,000)	\$0	(\$325,000)	\$0
Less. Retail Operating Expenses	(\$52,000)	(4 -))			<u> </u>
Less: Parking Operating Expenses	(\$ <u>32</u> ,000) \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Less: Parking Operating Expenses Annual Total Net Operating Income Net Operating Income	\$0 \$1,535,000 \$22.08	\$0 \$2,850,700 \$22,27	\$0 \$2,296,580 \$45.92	\$0 \$485,000 \$10.40	\$0 \$2,400,000 \$9.60

Table 43 Return on Equity Analysis Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Owner								
	Single-Family Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
7		0		, .		1		,		
Ienure De la	Owner	Owner	Owner	Kenter	Kenter	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Units	1	10	232	300	285	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Net SF	2,800	20,000	227,250	212,250	230,800	-	-	-	-	-
Site Area (SF)	6,250	10,000	43,560	130,680	26,136	32,000	32,000	89,734	121,968	696,960
Total Net SF	2,800	20,000	243,250	221,550	239,800	64,000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SF (Excluding Parking)	2,800	20,010	304,063	246,167	299,750	80,000	160,000	66,700	25,000	250,000
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Total Annual Net Operating Income, Rental Properties										
Low Scenario				\$3,704,327	\$4,554,120	\$966,200	\$2,793,100	\$1,722,435	\$350,000	\$1,725,000
NOI Per NSF				\$16.72	\$18.99	\$15.10	\$21.82	\$34.45	\$14.00	\$6.90
Middle Scenario				\$3,791,198	\$5,055,552	\$1,250,600	\$2,821,900	\$2,009,508	\$395.000	\$1,950,000
NOI Per NSE				\$17.11	\$21.08	\$19.54	\$22.05	\$40.19	\$15.80	\$7.80
High Scenario				\$4 233 375	\$5 556 984	\$1 535 000	\$2,850,700	\$2 296 580	\$485,000	\$2,400,000
NOI Por NSE				\$10.11	\$3,330,307	\$1,555,000	\$2,050,700	\$2,250,500 \$45.02	\$10.40	\$0.60
Norrei Na				\$15.11	\$23.17	\$23.50	\$22.27	\$43.93	\$19.40	\$9.00
Cap Rate				4.50%	4.50%	5.00%	5.00%	7.00%	5.00%	5.50%
Minimum Equity Yield on NOI	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Capitalized Value, Rental Properties										
Low Scenario				\$82,318,367	\$101,202,667	\$19,324,000	\$55,862,000	\$24,606,214	\$7,000,000	\$31,363,636
Middle Scenario				\$84,248,833	\$112,345,600	\$25,012,000	\$56,438,000	\$28,707,250	\$7,900,000	\$35,454,545
High Scenario				\$94,075,000	\$123,488,533	\$30,700,000	\$57,014,000	\$32,808,286	\$9,700,000	\$43,636,364
0				. , ,	. , ,	. , ,		. , ,		. , ,
Net Home Sales Proceeds										
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875							
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6.006.000	\$113,738,625							
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124 078 500							
i igli sechario	\$1,011,000	\$7,200,000	\$12 1/07 0/300							
Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Rental:										
Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership)										
Low Sconario	\$791.200	\$4 550 000	¢02.0E9.97E	\$92,219,267	\$101 202 667	\$10,224,000	\$FE 962 000	\$24 606 214	\$7,000,000	\$21 262 626
Der NCE	\$701,200	\$4,550,000	\$53,030,073	\$02,310,307	\$101,202,007	\$15,324,000	\$55,002,000	\$24,000,214	\$7,000,000	\$31,303,030
Per INSF	\$2/9	\$228	\$383	\$3/2	\$422	\$302	\$436	\$492	\$280	\$125 ¢25 454 545
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,/38,625	\$84,248,833	\$112,345,600	\$25,012,000	\$56,438,000	\$28,707,250	\$7,900,000	\$35,454,545
Per NSF	\$326	\$300	\$468	\$380	\$468	\$391	\$441	\$5/4	\$316	\$142
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500	\$94,0/5,000	\$123,488,533	\$30,700,000	\$57,014,000	\$32,808,286	\$9,700,000	\$43,636,364
Per NSF	\$372	\$364	\$510	\$425	\$515	\$480	\$445	\$656	\$388	\$175
Iotal Nexus Fee at Fee Level of:										
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	\$2,800	\$20,010	\$304,063	\$246,167	\$299,750	\$80,000	\$160,000	\$66,700	\$25,000	\$250,000
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	\$5,600	\$40,020	\$608,125	\$492,333	\$599,500	\$160,000	\$320,000	\$133,400	\$50,000	\$500,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF	\$8,400	\$60,030	\$912,188	\$738,500	\$899,250	\$240,000	\$480,000	\$200,100	\$75,000	\$750,000
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF	\$14,000	\$100,050	\$1,520,313	\$1,230,833	\$1,498,750	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$333,500	\$125,000	\$1,250,000
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	\$19,600	\$140,070	\$2,128,438	\$1,723,167	\$2,098,250	\$560,000	\$1,120,000	\$466,900	\$175,000	\$1,750,000
Less: Total Development Cost, Including Land										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$670,400	\$4,061,200	\$85,987,400	\$61,616,600	\$84,723,200	\$23,274,000	\$43,717,200	\$21,715,000	\$5,570,000	\$28,879,000
Per NSF	\$239	\$203	\$353	\$278	\$353	\$364	\$342	\$434	\$223	\$116
Middle Scenario	\$779,000	\$5,102,400	\$90,121,600	\$62,792,600	\$86,866,200	\$24,570,000	\$45,541,200	\$22,964,400	\$6,630,000	\$30,970,000
Per NSF	\$278	\$255	\$370	\$283	\$362	\$384	\$356	\$459	\$265	\$124
High Scenario	\$887,600	\$6,202,400	\$99,726,800	\$73,144,400	\$89,009,200	\$25,818,000	\$48,037,200	\$24,481,800	\$7,839,000	\$35,954,000
Per NSF	\$317	\$310	\$410	\$330	\$371	\$403	\$375	\$490	\$314	\$144
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$673,200	\$4,081,210	\$86,291,463	\$61,862,767	\$85,022,950	\$23,354,000	\$43,877,200	\$21,781,700	\$5,595,000	\$29,129,000
Per NSF	\$240	\$204	\$355	\$279	\$355	\$365	\$343	\$436	\$224	\$117
Middle Scenario	\$781.800	\$5.122.410	\$90.425.663	\$63,038,767	\$87,165,950	\$24.650.000	\$45,701.200	\$23,031,100	\$6,655,000	\$31,220.000
Per NSF	\$279	\$256	\$372	\$285	\$363	\$385	\$357	\$461	\$266	\$125
High Scenario	\$890 400	\$6 222 410	\$100.030 863	\$73 390 567	\$89 308 950	\$25,898,000	\$48 197 200	\$24 548 500	\$7 864 000	\$36,204,000
Per NSE	\$330,400	\$0,222,410	¢/11	¢, 5,550,507	¢373	\$25,050,000 \$40E	¢277	¢21,510,500 ¢401	¢215	¢1/E
Fee of \$2.00 Per CSE	0100	11 دو	.p++11	اددو	\$3/Z	\$ 1 05	, <i>"""</i>	.p++.71	CLC¢	\$143
Low Scepario	\$676.000	\$4 101 220	\$86 595 525	\$62 108 022	\$85 322 700	\$23 434 000	\$44.037.200	\$21.848.400	\$5.620.000	\$29.379.000
Dor NICE	\$070,000	\$20F	400,353,323 ¢3EC	\$02,100,333 \$200	\$05,522,700 \$2FC	423,434,000 6377	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	\$21,040,400 \$437	\$5,020,000 ¢aar	\$110
reingi	پ241 p	\$205	\$350	\$280	\$356	\$300	3344	\$43/	\$225	\$118

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 43 Return on Equity Analysis Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Owner								
	Single-Family Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Middle Commis	6704 (00	¢F 142 420	¢00 720 725	¢(2,204,022	¢07.4(F.700	\$24 720 000	¢ 45 0(1 200	¢22.007.000	¢c (00.000	\$21,470,000
Middle Scenario	\$/84,600	\$5,142,420	\$90,729,725	\$63,284,933	\$87,465,700	\$24,/30,000	\$45,861,200	\$23,097,800	\$6,680,000	\$31,470,000
Per NSF	\$280	\$257	\$3/3	\$286	\$365	\$386	\$358	\$462	\$26/	\$126
High Scenario	\$893,200	\$6,242,420	\$100,334,925	\$/3,636,/33	\$89,608,700	\$25,978,000	\$48,357,200	\$24,615,200	\$7,889,000	\$36,454,000
Per INSF	\$319	\$312	\$412	\$332	\$3/4	\$406	\$3/8	\$492	\$316	\$146
ree of \$3.00 Fer GSF	¢(70.000	64 101 000	¢00 000 500	¢(2,255,100	¢05 (00 450	¢22 514 000	\$44.107.200	¢01.015.100	¢F (4F 000	\$20,020,000
Low Scenario	\$6/8,800	\$4,121,230	\$86,899,588	\$62,355,100	\$85,622,450	\$23,514,000	\$44,197,200	\$21,915,100	\$5,645,000	\$29,629,000
Fel INSF Middle Seenerie	\$242	\$200 \$5 1(2,420	\$33/ \$01.022.799	\$201 ¢(2 = 21 100	\$337 \$97.7(F.4F0	\$24,910,000	\$343 \$46 021 200	\$400 \$22.164.500	\$220	\$119
Por NSE	\$707,400	\$5,162,430	\$91,055,700	\$05,551,100	\$07,703,430	\$24,010,000	\$46,021,200	\$25,164,500	\$6,705,000	\$31,720,000
High Scepario	\$896,000	\$6,262,430	\$100 638 988	\$73,882,900	\$89 908 450	\$26.058.000	\$48 517 200	\$24 681 900	\$7.914.000	\$36 704 000
Por NSE	\$320	\$0,202,450	\$100,030,500	\$75,002,500	\$05,500,450	\$20,050,000	\$40,517,200	\$24,001,000	\$7,514,000	\$30,704,000
Fee of \$5.00 Per CSE	\$520	6166	FIFÇ		C 16¢	\$407	\$575	τCr¢	41.66	
Low Scenario	\$684 400	\$4 161 250	\$87 507 713	\$62 847 433	\$86 221 950	\$23 674 000	\$44 517 200	\$22.048.500	\$5 695 000	\$30,129,000
Per NSE	\$244	\$208	\$360	\$284	\$360	\$370	\$348	\$441	\$228	\$121
Middle Scenario	\$793,000	\$5 202 450	\$91 641 913	\$64 023 433	\$88 364 950	\$24 970 000	\$46 341 200	\$23 297 900	\$6 755 000	\$32 220 000
Per NSE	\$283	\$260	\$377	\$289	\$368	\$390	\$362	\$466	\$270	\$129
High Scenario	\$901.600	\$6.302.450	\$101.247.113	\$74.375.233	\$90.507.950	\$26.218.000	\$48.837.200	\$24,815,300	\$7.964.000	\$37,204,000
Per NSF	\$322	\$315	\$416	\$336	\$377	\$410	\$382	\$496	\$319	\$149
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$690,000	\$4,201,270	\$88,115,838	\$63,339,767	\$86,821,450	\$23,834,000	\$44,837,200	\$22,181,900	\$5,745,000	\$30,629,000
Per NSF	\$246	\$210	\$362	\$286	\$362	\$372	\$350	\$444	\$230	\$123
Middle Scenario	\$798,600	\$5,242,470	\$92,250,038	\$64,515,767	\$88,964,450	\$25,130,000	\$46,661,200	\$23,431,300	\$6,805,000	\$32,720,000
Per NSF	\$285	\$262	\$379	\$291	\$371	\$393	\$365	\$469	\$272	\$131
High Scenario	\$907,200	\$6,342,470	\$101,855,238	\$74,867,567	\$91,107,450	\$26,378,000	\$49,157,200	\$24,948,700	\$8,014,000	\$37,704,000
Per NSF	\$324	\$317	\$419	\$338	\$380	\$412	\$384	\$499	\$321	\$151
Net Profit										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$110,800	\$488,800	\$7,071,475	\$20,701,767	\$16,479,467	(\$3,950,000)	\$12,144,800	\$2,891,214	\$1,430,000	\$2,484,636
Return on Equity (1)	44%	20%	7%	45%	16%	-28%	40%	21%	68%	23%
Middle Scenario	\$132,400	\$903,600	\$23,617,025	\$21,456,233	\$25,479,400	\$442,000	\$10,896,800	\$5,742,850	\$1,270,000	\$4,484,545
Return on Equity (1)	45%	30%	22%	46%	24%	3%	34%	40%	51%	39%
High Scenario	\$154,000	\$1,077,600	\$24,351,700	\$20,930,600	\$34,479,333	\$4,882,000	\$8,976,800	\$8,326,486	\$1,861,000	\$7,682,364
Return on Equity (1)	46%	29%	20%	38%	32%	32%	27%	54%	63%	57%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$108,000	\$468,790	\$6,767,413	\$20,455,600	\$16,179,717	(\$4,030,000)	\$11,984,800	\$2,824,514	\$1,405,000	\$2,234,636
Return on Equity (1)	43%	19%	7%	44%	16%	-29%	39%	21%	67%	20%
Middle Scenario	\$129,600	\$883,590	\$23,312,963	\$21,210,067	\$25,179,650	\$362,000	\$10,736,800	\$5,676,150	\$1,245,000	\$4,234,545
Return on Equity (1)	44%	29%	21%	45%	24%	2%	34%	39%	50%	36%
High Scenario	\$151,200	\$1,057,590	\$24,047,638	\$20,684,433	\$34,1/9,583	\$4,802,000	\$8,816,800	\$8,259,786	\$1,836,000	\$7,432,364
Keturn on Equity (1)	45%	28%	20%	38%	32%	31%	26%	54%	62%	55%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	£105 200	\$449.790	\$6,462,250	\$20,200,422	¢15 970 067	(\$4.110.000)	¢11 924 900	¢0.757.014	¢1 280 000	\$1.094.626
Low Scenario	\$105,200	\$448,780	\$6,463,350	\$20,209,433	\$15,8/9,96/	(\$4,110,000)	\$11,824,800	\$2,/5/,814	\$1,380,000	\$1,984,636
Middle Scenario	\$126,900	¢962 E90	\$22,009,000	\$20.062.000	\$24,970,000	\$292,000	\$10 576 900	\$E 600 4E0	\$1,220,000	\$2 094 E4E
Return on Equity (1)	\$120,000	\$003,300 28%	\$23,000,500	\$20,903,900	\$24,075,500	\$202,000	\$10,370,000	\$3,005,430	\$1,220,000	\$5,504,545
High Scenario	\$148.400	\$1.037.580	\$23 743 575	\$20,438,267	\$33,870,833	\$4 722 000	\$8,656,800	\$8 193 086	\$1,811,000	\$7 182 364
Return on Equity (1)	44%	28%	20%	37%	32%	30%	26%	53%	61%	53%
Fee of \$3.00 Per CSE	-11/0	2070	2070	57 70	5270	5070	2070	5570	0170	5570
Low Scenario	\$102 400	\$428 770	\$6 159 288	\$19 963 267	\$15 580 217	(\$4 190 000)	\$11 664 800	\$2 691 114	\$1 355 000	\$1 734 636
Return on Equity (1)	40%	17%	6%	43%	15%	-30%	38%	20%	¢1,555,666	16%
Middle Scenario	\$124.000	\$843.570	\$22,704,838	\$20,717,733	\$24,580,150	\$202.000	\$10.416.800	\$5.542.750	\$1.195.000	\$3,734,545
Return on Equity (1)	42%	27%	21%	43%	23%	1%	32%	38%	48%	31%
High Scenario	\$145,600	\$1.017.570	\$23,439,513	\$20,192,100	\$33,580,083	\$4,642,000	\$8,496,800	\$8,126,386	\$1,786,000	\$6,932,364
Return on Equity (1)	43%	27%	19%	36%	31%	30%	25%	53%	60%	50%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$96,800	\$388,750	\$5,551,163	\$19,470,933	\$14,980,717	(\$4,350,000)	\$11,344,800	\$2,557,714	\$1,305,000	\$1,234,636
Return on Equity (1)	38%	16%	5%	41%	14%	-31%	36%	19%	61%	11%
Middle Scenario	\$118,400	\$803,550	\$22,096,713	\$20,225,400	\$23,980,650	\$42,000	\$10,096,800	\$5,409,350	\$1,145,000	\$3,234,545
Return on Equity (1)	40%	26%	20%	42%	23%	0%	31%	37%	45%	27%
High Scenario	\$140,000	\$977,550	\$22,831,388	\$19,699,767	\$32,980,583	\$4,482,000	\$8,176,800	\$7,992,986	\$1,736,000	\$6,432,364
Return on Equity (1)	41%	26%	19%	35%	30%	28%	24%	52%	58%	46%

Table 43 Return on Equity Analysis Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Owner								
	Single-Family Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSE										
Low Scenario	\$91,200	\$348.730	\$4,943,038	\$18,978,600	\$14.381.217	(\$4.510.000)	\$11.024.800	\$2,424,314	\$1,255,000	\$734.636
Return on Equity (1)	35%	14%	\$1,515,656	40%	14%	-32%	35%	17%	58%	6%
Middle Scenario	\$112,800	\$763.530	\$21,488,588	\$19,733,067	\$23,381,150	(\$118.000)	\$9,776,800	\$5,275,950	\$1.095.000	\$2,734,545
Return on Equity (1)	38%	24%	19%	41%	22%	-1%	30%	36%	43%	22%
High Scenario	\$134,400	\$937,530	\$22,223,263	\$19,207,433	\$32,381,083	\$4,322,000	\$7,856,800	\$7,859,586	\$1,686,000	\$5,932,364
Return on Equity (1)	40%	25%	18%	34%	30%	27%	23%	50%	56%	42%
Assumed Equity Investment										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$201,120	\$1,218,360	\$25,796,220	\$18,484,980	\$25,416,960	\$9,309,600	\$17,486,880	\$10,857,500	\$2,785,000	\$14,439,500
Middle Scenario	\$233,700	\$1,530,720	\$27,036,480	\$18,837,780	\$26,059,860	\$9,828,000	\$18,216,480	\$11,482,200	\$3,315,000	\$15,485,000
High Scenario	\$266,280	\$1,860,720	\$29,918,040	\$21,943,320	\$26,702,760	\$10,327,200	\$19,214,880	\$12,240,900	\$3,919,500	\$17,977,000
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$201,960	\$1,224,363	\$25,887,439	\$18,558,830	\$25,506,885	\$9,341,600	\$17,550,880	\$10,890,850	\$2,797,500	\$14,564,500
Middle Scenario	\$234,540	\$1,536,723	\$27,127,699	\$18,911,630	\$26,149,785	\$9,860,000	\$18,280,480	\$11,515,550	\$3,327,500	\$15,610,000
High Scenario	\$267,120	\$1,866,723	\$30,009,259	\$22,017,170	\$26,792,685	\$10,359,200	\$19,278,880	\$12,274,250	\$3,932,000	\$18,102,000
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$202,800	\$1,230,366	\$25,978,658	\$18,632,680	\$25,596,810	\$9,373,600	\$17,614,880	\$10,924,200	\$2,810,000	\$14,689,500
Middle Scenario	\$235,380	\$1,542,726	\$27,218,918	\$18,985,480	\$26,239,710	\$9,892,000	\$18,344,480	\$11,548,900	\$3,340,000	\$15,735,000
High Scenario	\$267,960	\$1,872,726	\$30,100,478	\$22,091,020	\$26,882,610	\$10,391,200	\$19,342,880	\$12,307,600	\$3,944,500	\$18,227,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$203,640	\$1,236,369	\$26,069,876	\$18,706,530	\$25,686,735	\$9,405,600	\$17,678,880	\$10,957,550	\$2,822,500	\$14,814,500
Middle Scenario	\$236,220	\$1,548,729	\$27,310,136	\$19,059,330	\$26,329,635	\$9,924,000	\$18,408,480	\$11,582,250	\$3,352,500	\$15,860,000
High Scenario	\$268,800	\$1,878,729	\$30,191,696	\$22,164,870	\$26,972,535	\$10,423,200	\$19,406,880	\$12,340,950	\$3,957,000	\$18,352,000
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$205,320	\$1,248,375	\$26,252,314	\$18,854,230	\$25,866,585	\$9,469,600	\$17,806,880	\$11,024,250	\$2,847,500	\$15,064,500
Middle Scenario	\$237,900	\$1,560,735	\$27,492,574	\$19,207,030	\$26,509,485	\$9,988,000	\$18,536,480	\$11,648,950	\$3,377,500	\$16,110,000
High Scenario	\$270,480	\$1,890,735	\$30,374,134	\$22,312,570	\$27,152,385	\$10,487,200	\$19,534,880	\$12,407,650	\$3,982,000	\$18,602,000
ree of \$7.00 Per GSF	¢207.000	¢1 200 201	¢06 404 751	¢10.001.030	¢26.046.425	¢0 533 (00	¢17.024.000	¢11.000.050	¢2.072.500	¢15 014 500
Low Scenario	\$207,000	\$1,260,381	\$26,434,751	\$19,001,930	\$26,046,435	\$9,533,600	\$17,934,880	\$11,090,950	\$2,872,500	\$15,314,500
Middle Scenario	\$239,580	\$1,5/2,/41	\$27,675,011	\$19,354,730	\$26,689,335	\$10,052,000	\$18,664,480	\$11,715,650	\$3,402,500	\$16,360,000
High Scenario	\$272,160	\$1,902,741	\$30,556,571	\$22,460,270	\$27,332,235	\$10,551,200	\$19,662,880	\$12,474,350	\$4,007,000	\$18,852,000
Equity Investment Assumptions										
Equity as a % of TDC	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%	40%	50%	50%	50%
Assumed Investment Period (Months)	15	24	48	30	48	18	21	15	9	9

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

Table 44 Return on Equity Analysis High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Owner								
	Single-Family Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Tenure	Owper	Owner	Owper	Renter	Rontor					
Residential Units	1	10	232	300	285	_	_	_	-	-
Residential Net SE	2 800	20.000	227 250	212 250	230 800	-	-			-
Site Area (SE)	6.250	10.000	43.560	130.680	26.136	32.000	32.000	89.734	121.968	696.960
Total Net SF	2,800	20.000	243,250	221,550	239,800	64.000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SF (Excluding Parking)	2,800	20,010	304,063	246,167	299,750	80,000	160,000	66,700	25,000	250,000
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Total Annual Net Operating Income, Rental Properties										
Low Scenario				\$3,704,327	\$4,554,120	\$966,200	\$2,793,100	\$1,722,435	\$350,000	\$1,725,000
NOI Per NSF				\$16.72	\$18.99	\$15.10	\$21.82	\$34.45	\$14.00	\$6.90
Middle Scenario				\$3,791,198	\$5,055,552	\$1,250,600	\$2,821,900	\$2,009,508	\$395,000	\$1,950,000
NOI Per NSF				\$17.11	\$21.08	\$19.54	\$22.05	\$40.19	\$15.80	\$7.80
High Scenario				\$4,233,375	\$5,556,984	\$1,535,000	\$2,850,700	\$2,296,580	\$485,000	\$2,400,000
NOT FEI INSF				\$19.11	\$23.17	\$23.90	\$22.27	\$45.95	\$19.40	\$9.60
Cap Rate				5.00%	5.00%	5.50%	5.50%	7.50%	5.50%	6.00%
Minimum Equity Yield on NOI	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Capitalized Value Rental Properties										
Low Scenario				\$74 086 530	\$91.082.400	\$17 567 273	\$50 783 636	\$22 965 800	\$6 363 636	\$28 750 000
Middle Scenario				\$75.823.950	\$101.111.040	\$22,738,182	\$51,307,273	\$26,793,433	\$7,181,818	\$32,500,000
High Scenario				\$84,667,500	\$111,139,680	\$27,909,091	\$51,830,909	\$30,621,067	\$8,818,182	\$40,000,000
				. , ,		. , ,	. , ,	. , ,	.,,,	. , ,
Net Home Sales Proceeds										
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875							
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,738,625							
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500							
Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Pontal										
Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership)										
Low Scenario	\$781.200	\$4 550 000	\$93.058.875	\$74.086.530	\$91.082.400	\$17 567 273	\$50 783 636	\$22.965.800	\$6 363 636	\$28,750,000
Por NSE	\$279	\$778	\$33,030,073	\$74,000,330	\$380	\$17,507,275	\$30,703,030	\$22,505,000	\$0,505,050	\$20,7 50,000
Middle Scepario	\$911 400	\$6,006,000	\$113 738 625	\$75 823 950	\$101 111 040	\$22 738 182	\$51 307 273	\$26 793 433	\$7 181 818	\$32 500 000
Per NSE	\$326	\$300	\$468	\$342	\$422	\$355	\$401	\$536	\$287	\$130
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500	\$84,667,500	\$111,139,680	\$27,909,091	\$51,830,909	\$30,621,067	\$8,818,182	\$40,000,000
Per NSF	\$372	\$364	\$510	\$382	\$463	\$436	\$405	\$612	\$353	\$160
Total Nexus Fee at Fee Level of:										
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	\$2,800	\$20,010	\$304,063	\$246,167	\$299,750	\$80,000	\$160,000	\$66,700	\$25,000	\$250,000
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	\$5,600	\$40,020	\$608,125	\$492,333	\$599,500	\$160,000	\$320,000	\$133,400	\$50,000	\$500,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF	\$8,400	\$60,030	\$912,188	\$738,500	\$899,250	\$240,000	\$480,000	\$200,100	\$/5,000	\$/50,000
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF	\$14,000	\$100,050	\$1,520,313	\$1,230,833	\$1,498,750	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$333,500	\$125,000	\$1,250,000
	\$19,000	\$140,070	\$2,120,430	\$1,723,107	\$2,050,230	\$300,000	\$1,120,000	\$400,900	\$175,000	\$1,730,000
Less: Total Development Cost, Including Land										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$670,400	\$4,061,200	\$85,987,400	\$61,616,600	\$84,723,200	\$23,274,000	\$43,717,200	\$21,715,000	\$5,570,000	\$28,879,000
Per NSF	\$239	\$203	\$353	\$278	\$353	\$364	\$342	\$434	\$223	\$116
Middle Scenario	\$779,000	\$5,102,400	\$90,121,600	\$62,792,600	\$86,866,200	\$24,570,000	\$45,541,200	\$22,964,400	\$6,630,000	\$30,970,000
Per NSF	\$278	\$255	\$370	\$283	\$362	\$384	\$356	\$459	\$265	\$124
High Scenario	\$887,600	\$6,202,400	\$99,726,800	\$73,144,400	\$89,009,200	\$25,818,000	\$48,037,200	\$24,481,800	\$7,839,000	\$35,954,000
Per NSF	\$317	\$310	\$410	\$330	\$371	\$403	\$375	\$490	\$314	\$144
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	ec=2.200	¢4.001.010	¢0(201 452	¢(1.0(0.7)=	¢05 000 050	600 0F 4 000	642.077.000	¢01 701 700	de for oco	¢20,120,000
LOW SCENATIO	\$6/3,200	\$4,081,210	\$86,291,463	\$61,862,/6/	\$85,022,950	\$23,354,000	\$43,8/7,200	\$21,/81,/00	\$5,595,000	\$29,129,000
Middle Scepario	\$240	\$204 \$5 122 410	\$90 425 662	\$63.038.747	\$87 165 950	\$24 650 000	\$45 701 200	\$23 021 100	\$6 655 000	\$31.220.000
Por NSE	\$701,000	\$3,122,410 \$354	\$70,423,003 \$273	\$03,030,767 \$79E	\$07,103,930	\$24,030,000	¢3,701,200	\$25,051,100	\$0,055,000 \$744	\$31,220,000
High Scenario	\$890.400	\$6 222 410	\$100.030.863	\$73 390 567	\$89 308 950	\$25,898,000	\$48 197 200	\$24 548 500	\$7 864 000	\$36 204 000
Per NSE	\$318	\$311	\$411	\$331	\$372	\$405	\$377	\$491	\$315	\$145
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	\$510	ψυτι	<i>v</i>	4551	4372		4377	<i></i>	4515	<i>.</i>
Low Scenario	\$676,000	\$4,101,220	\$86,595,525	\$62,108,933	\$85,322,700	\$23,434,000	\$44,037,200	\$21,848,400	\$5,620,000	\$29,379,000
•				•	•	 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•			

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 44 Return on Equity Analysis High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Owner								
	Single-Family Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Per NSF	\$241	\$205	\$356	\$280	\$356	\$366	\$344	\$437	\$225	\$118
Middle Scenario	\$784,600	\$5,142,420	\$90,729,725	\$63,284,933	\$87,465,700	\$24,730,000	\$45,861,200	\$23,097,800	\$6,680,000	\$31,470,000
Per NSF	\$280	\$257	\$373	\$286	\$365	\$386	\$358	\$462	\$267	\$126
High Scenario	\$893,200	\$6,242,420	\$100,334,925	\$73,636,733	\$89,608,700	\$25,978,000	\$48,357,200	\$24,615,200	\$7,889,000	\$36,454,000
Per NSF	\$319	\$312	\$412	\$332	\$374	\$406	\$378	\$492	\$316	\$146
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF	A (= 0, 0, 0, 0)		404 000 800		AAR (AA 180	400 Ft 4 000	A 4 4 6 8 6 6 6		AH (14 000	****
Low Scenario	\$6/8,800	\$4,121,230	\$86,899,588	\$62,355,100	\$85,622,450	\$23,514,000	\$44,197,200	\$21,915,100	\$5,645,000	\$29,629,000
Middle Scenario	\$242	\$200 \$E 162 420	\$337 \$01 022 799	\$42 E21 100	\$337 \$97 765 450	\$24,910,000	\$343	\$430 \$22 164 500	\$6 705 000	\$119
Por NSE	\$281	\$258	\$91,033,788	\$03,331,100	\$366	\$24,010,000	\$40,021,200	\$25,104,500	\$0,703,000	\$31,720,000
High Scenario	\$896,000	\$6 262 430	\$100 638 988	\$73,882,900	\$89 908 450	\$26.058.000	\$48 517 200	\$24 681 900	\$7 914 000	\$36 704 000
Per NSF	\$320	\$313	\$414	\$333	\$375	\$407	\$379	\$494	\$317	\$147
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$684,400	\$4,161,250	\$87,507,713	\$62,847,433	\$86,221,950	\$23,674,000	\$44,517,200	\$22,048,500	\$5,695,000	\$30,129,000
Per NSF	\$244	\$208	\$360	\$284	\$360	\$370	\$348	\$441	\$228	\$121
Middle Scenario	\$793,000	\$5,202,450	\$91,641,913	\$64,023,433	\$88,364,950	\$24,970,000	\$46,341,200	\$23,297,900	\$6,755,000	\$32,220,000
Per NSF	\$283	\$260	\$377	\$289	\$368	\$390	\$362	\$466	\$270	\$129
High Scenario	\$901,600	\$6,302,450	\$101,247,113	\$74,375,233	\$90,507,950	\$26,218,000	\$48,837,200	\$24,815,300	\$7,964,000	\$37,204,000
Per NSF	\$322	\$315	\$416	\$336	\$377	\$410	\$382	\$496	\$319	\$149
Low Scopario	\$600.000	\$4 201 270	¢00 115 020	\$62 220 767	\$96 921 450	\$22,924,000	\$44,927,200	\$22 191 000	\$E 74E 000	\$20,620,000
Por NSE	\$050,000	\$210	\$00,115,050	\$03,333,707	\$00,021,450	\$23,034,000	\$350	\$22,101,900	\$3,743,000	\$30,025,000
Middle Scepario	\$798,600	\$5 242 470	\$92 250 038	\$64 515 767	\$88 964 450	\$25 130 000	\$46 661 200	\$23 431 300	\$6.805.000	\$32 720 000
Per NSE	\$285	\$262	\$379	\$291	\$371	\$393	\$365	\$469	\$272	\$131
High Scenario	\$907,200	\$6,342,470	\$101,855,238	\$74,867,567	\$91,107,450	\$26,378,000	\$49,157,200	\$24,948,700	\$8,014,000	\$37,704,000
Per NSF	\$324	\$317	\$419	\$338	\$380	\$412	\$384	\$499	\$321	\$151
Net Profit										
No Fee	¢110.000	¢ 100 000	AT 071 475	¢10.460.000	¢(250 200	(45 704 727)	\$7.0(C.12)	¢1.050.000	A702 (2)	(\$120.000)
Low Scenario	\$110,800	\$488,800	\$/,0/1,4/5	\$12,469,930	\$6,359,200	(\$5,/06,/2/)	\$7,066,436	\$1,250,800	\$/93,636	(\$129,000)
Middle Scepario	\$132,400	\$903.600	\$23.617.025	\$13.031.350	\$14 244 840	-41%	\$5 766 073	\$3,829,033	30% \$551.818	-1% \$1 530 000
Return on Equity (1)	45%	30%	225,017,025	28%	14%	-12%	18%	27%	22%	13%
High Scenario	\$154.000	\$1.077.600	\$24.351.700	\$11.523.100	\$22,130,480	\$2.091.091	\$3,793,709	\$6,139,267	\$979.182	\$4.046.000
Return on Equity (1)	46%	29%	20%	21%	21%	13%	11%	40%	33%	30%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$108,000	\$468,790	\$6,767,413	\$12,223,763	\$6,059,450	(\$5,786,727)	\$6,906,436	\$1,184,100	\$768,636	(\$379,000)
Return on Equity (1)	43%	19%	7%	26%	6%	-41%	22%	9%	37%	-3%
Middle Scenario	\$129,600	\$883,590	\$23,312,963	\$12,785,183	\$13,945,090	(\$1,911,818)	\$5,606,073	\$3,762,333	\$526,818	\$1,280,000
Return on Equity (1)	44%	29%	21%	27%	13%	-13%	18%	26%	21%	11%
High Scenario	\$151,200	\$1,057,590	\$24,047,638	\$11,276,933	\$21,830,730	\$2,011,091	\$3,633,709	\$6,0/2,56/	\$954,182	\$3,/96,000
Return on Equity (1)	45%	28%	20%	20%	20%	13%	11%	40%	32%	28%
Low Scenario	\$105.200	\$448 780	\$6 463 350	\$11 977 597	\$5 759 700	(\$5,866,727)	\$6 746 436	\$1 117 400	\$743.636	(\$629.000)
Return on Equity (1)	41%	18%	\$0,405,550 6%	26%	¢3,733,760 6%	-42%	22%	8%	35%	-6%
Middle Scenario	\$126,800	\$863,580	\$23,008,900	\$12,539,017	\$13,645,340	(\$1,991,818)	\$5,446,073	\$3,695,633	\$501,818	\$1,030,000
Return on Equity (1)	43%	28%	21%	26%	13%	-13%	17%	26%	20%	9%
High Scenario	\$148,400	\$1,037,580	\$23,743,575	\$11,030,767	\$21,530,980	\$1,931,091	\$3,473,709	\$6,005,867	\$929,182	\$3,546,000
Return on Equity (1)	44%	28%	20%	20%	20%	12%	10%	39%	31%	26%
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$102,400	\$428,770	\$6,159,288	\$11,731,430	\$5,459,950	(\$5,946,727)	\$6,586,436	\$1,050,700	\$718,636	(\$879,000)
Return on Equity (1)	40%	1/%	6%	¢12.202.050	¢12.245.500	-42%	21% ¢5 20(072	8% ¢2 (20 022	\$4%	-8%
Return on Equity (1)	\$124,000	\$843,570	\$22,/04,838	\$12,292,850	\$13,345,590	(\$2,0/1,818)	\$5,286,073	\$3,628,933	\$4/6,818	\$/80,000
High Scenario	\$145.600	2/% \$1.017.570	\$23,439,513	\$10 784 600	\$21 231 230	\$1.851.001	\$3 313 700	25% \$5,939,167	\$904 182	\$3,296,000
Return on Equity (1)	43%	27%	425,755,515 19%	19%	21,231,230	12%	10%	30%	30%	\$5,2 50,000 24%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF	-1370	2770	1370	1370	2070	1270	10,0	5570	5070	2170
Low Scenario	\$96,800	\$388,750	\$5,551,163	\$11,239,097	\$4,860,450	(\$6,106,727)	\$6,266,436	\$917,300	\$668,636	(\$1,379,000)
Return on Equity (1)	38%	16%	5%	24%	5%	-43%	20%	7%	31%	-12%
Middle Scenario	\$118,400	\$803,550	\$22,096,713	\$11,800,517	\$12,746,090	(\$2,231,818)	\$4,966,073	\$3,495,533	\$426,818	\$280,000
Return on Equity (1)	40%	26%	20%	25%	12%	-15%	15%	24%	17%	2%

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 44 Return on Equity Analysis High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

		Owner								
	Single-Family Infill	Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
High Scenario	\$140,000	\$977 550	\$22,831,388	\$10 292 267	\$20,631,730	\$1 691 091	\$2 993 709	\$5,805,767	\$854 182	\$2 796 000
Return on Equity (1)	41%	26%	19%	18%	19%	11%	9%	37%	29%	20%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSE									, .	
Low Scenario	\$91,200	\$348,730	\$4,943,038	\$10,746,763	\$4,260,950	(\$6,266,727)	\$5,946,436	\$783,900	\$618,636	(\$1,879,000)
Return on Equity (1)	35%	14%	5%	23%	4%	-44%	19%	6%	29%	-16%
Middle Scenario	\$112,800	\$763,530	\$21,488,588	\$11,308,183	\$12,146,590	(\$2,391,818)	\$4,646,073	\$3,362,133	\$376,818	(\$220,000)
Return on Equity (1)	38%	24%	19%	23%	11%	-16%	14%	23%	15%	-2%
High Scenario	\$134,400	\$937,530	\$22,223,263	\$9,799,933	\$20,032,230	\$1,531,091	\$2,673,709	\$5,672,367	\$804,182	\$2,296,000
Return on Equity (1)	40%	25%	18%	17%	18%	10%	8%	36%	27%	16%
Assumed Equity Investment										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$201,120	\$1,218,360	\$25,796,220	\$18,484,980	\$25,416,960	\$9,309,600	\$17,486,880	\$10,857,500	\$2,785,000	\$14,439,500
Middle Scenario	\$233,700	\$1,530,720	\$27,036,480	\$18,837,780	\$26,059,860	\$9,828,000	\$18,216,480	\$11,482,200	\$3,315,000	\$15,485,000
High Scenario	\$266,280	\$1,860,720	\$29,918,040	\$21,943,320	\$26,702,760	\$10,327,200	\$19,214,880	\$12,240,900	\$3,919,500	\$17,977,000
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$201,960	\$1,224,363	\$25,887,439	\$18,558,830	\$25,506,885	\$9,341,600	\$17,550,880	\$10,890,850	\$2,797,500	\$14,564,500
Middle Scenario	\$234,540	\$1,536,723	\$27,127,699	\$18,911,630	\$26,149,785	\$9,860,000	\$18,280,480	\$11,515,550	\$3,327,500	\$15,610,000
High Scenario	\$267,120	\$1,866,723	\$30,009,259	\$22,017,170	\$26,792,685	\$10,359,200	\$19,278,880	\$12,274,250	\$3,932,000	\$18,102,000
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	*****	A1 000 044		***	408 804 040	*****	A1 - 11 - 000	***	** ***	
Low Scenario	\$202,800	\$1,230,366	\$25,978,658	\$18,632,680	\$25,596,810	\$9,373,600	\$17,614,880	\$10,924,200	\$2,810,000	\$14,689,500
Middle Scenario	\$235,380	\$1,542,726	\$27,218,918	\$18,985,480	\$26,239,710	\$9,892,000	\$18,344,480	\$11,548,900	\$3,340,000	\$15,735,000
High Scenario	\$267,960	\$1,8/2,/26	\$30,100,478	\$22,091,020	\$26,882,610	\$10,391,200	\$19,342,880	\$12,307,600	\$3,944,500	\$18,227,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF	\$202.640	¢1.000.000	¢26.060.076	¢10 706 530	¢25 (0(725	¢0.405.600	£17 (70 000	¢10.057.550	¢2,022,500	¢14.014.500
Low Scenario	\$203,640	\$1,236,369	\$26,069,876	\$18,706,530	\$25,686,735	\$9,405,600	\$17,678,880	\$10,957,550	\$2,822,500	\$14,814,500
Middle Scenario	\$236,220	\$1,540,729	\$27,510,156	\$19,039,330	\$20,329,033	\$9,924,000	\$10,400,400	\$11,502,250	\$3,352,500	\$15,000,000
Figh Scenario	\$200,000	\$1,0/0,/29	\$50,191,090	\$22,104,070	\$20,972,555	\$10,423,200	\$19,406,660	\$12,340,950	\$3,957,000	\$10,552,000
Low Scenario	\$205.320	\$1 248 375	\$26 252 314	\$18 854 230	\$25,866,585	\$9.469.600	\$17 806 880	\$11.024.250	\$2,847,500	\$15,064,500
Middle Scenario	\$237,900	\$1,240,373	\$27 492 574	\$19,207,030	\$26,509,485	\$9,988,000	\$18 536 480	\$11,648,950	\$3 377 500	\$16,110,000
High Scenario	\$270,480	\$1,890,735	\$30 374 134	\$22 312 570	\$27 152 385	\$10,487,200	\$19 534 880	\$12 407 650	\$3,982,000	\$18,602,000
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	\$27.07100	\$1,050,755	\$30,37 1,13 1	<i>422,312,370</i>	\$27,152,505	\$10,107,200	\$13,333 1,000	<i>Q</i> .2,107,050	\$3,302,000	\$10,002,000
Low Scenario	\$207,000	\$1,260,381	\$26,434,751	\$19.001.930	\$26,046,435	\$9,533,600	\$17,934,880	\$11,090,950	\$2,872,500	\$15.314.500
Middle Scenario	\$239,580	\$1,572,741	\$27,675,011	\$19,354,730	\$26,689,335	\$10,052,000	\$18,664,480	\$11,715,650	\$3,402,500	\$16,360,000
High Scenario	\$272,160	\$1,902,741	\$30,556,571	\$22,460,270	\$27,332,235	\$10,551,200	\$19,662,880	\$12,474,350	\$4,007,000	\$18,852,000
Fauity Investment Assumptions										
Equity as a % of TDC	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%	40%	50%	50%	50%
Assumed Investment Period (Months)	15	24	48	30	48	18	21	15	9	9
										÷

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

Table 45 Land Residual Analysis Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Topuro	Ownor	Ownor	Ownor	Pontor	Pontor					
Posidontial Units	Owner 1	10	222	200	295	-		-	-	-
Residential Nat SE	2 800	20,000	232	212 250	205					
Site Area (SE)	6 250	10,000	43 560	130,680	250,000	32,000	32,000	89 734	121 968	696 960
Total Net SE	2 800	20,000	243 250	221 550	239,800	64 000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SE (Excluding Parking)	2,800	20,010	304.063	246.167	299,750	80,000	160,000	66,700	25,000	250,000
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Assumed Land Value/SF Site Area										
Low Scenario	\$32	\$70	\$107	\$60	\$147	\$41	\$81	\$19	\$10	\$7
Middle Scenario	\$44	\$90	\$160	\$69	\$229	\$45	\$90	\$24	\$15	\$10
High Scenario	\$56	\$200	\$213	\$103	\$311	\$60	\$120	\$32	\$20	\$15
Total Annual Net Operating Income, Rental										
Low Scenario				\$3,704,327	\$4,554,120	\$966,200	\$2,793,100	\$1,722,435	\$350,000	\$1,725,000
NOI Per NSF				\$16.72	\$18.99	\$15.10	\$21.82	\$34.45	\$14.00	\$6.90
Middle Scenario				\$5,449,598	\$7,201,452	\$1,250,600	\$2,821,900	\$2,009,508	\$395,000	\$1,950,000
NOI Per NSF				\$24.60	\$30.03	\$19.54	\$22.05	\$40.19	\$15.80	\$7.80
High Scenario				\$4,233,375	\$5,556,984	\$1,535,000	\$2,850,700	\$2,296,580	\$485,000	\$2,400,000
NOI Per NSF				\$19.11	\$23.17	\$23.98	\$22.27	\$45.93	\$19.40	\$9.60
Cap Rate	10.000/	0.000(0.000/	4.50%	4.50%	5.00%	5.00%	7.00%	5.00%	5.50%
Minum Return on Equity	10.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Capitalized Value, Rental Properties										
Low Scenario				\$82,318,367	\$101,202,667	\$19,324,000	\$55,862,000	\$24,606,214	\$7,000,000	\$31,363,636
Middle Scenario				\$121,102,167	\$160,032,267	\$25,012,000	\$56,438,000	\$28,707,250	\$7,900,000	\$35,454,545
High Scenario				\$94,075,000	\$123,488,533	\$30,700,000	\$57,014,000	\$32,808,286	\$9,700,000	\$43,636,364
Net Home Sales Proceeds										
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875							
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,/38,625							
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500							
Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Rental; Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership)										
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875	\$82,318,367	\$101,202,667	\$19,324,000	\$55,862,000	\$24,606,214	\$7,000,000	\$31,363,636
Per NSF	\$279	\$228	\$383	\$372	\$422	\$302	\$436	\$492	\$280	\$125
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,738,625	\$121,102,167	\$160,032,267	\$25,012,000	\$56,438,000	\$28,707,250	\$7,900,000	\$35,454,545
Per NSF	\$326	\$300	\$468	\$547	\$667	\$391	\$441	\$574	\$316	\$142
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500	\$94,075,000	\$123,488,533	\$30,700,000	\$57,014,000	\$32,808,286	\$9,700,000	\$43,636,364
Per NSF	\$3/2	\$364	\$510	\$425	\$515	\$480	\$445	\$656	\$388	\$1/5
Total Nexus Fee at Fee Level of:										
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	\$2,800	\$20,010	\$304,063	\$246,167	\$299,750	\$80,000	\$160,000	\$66,700	\$25,000	\$250,000
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	\$5,600	\$40,020	\$608,125	\$492,333	\$599,500	\$160,000	\$320,000	\$133,400	\$50,000	\$500,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF	\$8,400	\$60,030	\$912,188	\$738,500	\$899,250	\$240,000	\$480,000	\$200,100	\$75,000	\$750,000
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF	\$14,000	\$100,050	\$1,520,313	\$1,230,833	\$1,498,750	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$333,500	\$125,000	\$1,250,000
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	\$19,600	\$140,070	\$2,128,438	\$1,723,167	\$2,098,250	\$560,000	\$1,120,000	\$466,900	\$175,000	\$1,750,000
Less: Total Development Cost, Excluding Land										
Low Scenario	\$470.400	\$3 361 200	\$81 326 400	\$53 775 400	\$80,881,200	\$21,978,000	\$41 125 200	\$20.010.000	\$4 350 000	\$24,000,000
Per NSE	\$470,400 \$169	\$3,301,200 \$149	\$01,520,400 \$224	\$33,773,000 \$343	\$00,001,200	¢21,570,000 ¢243	¢71,123,200 \$201	\$20,010,000 \$400	¢174	\$27,000,000 \$04
Middle Scenario	\$504.000	\$4 202 400	\$83 151 600	\$53 775 600	\$80 881 200	\$23 130 000	\$42 661 200	\$20,810,400	\$4 800 000	\$24,000,000
Per NSE	\$180	\$210	\$342	\$243	\$337	\$361	\$333	\$416	\$1,000,000	\$96
High Scenario	\$537,600	\$4.202 400	\$90,448,800	\$59.684.400	\$80,881,200	\$23,898,000	\$44,197,200	\$21.610.800	\$5,400,000	\$25,500,000
Per NSE	\$192	\$210	\$372	\$269	\$337	\$373	\$345	\$432	\$216	\$102
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	<i>Q192</i>	\$210	4372	\$205	4557	ψ57.5	4515	φ.32	\$210	<i></i>
Low Scenario	\$473.200	\$3.381.210	\$81.630.463	\$54.021.767	\$81.180.950	\$22.058.000	\$41.285.200	\$20,076.700	\$4.375.000	\$24,250.000
Per NSF	\$169	\$169	\$336	\$244	\$339	\$345	\$323	\$402	\$175	\$97
Middle Scenario	\$506,800	\$4,222,410	\$83,455,663	\$54,021,767	\$81,180,950	\$23,210,000	\$42,821,200	\$20,877,100	\$4,825,000	\$24,250,000
Per NSF	\$181	\$211	\$343	\$244	\$339	\$363	\$335	\$418	\$193	\$97

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 45 Land Residual Analysis Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
High Scopario	\$540.400	\$4 222 410	\$00 752 862	\$50.020.567	\$81 180 050	\$22.078.000	\$44.257.200	\$21,677,500	\$5.425.000	\$25,750,000
	\$540,400	\$4,222,410	\$90,752,005	\$39,930,307	\$01,100,950	\$23,976,000	\$44,337,200 \$247	\$21,677,500	\$5,425,000	\$25,750,000
Fel INSF Eco of \$2.00 Por CSE	\$195	\$211	\$3/3	\$271	\$228	\$3/3	\$347	\$434	\$217	\$105
Low Separio	\$476.000	\$2,401,220	¢01.024.525	¢E4 267 022	¢ 91 490 700	\$22,129,000	£41 44E 200	\$20,142,400	¢4,400,000	\$24 E00 000
Por NISE	\$476,000	\$5,401,220	\$01,954,525	\$34,207,933	\$01,400,700	\$22,150,000	\$41,445,200 \$224	\$20,143,400	\$4,400,000	\$24,500,000
Middle Scenario	\$170	\$170	\$92 750 725	\$54.267.022	\$21 420 700	\$32,200,000	\$324	\$20.042.800	\$4.950,000	\$24 500 000
Por NSE	\$309,000	\$4,242,420	\$03,733,723	\$34,207,333	\$01,400,700	\$23,230,000	\$42,501,200	\$20,543,000	\$4,030,000	\$24,300,000
High Sconario	\$102	\$4 242 420	\$01.056.025	\$60 176 722	\$21 420 700	\$24.059.000	\$350	\$21 744 200	\$5 450 000	\$26,000,000
Por NSE	\$343,200	\$4,242,420	\$91,030,923	\$00,170,733	\$01,400,700	\$24,030,000	\$249	\$21,744,200	\$3,430,000	\$20,000,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per CSE	+016	9212	- 10¢	9212	9 - -C¢	\$570	\$J+0	CCF¢	\$210	\$104
Low Scenario	\$478.800	\$3 421 230	\$82 238 588	\$54 514 100	\$81 780 450	\$22,218,000	\$41 605 200	\$20,210,100	\$4 425 000	\$24 750 000
Per NSE	\$171	\$171	\$338	\$246	\$341	\$347	\$325	\$20,210,100	\$177	\$99
Middle Scenario	\$512,400	\$4 262 430	\$84.063.788	\$54 514 100	\$81 780 450	\$23 370 000	\$43 141 200	\$21.010.500	\$4 875 000	\$24 750 000
Per NSE	\$183	\$213	\$346	\$246	\$341	\$365	\$337	\$420	\$195	\$99
High Scenario	\$546,000	\$4 262 430	\$91 360 988	\$60,422,900	\$81 780 450	\$24 138 000	\$44 677 200	\$21 810 900	\$5 475 000	\$26 250 000
Per NSE	\$195	\$213	\$376	\$273	\$341	\$377	\$349	\$436	\$219	\$105
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSE	\$155	\$215	\$370	\$275	\$511	4377	\$515	\$150	9219	\$105
Low Scenario	\$484 400	\$3,461,250	\$82,846,713	\$55,006,433	\$82,379,950	\$22.378.000	\$41,925,200	\$20.343.500	\$4,475,000	\$25,250,000
Per NSE	\$173	\$173	\$341	\$248	\$344	\$350	\$328	\$407	\$179	\$101
Middle Scenario	\$518,000	\$4,302,450	\$84.671.913	\$55,006,433	\$82,379,950	\$23,530,000	\$43,461,200	\$21,143,900	\$4.925,000	\$25,250,000
Per NSF	\$185	\$215	\$348	\$248	\$344	\$368	\$340	\$423	\$197	\$101
High Scenario	\$551,600	\$4 302 450	\$91 969 113	\$60.915.233	\$82 379 950	\$24 298 000	\$44 997 200	\$21 944 300	\$5 525 000	\$26 750 000
Per NSE	\$197	\$215	\$378	\$275	\$344	\$380	\$352	\$439	\$221	\$107
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSE	<i><i><i>ϕ</i>.<i>s</i>,</i></i>	<i>\$</i> 213	\$370	42/3	4311	\$300	4001	¢.55	<i>v</i> ·	4.07
Low Scenario	\$490.000	\$3,501,270	\$83,454,838	\$55,498,767	\$82,979,450	\$22,538,000	\$42,245,200	\$20.476.900	\$4.525.000	\$25,750,000
Per NSE	\$175	\$175	\$343	\$251	\$346	\$352	\$330	\$410	\$181	\$103
Middle Scenario	\$523,600	\$4,342,470	\$85,280,038	\$55,498,767	\$82,979,450	\$23.690.000	\$43,781,200	\$21,277,300	\$4.975.000	\$25,750,000
Per NSE	\$187	\$217	\$351	\$251	\$346	\$370	\$342	\$426	\$199	\$103
High Scenario	\$557,200	\$4 342 470	\$92 577 238	\$61 407 567	\$82 979 450	\$24 458 000	\$45 317 200	\$22.077.700	\$5 575 000	\$27 250 000
Per NSF	\$199	\$217	\$381	\$277	\$346	\$382	\$354	\$442	\$223	\$109
Less: Assumed Return on Equity (See Below)										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$14,112	\$161,338	\$7,807,334	\$3,226,536	\$7,764,595	\$1,054,944	\$2,303,011	\$1,000,500	\$130,500	\$720,000
Middle Scenario	\$15,120	\$201,715	\$7,982,554	\$3,226,536	\$7,764,595	\$1,110,240	\$2,389,027	\$1,040,520	\$144,000	\$720,000
High Scenario	\$16,128	\$201,715	\$8,683,085	\$3,581,064	\$7,764,595	\$1,147,104	\$2,475,043	\$1,080,540	\$162,000	\$765,000
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$14,196	\$162,298	\$7,836,524	\$3,241,306	\$7,793,371	\$1,058,784	\$2,311,971	\$1,003,835	\$131,250	\$727,500
Middle Scenario	\$15,204	\$202,676	\$8,011,744	\$3,241,306	\$7,793,371	\$1,114,080	\$2,397,987	\$1,043,855	\$144,750	\$727,500
High Scenario	\$16,212	\$202,676	\$8,712,275	\$3,595,834	\$7,793,371	\$1,150,944	\$2,484,003	\$1,083,875	\$162,750	\$772,500
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$14,280	\$163,259	\$7,865,714	\$3,256,076	\$7,822,147	\$1,062,624	\$2,320,931	\$1,007,170	\$132,000	\$735,000
Middle Scenario	\$15,288	\$203,636	\$8,040,934	\$3,256,076	\$7,822,147	\$1,117,920	\$2,406,947	\$1,047,190	\$145,500	\$735,000
High Scenario	\$16,296	\$203,636	\$8,741,465	\$3,610,604	\$7,822,147	\$1,154,784	\$2,492,963	\$1,087,210	\$163,500	\$780,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$14,364	\$164,219	\$7,894,904	\$3,270,846	\$7,850,923	\$1,066,464	\$2,329,891	\$1,010,505	\$132,750	\$742,500
Middle Scenario	\$15,372	\$204,597	\$8,070,124	\$3,270,846	\$7,850,923	\$1,121,760	\$2,415,907	\$1,050,525	\$146,250	\$742,500
High Scenario	\$16,380	\$204,597	\$8,770,655	\$3,625,374	\$7,850,923	\$1,158,624	\$2,501,923	\$1,090,545	\$164,250	\$787,500
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$14,532	\$166,140	\$7,953,284	\$3,300,386	\$7,908,475	\$1,074,144	\$2,347,811	\$1,017,175	\$134,250	\$757,500
Middle Scenario	\$15,540	\$206,518	\$8,128,504	\$3,300,386	\$7,908,475	\$1,129,440	\$2,433,827	\$1,057,195	\$147,750	\$757,500
High Scenario	\$16,548	\$206,518	\$8,829,035	\$3,654,914	\$7,908,475	\$1,166,304	\$2,519,843	\$1,097,215	\$165,750	\$802,500
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$14,700	\$168,061	\$8,011,664	\$3,329,926	\$7,966,027	\$1,081,824	\$2,365,731	\$1,023,845	\$135,750	\$772,500
Middle Scenario	\$15,708	\$208,439	\$8,186,884	\$3,329,926	\$7,966,027	\$1,137,120	\$2,451,747	\$1,063,865	\$149,250	\$772,500
High Scenario	\$16,716	\$208,439	\$8,887,415	\$3,684,454	\$7,966,027	\$1,173,984	\$2,537,763	\$1,103,885	\$167,250	\$817,500
1	I									

Table 45 Land Residual Analysis Low Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Residual Land Value			,	,			1	,		
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$296,688	\$1,027,462	\$3,925,141	\$25,316,231	\$12,556,871	(\$3,708,944)	\$12,433,789	\$3,595,714	\$2,519,500	\$6,643,636
Per NSF	\$47.47	\$102.75	\$90.11	\$193.73	\$480.44	(\$115.90)	\$388.56	\$40.07	\$20.66	\$9.53
Middle Scenario	\$392,280	\$1,601,885	\$22,604,471	\$64,100,031	\$71,386,471	\$771,760	\$11,387,773	\$6,856,330	\$2,956,000	\$10,734,545
Per NSF	\$62.76	\$160.19	\$518.93	\$490.51	\$2,731.35	\$24.12	\$355.87	\$76.41	\$24.24	\$15.40
High Scenario	\$487,872	\$2,875,885	\$24,946,615	\$30,809,536	\$34,842,738	\$5,654,896	\$10,341,757	\$10,116,946	\$4,138,000	\$17,371,364
Per NSF	\$78.06	\$287.59	\$572.70	\$235.76	\$1,333.13	\$176.72	\$323.18	\$112.74	\$33.93	\$24.92
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$293,888	\$1,007,452	\$3,621,078	\$25,070,064	\$12,257,121	(\$3,788,944)	\$12,273,789	\$3,529,014	\$2,494,500	\$6,393,636
Per NSF	\$47.02	\$100.75	\$83.13	\$191.84	\$468.97	(\$118.40)	\$383.56	\$39.33	\$20.45	\$9.17
Middle Scenario	\$390,404	\$1,621,292	\$22,446,438	\$63,839,094	\$71,057,945	\$743,216	\$11,304,829	\$6,826,315	\$2,943,750	\$10,477,045
Per NSF	\$62.46	\$162.13	\$515.30	\$488.51	\$2,718.78	\$23.23	\$353.28	\$76.07	\$24.14	\$15.03
High Scenario	\$484,988	\$2,854,914	\$24,613,363	\$30,548,599	\$34,514,212	\$5,571,056	\$10,172,797	\$10,046,911	\$4,112,250	\$17,113,864
Per NSF	\$77.60	\$285.49	\$565.05	\$233.77	\$1,320.56	\$174.10	\$317.90	\$111.96	\$33.72	\$24.56
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$291,088	\$987,442	\$3,317,016	\$24,823,897	\$11,957,371	(\$3,868,944)	\$12,113,789	\$3,462,314	\$2,469,500	\$6,143,636
Per NSF	\$46.57	\$98.74	\$76.15	\$189.96	\$457.51	(\$120.90)	\$378.56	\$38.58	\$20.25	\$8.81
Middle Scenario	\$387,520	\$1,600,321	\$22,113,186	\$63,578,157	\$70,729,419	\$659,376	\$11,135,869	\$6,756,280	\$2,918,000	\$10,219,545
Per NSF	\$62.00	\$160.03	\$507.65	\$486.52	\$2,706.21	\$20.61	\$348.00	\$75.29	\$23.92	\$14.66
High Scenario	\$482,104	\$2,833,944	\$24,280,110	\$30,287,663	\$34,185,686	\$5,487,216	\$10,003,837	\$9,976,876	\$4,086,500	\$16,856,364
Per NSF	\$77.14	\$283.39	\$557.39	\$231.77	\$1,307.99	\$171.48	\$312.62	\$111.18	\$33.50	\$24.19
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$288,288	\$967,432	\$3,012,953	\$24,577,731	\$11,657,621	(\$3,948,944)	\$11,953,789	\$3,395,614	\$2,444,500	\$5,893,636
Per NSF	\$46.13	\$96.74	\$69.17	\$188.08	\$446.04	(\$123.40)	\$373.56	\$37.84	\$20.04	\$8.46
Middle Scenario	\$383,628	\$1,538,973	\$21,604,714	\$63,317,221	\$70,400,893	\$520,240	\$10,880,893	\$6,646,225	\$2,878,750	\$9,962,045
Per NSF	\$61.38	\$153.90	\$495.98	\$484.52	\$2,693.64	\$16.26	\$340.03	\$74.07	\$23.60	\$14.29
High Scenario	\$479,220	\$2,812,973	\$23,946,858	\$30,026,726	\$33,857,160	\$5,403,376	\$9,834,877	\$9,906,841	\$4,060,750	\$16,598,864
Per NSF	\$76.68	\$281.30	\$549.74	\$229.77	\$1,295.42	\$168.86	\$307.34	\$110.40	\$33.29	\$23.82
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$282,688	\$927,412	\$2,404,828	\$24,085,397	\$11,058,121	(\$4,108,944)	\$11,633,789	\$3,262,214	\$2,394,500	\$5,393,636
Per NSF	\$45.23	\$92.74	\$55.21	\$184.31	\$423.10	(\$128.40)	\$363.56	\$36.35	\$19.63	\$7.74
Middle Scenario	\$377,860	\$1,497,032	\$20,938,209	\$62,795,347	\$69,743,841	\$352,560	\$10,542,973	\$6,506,155	\$2,827,250	\$9,447,045
Per NSF	\$60.46	\$149.70	\$480.68	\$480.53	\$2,668.50	\$11.02	\$329.47	\$72.51	\$23.18	\$13.55
High Scenario	\$473,452	\$2,771,032	\$23,280,353	\$29,504,853	\$33,200,108	\$5,235,696	\$9,496,957	\$9,766,771	\$4,009,250	\$16,083,864
Per NSF	\$75.75	\$277.10	\$534.44	\$225.78	\$1,270.28	\$163.62	\$296.78	\$108.84	\$32.87	\$23.08
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$276,500	\$880,669	\$1,592,373	\$23,489,674	\$10,257,189	(\$4,295,824)	\$11,251,069	\$3,105,469	\$2,339,250	\$4,841,136
Per NSF	\$44.24	\$88.07	\$36.56	\$179.75	\$392.45	(\$134.24)	\$351.60	\$34.61	\$19.18	\$6.95
Middle Scenario	\$372,092	\$1,455,091	\$20,271,704	\$62,273,474	\$69,086,789	\$184,880	\$10,205,053	\$6,366,085	\$2,775,750	\$8,932,045
Per NSF	\$59.53	\$145.51	\$465.37	\$476.53	\$2,643.36	\$5.78	\$318.91	\$70.94	\$22.76	\$12.82
High Scenario	\$467,684	\$2,729,091	\$22,613,848	\$28,982,979	\$32,543,056	\$5,068,016	\$9,159,037	\$9,626,701	\$3,957,750	\$15,568,864
Per NSF	\$74.83	\$272.91	\$519.14	\$221.79	\$1,245.14	\$158.38	\$286.22	\$107.28	\$32.45	\$22.34
Equity Investment Assumptions										
Equity as a % of TDC	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%	40%	50%	50%	50%
Assumed Return on Equity	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
Assumed Investment Period (Months)	15	24	48	30	48	18	21	15	9	9

Table 46 Land Residual Analysis High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Tenure	Owner	Owner	Owner	Renter	Renter		-	-	_	_
Residential Units	1	10	232	300	285	-	-	-	_	-
Residential Net SE	2 800	20.000	227 250	212 250	230,800	-	-	-	_	_
Site Area (SE)	6 2 5 0	10,000	43 560	130,680	26,136	32,000	32,000	89 734	121 968	696 960
Total Net SE	2.800	20.000	243.250	221.550	239.800	64.000	128.000	50.000	25.000	250.000
Total Gross SF (Excluding Parking)	2.800	20.010	304.063	246.167	299.750	80.000	160.000	66.700	25.000	250.000
Approximate Building Stories	2 Stories	3 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 Stories	1 Stories	1 Stories
Assumed Land Value/SF Site Area										
Low Scenario	\$32	\$70	\$107	\$60	\$147	\$41	\$81	\$19	\$10	\$7
Middle Scenario	\$44	\$90	\$160	\$69	\$229	\$45	\$90	\$24	\$15	\$10
High Scenario	\$56	\$200	\$213	\$103	\$311	\$60	\$120	\$32	\$20	\$15
Total Annual Net Operating Income, Rental				40 E0 4 00 E	A	* ****		A4 800 408	*****	A1 808 000
Low Scenario				\$3,/04,32/	\$4,554,120	\$966,200	\$2,/93,100	\$1,/22,435	\$350,000	\$1,/25,000
NOI Per NSF				\$16.72	\$18.99	\$15.10	\$21.82	\$34.45	\$14.00	\$6.90
Middle Scenario				\$5,449,598	\$7,201,452	\$1,250,600	\$2,821,900	\$2,009,508	\$395,000	\$1,950,000
NOI Per INSF				\$24.60	\$30.03	\$19.54	\$22.05	\$40.19	\$15.80	\$7.80
High Scenario				\$4,233,375	\$5,556,984	\$1,535,000	\$2,850,700	\$2,296,580	\$485,000	\$2,400,000
NOI Per NSF				\$19.11	\$23.17	\$23.98	\$22.27	\$45.93	\$19.40	\$9.60
Cap Rate	10.00%	9.009/	9.009/	5.00%	5.00%	5.50%	5.50%	/.50%	5.50%	6.00%
	10.00%	8.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Capitalized Value, Rental Properties										
Low Scenario				\$74,086,530	\$91,082,400	\$17,567,273	\$50,783,636	\$22,965,800	\$6,363,636	\$28,750,000
Middle Scenario				\$108,991,950	\$144,029,040	\$22,/38,182	\$51,307,273	\$26,/93,433	\$7,181,818	\$32,500,000
High Scenario				\$84,667,500	\$111,139,680	\$27,909,091	\$51,830,909	\$30,621,067	\$8,818,182	\$40,000,000
Net Home Sales Proceeds	6701 200	£4.550.000	¢02.050.075							
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875							
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,/38,625							
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500							
Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Rental; Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership)										
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875	\$74,086,530	\$91,082,400	\$17,567,273	\$50,783,636	\$22,965,800	\$6,363,636	\$28,750,000
Per NSF	\$279	\$228	\$383	\$334	\$380	\$274	\$397	\$459	\$255	\$115
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,738,625	\$108,991,950	\$144,029,040	\$22,738,182	\$51,307,273	\$26,793,433	\$7,181,818	\$32,500,000
Per NSF	\$326	\$300	\$468	\$492	\$601	\$355	\$401	\$536	\$287	\$130
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,0/8,500	\$84,667,500	\$111,139,680	\$27,909,091	\$51,830,909	\$30,621,067	\$8,818,182	\$40,000,000
FEI INSF	\$372	\$304	\$510	\$302	\$405	\$430	\$405	\$612	\$333	\$160
Total Nexus Fee at Fee Level of:										
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	\$2,800	\$20,010	\$304,063	\$246,167	\$299,750	\$80,000	\$160,000	\$66,700	\$25,000	\$250,000
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF	\$5,600	\$40,020	\$608,125	\$492,333	\$599,500	\$160,000	\$320,000	\$133,400	\$50,000	\$500,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF	\$8,400	\$60,030	\$912,188	\$738,500	\$899,250	\$240,000	\$480,000	\$200,100	\$75,000	\$750,000
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF	\$14,000	\$100,050	\$1,520,313	\$1,230,833	\$1,498,750	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$333,500	\$125,000	\$1,250,000
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	\$19,600	\$140,070	\$2,128,438	\$1,723,167	\$2,098,250	\$560,000	\$1,120,000	\$466,900	\$175,000	\$1,750,000
Less: Total Development Cost, Excluding Land										
Low Scepario	\$470.400	\$3 361 200	\$81 326 400	\$53 775 600	\$80 881 200	\$21 978 000	\$41 125 200	\$20.010.000	\$4 350 000	\$24,000,000
Per NSE	\$168	\$168	\$334	\$743	\$337	\$343	\$321	\$400	\$174	\$96
Middle Scenario	\$504.000	\$4 202 400	\$83 151 600	\$53 775 600	\$80,881,200	\$23 130 000	\$42 661 200	\$20 810 400	\$4 800 000	\$24,000,000
Per NSE	\$180	\$210	\$342	\$243	\$337	\$361	\$333	\$416	\$192	\$96
High Scenario	\$537.600	\$4,202,400	\$90,448,800	\$59,684,400	\$80,881,200	\$23,898,000	\$44,197,200	\$21,610,800	\$5,400,000	\$25,500,000
Per NSF	\$192	\$210	\$372	\$269	\$337	\$373	\$345	\$432	\$216	\$102
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF	0.02	\$2.0	4072	\$205	2007	\$575	40.0	÷ 102	+210	÷.02
Low Scenario	\$473.200	\$3,381.210	\$81,630,463	\$54,021,767	\$81,180,950	\$22,058,000	\$41,285.200	\$20,076,700	\$4,375,000	\$24,250,000
Per NSF	\$169	\$169	\$336	\$244	\$339	\$345	\$323	\$402	\$175	\$97
Middle Scenario	\$506,800	\$4,222,410	\$83,455,663	\$54,021,767	\$81,180,950	\$23,210,000	\$42,821,200	\$20,877,100	\$4,825,000	\$24,250,000
Per NSF	\$181	\$211	\$343	\$244	\$339	\$363	\$335	\$418	\$193	\$97

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 46 Land Residual Analysis High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
High Scopario	\$540.400	\$4,222,410	\$00.752.862	\$50.020.567	\$81 180 050	\$22.078.000	\$44.257.200	\$21,677,500	\$5.425.000	\$25,750,000
	\$540,400	\$4,222,410	\$90,752,005	\$39,930,307	\$01,100,950	\$23,976,000	\$44,337,200 \$247	\$21,677,500	\$5,425,000	\$25,750,000
Fel INSF Eco of \$2.00 Por CSE	\$195	\$211	\$3/3	\$271	\$228	\$3/3	\$347	\$434	\$217	\$105
Low Separio	\$476.000	\$2 401 220	¢01.024.525	¢E4 267 022	¢ 91 490 700	\$22,129,000	£41 44E 200	\$20,142,400	¢4,400,000	\$24 E00 000
LOW SCENATIO Por NISE	\$476,000	\$5,401,220	\$01,954,525	\$34,207,933	\$01,400,700	\$22,150,000	\$41,445,200 \$224	\$20,143,400	\$4,400,000	\$24,500,000
Middle Scenario	\$170	\$1.242,420	\$92 750 725	\$54.267.022	\$21 420 700	\$32,200,000	\$324	\$20.042.800	\$4.950,000	\$24 500 000
Por NSE	\$305,000	\$4,242,420	\$03,733,723	\$34,207,333	\$01,400,700	\$23,230,000	\$42,501,200	\$20,543,000	\$4,030,000	\$24,300,000
High Scopario	\$542,200	\$4.242.420	\$01.056.025	\$60 176 722	\$21 420 700	\$24.059.000	\$350	\$21 744 200	\$5 450 000	\$26,000,000
Por NSE	\$343,200	\$4,242,420	\$91,030,923	\$00,170,733	\$01,400,700	\$24,030,000	\$249	\$21,744,200	\$3,430,000	\$20,000,000
Foo of \$2.00 Por CSE	\$194	\$21Z	\$3/4	\$272	\$340	\$370	\$J40	\$433	\$210	\$104
Low Scenario	\$478.800	\$3 421 230	\$82 238 588	\$54 514 100	\$81 780 450	\$22,218,000	\$41,605,200	\$20,210,100	\$4.425.000	\$24 750 000
Por NSE	\$171	\$3,421,230	\$02,230,300	\$246	\$3/1	\$22,210,000	\$325	\$20,210,100	\$177	\$24,750,000
Middle Scenario	\$E12.400	\$4,262,420	\$94,062,799	\$54 514 100	\$91 790 450	\$22,270,000	\$325	\$21.010.500	\$4.975.000	\$24 750 000
Por NSE	\$312,400	\$4,202,430	\$04,003,700	\$34,314,100	\$01,700,430	\$23,370,000	\$43,141,200	\$21,010,300	\$105	\$24,730,000
Lligh Connario	\$103 ¢E46.000	\$4.262.420	¢01.200.099	\$60,422,000	¢01 700 450	\$24 129 000	\$337 \$44.677.200	\$21,910,000	¢E 47E 000	\$26.250.000
Dor NICE	\$340,000	\$4,202,430	\$91,300,988	\$00,422,900 \$373	\$01,700,450 \$241	\$24,130,000	\$44,077,200 \$240	\$21,010,900	\$3,473,000 \$310	\$20,250,000
Foo of \$5.00 Por CSE	\$195	\$213	\$3/6	\$2/3	\$341	\$3//	\$349	\$436	\$219	\$105
Low Sconario	\$494.400	\$2.461.250	\$93.946 713	\$EE 006 422	¢92.270.0F0	\$22.279.000	\$41.025.200	\$20.242 500	\$4.475.000	\$25,250,000
Dor NICE	\$484,400	\$3,401,250	\$02,040,/13	\$33,006,433 ¢340	\$02,379,950 \$344	\$22,378,000	\$41,925,200 \$220	\$20,343,500	\$4,4/5,000 \$170	\$23,250,000
Fel INSF Middle Separatio	\$1/3	\$1/3	\$341	\$248	\$344	\$350 \$33 E20 000	\$328	\$40/	\$1/9	\$101 ¢25.250.000
IVIIIIIIII SCENATIO	\$518,000	\$4,302,450	\$04,6/1,913	\$35,006,433	\$02,379,950 \$344	\$23,530,000	\$43,461,200	\$21,143,900	\$4,925,000	\$25,250,000
Per NSF	\$185	\$215	\$348	\$248	\$344	\$368	\$340	\$423	\$197	\$101
High Scenario	\$551,600	\$4,302,450	\$91,969,113	\$60,915,233	\$82,379,950	\$24,298,000	\$44,997,200	\$21,944,300	\$5,525,000	\$26,750,000
Per NSF	\$197	\$215	\$3/8	\$2/5	\$344	\$380	\$352	\$439	\$221	\$107
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF	£ 400.000	¢2 501 270	¢02.454.020	AFE 400 767	¢02.070.450	¢22 520 000	£ 42 2 45 200	\$20 47C 000	¢ 4 525 000	¢25 750 000
Low Scenario	\$490,000	\$3,501,270	\$83,454,838	\$55,498,767	\$82,979,450	\$22,538,000	\$42,245,200	\$20,476,900	\$4,525,000	\$25,750,000
Per NSF	\$1/5	\$1/5	\$343	\$251	\$346	\$352	\$330	\$410	\$181	\$103
Middle Scenario	\$523,600	\$4,342,470	\$85,280,038	\$55,498,767	\$82,979,450	\$23,690,000	\$43,/81,200	\$21,277,300	\$4,975,000	\$25,750,000
Per NSF	\$187	\$217	\$351	\$251	\$346	\$370	\$342	\$426	\$199	\$103
High Scenario	\$557,200	\$4,342,470	\$92,577,238	\$61,407,567	\$82,979,450	\$24,458,000	\$45,317,200	\$22,077,700	\$5,575,000	\$27,250,000
Per NSF	\$199	\$217	\$381	\$277	\$346	\$382	\$354	\$442	\$223	\$109
Less: Assumed Return on Equity (See Below)										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$14 112	\$161 338	\$7 807 334	\$3 226 536	\$7 764 595	\$1 054 944	\$2 303 011	\$1,000,500	\$130,500	\$720,000
Middle Scenario	\$15,120	\$201,715	\$7 982 554	\$3,226,536	\$7,764,595	\$1,10,240	\$2,389,027	\$1,000,500	\$144,000	\$720,000
High Scenario	\$16,128	\$201,715	\$8.683.085	\$3,581,064	\$7,764,595	\$1,147,104	\$2,475.043	\$1,080,540	\$162,000	\$765.000
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSE	\$10/120	\$201,715	\$0,000,000	\$3,301,001	<i>\$1,101,000</i>	\$1,1.17,101	<i>q</i> 2, 17 3, 0 13	\$1,000,510	\$102,000	\$7.057000
Low Scenario	\$14.196	\$162.298	\$7 836 524	\$3 241 306	\$7 793 371	\$1.058.784	\$2 311 971	\$1.003.835	\$131.250	\$727 500
Middle Scenario	\$15,204	\$202,676	\$8 011 744	\$3,241,306	\$7,793,371	\$1,050,701	\$2,397,987	\$1,003,055	\$144 750	\$727,500
High Scenario	\$16,201	\$202,676	\$8,712,275	\$3 595 834	\$7,793,371	\$1,150,944	\$2,484,003	\$1,013,035	\$162,750	\$772,500
Fee of \$2.00 Per CSE	\$10,212	\$202,070	\$0,712,275	\$5,555,051	<i>\$7,755,57</i>	\$1,150,511	\$2,101,005	\$1,005,075	\$102,750	\$772,500
Low Scenario	\$14 280	\$163,259	\$7 865 714	\$3,256,076	\$7 822 147	\$1.062.624	\$2 320 931	\$1.007.170	\$132,000	\$735.000
Middle Scenario	\$15,288	\$203.636	\$8,040,934	\$3,256,076	\$7,822,117	\$1,002,021	\$2,526,551	\$1,007,170	\$145 500	\$735,000
High Scenario	\$16,200	\$203,636	\$8 741 465	\$3,610,604	\$7,822,117	\$1 154 784	\$2,492,963	\$1,087,210	\$163 500	\$780,000
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSE	\$10,290	\$205,050	40,7 FT, FOS	\$5,010,004	\$7,022,147	ψ1,1 <i>3</i> 4,704	42,7J2,J0J	\$1,007,210	φ105,500	÷, 00,000
Low Scenario	\$14.364	\$164.219	\$7 894 904	\$3 270 846	\$7,850,923	\$1.066.464	\$2 329 891	\$1.010.505	\$132,750	\$742.500
Middle Scenario	\$15,272	\$204 597	\$8 070 124	\$3 270 846	\$7,850,923	\$1 121 760	\$2,525,051	\$1.050.525	\$146.250	\$742,500
High Scenario	\$16.280	\$204,397	\$8 770 655	\$3 675 274	\$7 850,923	\$1,121,700	\$2,713,307	\$1,050,525	\$164.250	\$787 500
Fee of \$5.00 Per CSE	\$10,500	\$204,397	\$0,770,000	\$3,023,374	\$7,030,923	\$1,130,024	\$2,301,923	\$1,050,345	\$10 4 ,230	\$707,300
Low Scenario	\$14 522	\$166.140	\$7 953 284	\$3 300 386	\$7 908 475	\$1 074 144	\$2 347 811	\$1.017.175	\$134.250	\$757 500
Middle Scenario	\$14,332 \$15 E40	\$206 519	\$8 128 504	\$3,300,386	\$7,900,475	\$1,074,144	\$2,347,011 \$2,433,937	\$1,017,173	\$147.750	\$757,500
High Scenario	\$13,340 \$16 F40	\$200,510	\$2,120,304	\$3,500,500	\$7,500,475	\$1,123,440	J∠,+JJ,02/ \$7 E10 942	\$1,037,193	\$147,730	\$202 500
Foo of \$7.00 Por CSE	\$10,540	\$200,518	\$0,029,035	\$3,034,914	\$7,900,475	\$1,100,304	\$2,319,843	\$1,097,215	\$105,75U	\$002,500
	¢14 700	¢160.061	¢0.011.004	\$2.220.026	\$7.066.027	¢1.001.034	¢0.065.701	¢1.022.045	¢125 750	\$772 500
Low Scenario Middle Scenario	\$14,/00	\$100,061	\$0,011,664	\$3,329,926	\$7,966,027	\$1,001,824	\$2,305,/31	\$1,023,845	\$135,/50	\$772,500
High Scopario	\$15,/08	\$200,439	\$0,100,004	\$3,329,920 \$3,694 4F4	\$7,900,027	\$1,137,120 \$1,172,004	\$2,431,/4/ \$3,527,762	\$1,005,005	\$149,250	\$772,500
righ scenario	\$10,716	\$200,439	\$0,007,415	\$3,004,454	\$7,900,027	\$1,175,984	\$2,337,763	\$1,105,005	\$107,250	\$017,5UU
I	1	ļ.	I	I I		I I		I I	ļ	I.

Table 46 Land Residual Analysis High Cap Rate Assumption Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
Residual Land Value										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	\$296.688	\$1 027 462	\$3 925 141	\$17 084 394	\$2 436 605	(\$5 465 671)	\$7 355 425	\$1 955 300	\$1 883 136	\$4 030 000
Per NSE	\$47.47	\$102.75	\$90.11	\$130.73	\$93.23	(\$170.80)	\$229.86	\$21.79	\$15.44	\$5,78
Middle Scenario	\$392.280	\$1.601.885	\$22.604.471	\$51,989,814	\$55.383.245	(\$1,502,058)	\$6.257.046	\$4.942.513	\$2.237.818	\$7,780,000
Per NSF	\$62.76	\$160.19	\$518.93	\$397.84	\$2,119.04	(\$46,94)	\$195.53	\$55.08	\$18.35	\$11.16
High Scenario	\$487,872	\$2,875,885	\$24,946,615	\$21,402,036	\$22,493,885	\$2,863,987	\$5,158,666	\$7,929,727	\$3,256,182	\$13,735,000
Per NSF	\$78.06	\$287.59	\$572.70	\$163.77	\$860.65	\$89.50	\$161.21	\$88.37	\$26.70	\$19.71
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$293,888	\$1,007,452	\$3,621,078	\$16,838,227	\$2,136,855	(\$5,545,671)	\$7,195,425	\$1,888,600	\$1,858,136	\$3,780,000
Per NSF	\$47.02	\$100.75	\$83.13	\$128.85	\$81.76	(\$173.30)	\$224.86	\$21.05	\$15.23	\$5.42
Middle Scenario	\$390,404	\$1,621,292	\$22,446,438	\$51,728,877	\$55,054,719	(\$1,530,602)	\$6,174,102	\$4,912,498	\$2,225,568	\$7,522,500
Per NSF	\$62.46	\$162.13	\$515.30	\$395.84	\$2,106.47	(\$47.83)	\$192.94	\$54.75	\$18.25	\$10.79
High Scenario	\$484,988	\$2,854,914	\$24,613,363	\$21,141,099	\$22,165,359	\$2,780,147	\$4,989,706	\$7,859,692	\$3,230,432	\$13,477,500
Per NSF	\$77.60	\$285.49	\$565.05	\$161.78	\$848.08	\$86.88	\$155.93	\$87.59	\$26.49	\$19.34
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$291,088	\$987,442	\$3,317,016	\$16,592,061	\$1,837,105	(\$5,625,671)	\$7,035,425	\$1,821,900	\$1,833,136	\$3,530,000
Per NSF	\$46.57	\$98.74	\$76.15	\$126.97	\$70.29	(\$175.80)	\$219.86	\$20.30	\$15.03	\$5.06
Middle Scenario	\$387,520	\$1,600,321	\$22,113,186	\$51,467,941	\$54,726,193	(\$1,614,442)	\$6,005,142	\$4,842,463	\$2,199,818	\$7,265,000
Per NSF	\$62.00	\$160.03	\$507.65	\$393.85	\$2,093.90	(\$50.45)	\$187.66	\$53.96	\$18.04	\$10.42
High Scenario	\$482,104	\$2,833,944	\$24,280,110	\$20,880,163	\$21,836,833	\$2,696,307	\$4,820,746	\$7,789,657	\$3,204,682	\$13,220,000
Per NSF	\$77.14	\$283.39	\$557.39	\$159.78	\$835.51	\$84.26	\$150.65	\$86.81	\$26.27	\$18.97
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$288,288	\$967,432	\$3,012,953	\$16,345,894	\$1,537,355	(\$5,705,671)	\$6,875,425	\$1,755,200	\$1,808,136	\$3,280,000
Per NSF	\$46.13	\$96.74	\$69.17	\$125.08	\$58.82	(\$178.30)	\$214.86	\$19.56	\$14.82	\$4.71
Middle Scenario	\$383,628	\$1,538,973	\$21,604,714	\$51,207,004	\$54,397,667	(\$1,753,578)	\$5,750,166	\$4,732,408	\$2,160,568	\$7,007,500
Per NSF	\$61.38	\$153.90	\$495.98	\$391.85	\$2,081.33	(\$54.80)	\$179.69	\$52.74	\$17.71	\$10.05
High Scenario	\$479,220	\$2,812,973	\$23,946,858	\$20,619,226	\$21,508,307	\$2,612,467	\$4,651,786	\$7,719,622	\$3,178,932	\$12,962,500
Per NSF	\$76.68	\$281.30	\$549.74	\$157.78	\$822.94	\$81.64	\$145.37	\$86.03	\$26.06	\$18.60
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$282,688	\$927,412	\$2,404,828	\$15,853,561	\$937,855	(\$5,865,671)	\$6,555,425	\$1,621,800	\$1,758,136	\$2,780,000
Per NSF	\$45.23	\$92.74	\$55.21	\$121.32	\$35.88	(\$183.30)	\$204.86	\$18.07	\$14.41	\$3.99
Middle Scenario	\$377,860	\$1,497,032	\$20,938,209	\$50,685,131	\$53,740,615	(\$1,921,258)	\$5,412,246	\$4,592,338	\$2,109,068	\$6,492,500
Per NSF	\$60.46	\$149.70	\$480.68	\$387.86	\$2,056.19	(\$60.04)	\$169.13	\$51.18	\$17.29	\$9.32
High Scenario	\$473,452	\$2,771,032	\$23,280,353	\$20,097,353	\$20,851,255	\$2,444,787	\$4,313,866	\$7,579,552	\$3,127,432	\$12,447,500
Per NSF	\$75.75	\$277.10	\$534.44	\$153.79	\$797.80	\$76.40	\$134.81	\$84.47	\$25.64	\$17.86
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$276,500	\$880,669	\$1,592,373	\$15,257,837	\$136,923	(\$6,052,551)	\$6,172,705	\$1,465,055	\$1,702,886	\$2,227,500
Per NSF	\$44.24	\$88.07	\$36.56	\$116.76	\$5.24	(\$189.14)	\$192.90	\$16.33	\$13.96	\$3.20
Middle Scenario	\$372,092	\$1,455,091	\$20,271,704	\$50,163,257	\$53,083,563	(\$2,088,938)	\$5,074,326	\$4,452,268	\$2,057,568	\$5,977,500
Per NSF	\$59.53	\$145.51	\$465.37	\$383.86	\$2,031.05	(\$65.28)	\$158.57	\$49.62	\$16.87	\$8.58
High Scenario	\$467,684	\$2,729,091	\$22,613,848	\$19,575,479	\$20,194,203	\$2,277,107	\$3,975,946	\$7,439,482	\$3,075,932	\$11,932,500
Per NSF	\$74.83	\$272.91	\$519.14	\$149.80	\$772.66	\$71.16	\$124.25	\$82.91	\$25.22	\$17.12
Equity Investment Assumptions	2004	2004	200/	2004	2004	100/	100/	F00/	E00/	500/
Equity as a % OF IDC	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	40%	40%	50%	50%	50%
Assumed Return on Equity	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
Assumed Investment Period (Months)	15	24	48	30	48	18	21	15	9	9

Table 47 Unleveraged Return on Cost Analysis Sensitivity Analyses A and B Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warehouse
	Single-rainity mini	Owner rowninomes	12-Story Owner	5-5tory Kentai	20-Story Kentar	5-5tory Office	12-story office	4-5101 y 110101	Ketun	Warehouse
Tenure	Owner	Owner	Owner	Renter	Renter	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Units	1	10	232	300	285	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Net SF	2,800	20,000	227,250	212,250	230,800		-	-	-	
Site Area (SF)	6,250	10,000	43,560	130,680	26,136	32,000	32,000	89,734	121,968	696,960
Iotal Net SF	2,800	20,000	243,250	221,550	239,800	64,000	128,000	50,000	25,000	250,000
Total Gross SF (Excluding Parking)	2,800	20,010	304,063	246,167	299,750	80,000	160,000	66,700	25,000	250,000
Approximate building stones	2 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	5 Stories	20 Stories	5 Stories	12 Stories	4 5tones	1 Stones	T Stories
Total Annual Net Operating Income Reptal Properties										
I ow Scenario				\$3,704,327	\$4,554,120	\$966.200	\$2,793,100	\$1.722.435	\$350.000	\$1,725,000
NOI Per NSF				\$16.72	\$18.99	\$15.10	\$21.82	\$34.45	\$14.00	\$6.90
Middle Scenario				\$3,791,198	\$5.055.552	\$1,250,600	\$2,821,900	\$2,009,508	\$395,000	\$1,950,000
NOI Per NSF				\$17.11	\$21.08	\$19.54	\$22.05	\$40.19	\$15.80	\$7.80
High Scenario				\$4,233,375	\$5,556,984	\$1,535,000	\$2,850,700	\$2,296,580	\$485,000	\$2,400,000
NOI Per NSF				\$19.11	\$23.17	\$23.98	\$22.27	\$45.93	\$19.40	\$9.60
Total Market Value (Capitalized NOI for Rental;										
Net Sales Proceeds for Ownership)										
Low Scenario	\$781,200	\$4,550,000	\$93,058,875	\$74,086,530	\$91,082,400	\$17,567,273	\$50,783,636	\$22,965,800	\$6,363,636	\$28,750,000
Per NSF	\$279	\$228	\$383	\$334	\$380	\$274	\$397	\$459	\$255	\$115
Middle Scenario	\$911,400	\$6,006,000	\$113,738,625	\$75,823,950	\$101,111,040	\$22,738,182	\$51,307,273	\$26,793,433	\$7,181,818	\$32,500,000
Per NSF	\$326	\$300	\$468	\$342	\$422	\$355	\$401	\$536	\$287	\$130
High Scenario	\$1,041,600	\$7,280,000	\$124,078,500	\$84,667,500	\$111,139,680	\$27,909,091	\$51,830,909	\$30,621,067	\$8,818,182	\$40,000,000
Per NSF	\$372	\$364	\$510	\$382	\$463	\$436	\$405	\$612	\$353	\$160
Total Development Cost, Including Land										
No Fee	ACE0 100	AL 051 000	AGE 005 400	Ac4 c4c c00	A. 4 200.000	400.0 0 .000		404 545 000	A	400.0 0 0.000
Low Scenario	\$6/0,400	\$4,061,200	\$85,987,400	\$61,616,600	\$84,/23,200	\$23,2/4,000	\$43,/1/,200	\$21,/15,000	\$5,570,000	\$28,879,000
Per NSF	\$239	\$203	\$353	\$2/8	\$353	\$364	\$342	\$434	\$223	\$116
Middle Scenario	\$779,000	\$5,102,400	\$90,121,600	\$62,792,600	\$86,866,200	\$24,570,000	\$45,541,200	\$22,964,400	\$6,630,000	\$30,970,000
Fel INSF	\$2/0	\$6,202,400	\$370 \$00 726 800	\$203 \$72 144 400	\$302 ¢20,000,200	\$304 \$25 919 000	\$330 \$49,027,200	\$439 \$24.491.900	\$203	\$124 \$25.054.000
Por NSE	\$007,000	\$0,202,400	\$99,720,000	\$75,144,400	\$69,009,200	\$25,010,000	\$40,037,200	\$24,401,000	\$7,039,000	\$55,954,000 \$144
Fel INSF Eeo of \$1.00 Por CSE	\$517	\$510	\$410	\$330	\$571	\$405	\$3/3	\$490	\$514	\$144
Low Scopario	\$672.200	\$4.091.210	\$96 201 462	\$61 862 767	\$9E 022 0E0	\$22.254.000	\$42,977,200	\$21 781 700	\$5 505 000	\$20,120,000
Por NISE	\$240	\$204	\$00,291,403	\$01,002,707	\$05,022,950	\$23,334,000	\$3/3	\$21,701,700	\$3,333,000	\$25,125,000
Middle Scenario	\$781,800	\$5 122 410	\$90.425.663	\$63 038 767	\$87 165 950	\$24,650,000	\$45 701 200	\$23,031,100	\$6.655.000	\$31,220,000
Per NSE	\$279	\$256	\$372	\$285	\$363	\$385	\$357	\$461	\$266	\$125
High Scenario	\$890,400	\$6 222 410	\$100.030.863	\$73 390 567	\$89 308 950	\$25,898,000	\$48 197 200	\$24 548 500	\$7 864 000	\$36,204,000
Per NSF	\$318	\$311	\$411	\$331	\$372	\$405	\$377	\$491	\$315	\$145
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF		40.11	*	4001	40		40	4	40.0	*
Low Scenario	\$676,000	\$4,101,220	\$86,595,525	\$62,108,933	\$85,322,700	\$23,434,000	\$44,037,200	\$21,848,400	\$5,620,000	\$29,379,000
Per NSF	\$241	\$205	\$356	\$280	\$356	\$366	\$344	\$437	\$225	\$118
Middle Scenario	\$784,600	\$5,142,420	\$90,729,725	\$63,284,933	\$87,465,700	\$24,730,000	\$45,861,200	\$23,097,800	\$6,680,000	\$31,470,000
Per NSF	\$280	\$257	\$373	\$286	\$365	\$386	\$358	\$462	\$267	\$126
High Scenario	\$893,200	\$6,242,420	\$100,334,925	\$73,636,733	\$89,608,700	\$25,978,000	\$48,357,200	\$24,615,200	\$7,889,000	\$36,454,000
Per NSF	\$319	\$312	\$412	\$332	\$374	\$406	\$378	\$492	\$316	\$146
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$678,800	\$4,121,230	\$86,899,588	\$62,355,100	\$85,622,450	\$23,514,000	\$44,197,200	\$21,915,100	\$5,645,000	\$29,629,000
Per NSF	\$242	\$206	\$357	\$281	\$357	\$367	\$345	\$438	\$226	\$119
Middle Scenario	\$787,400	\$5,162,430	\$91,033,788	\$63,531,100	\$87,765,450	\$24,810,000	\$46,021,200	\$23,164,500	\$6,705,000	\$31,720,000
Per NSF	\$281	\$258	\$374	\$287	\$366	\$388	\$360	\$463	\$268	\$127
High Scenario	\$896,000	\$6,262,430	\$100,638,988	\$73,882,900	\$89,908,450	\$26,058,000	\$48,517,200	\$24,681,900	\$7,914,000	\$36,704,000
Per NSF	\$320	\$313	\$414	\$333	\$375	\$407	\$379	\$494	\$317	\$147
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF			A	ACO 0 18 17-7	**** ****	400 (FL		*** * * * * * * * * *	AR 608	ADD 400 5
Low Scenario	\$684,400	\$4,161,250	\$87,507,713	\$62,847,433	\$86,221,950	\$23,674,000	\$44,517,200	\$22,048,500	\$5,695,000	\$30,129,000
Per NSF	\$244	\$208	\$360	\$284	\$360	\$370	\$348	\$441	\$228	\$121
Middle Scenario	\$793,000	\$5,202,450	\$91,641,913	\$64,023,433	\$88,364,950	\$24,970,000	\$46,341,200	\$23,297,900	\$6,755,000	\$32,220,000
Per NSF	\$283	\$260	\$377	\$289	\$368	\$390	\$362	\$466	\$270	\$129
High Scenario	\$901,600	\$6,302,450	\$101,247,113	\$/4,3/5,233	\$90,507,950	\$26,218,000	\$48,837,200	\$24,815,300	\$7,964,000	\$37,204,000
rei INSF	\$322	\$315	\$416	\$336	\$3//	\$410	\$382	\$496	\$319	\$149

Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

Table 47 Unleveraged Return on Cost Analysis Sensitivity Analyses A and B Denver Affordable Housing Nexus Study

	Single-Family Infill	Owner Townhomes	12-Story Owner	5-Story Rental	20-Story Rental	5-Story Office	12-Story Office	4-Story Hotel	Retail	Warebouse
	Single-rainity mini	Owner Iowinionies	12-Story Owner	J-Story Kentar	20-Story Kentar	J-Story Office	12-Story Onice	4-5101 y 110101	Ketan	warenouse
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	\$690,000	\$4,201,270	\$88,115,838	\$63,339,767	\$86,821,450	\$23,834,000	\$44,837,200	\$22,181,900	\$5,745,000	\$30,629,000
Per NSF	\$246	\$210	\$362	\$286	\$362	\$372	\$350	\$444	\$230	\$123
Middle Scenario	\$798,600	\$5,242,470	\$92,250,038	\$64,515,767	\$88,964,450	\$25,130,000	\$46,661,200	\$23,431,300	\$6,805,000	\$32,720,000
Per NSF	\$285	\$262	\$379	\$291	\$371	\$393	\$365	\$469	\$272	\$131
High Scenario	\$907,200	\$6,342,470	\$101,855,238	\$74,867,567	\$91,107,450	\$26,378,000	\$49,157,200	\$24,948,700	\$8,014,000	\$37,704,000
Per NSF	\$324	\$317	\$419	\$338	\$380	\$412	\$384	\$499	\$321	\$151
Unleveraged Return on Cost										
No Fee										
Low Scenario	16.5%	12.0%	8.2%	6.0%	5.4%	4.2%	6.4%	7.9%	6.3%	6.0%
Middle Scenario	17.0%	17.7%	26.2%	6.0%	5.8%	5.1%	6.2%	8.8%	6.0%	6.3%
High Scenario	17.4%	17.4%	24.4%	5.8%	6.2%	5.9%	5.9%	9.4%	6.2%	6.7%
Fee of \$1.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	16.0%	11.5%	7.8%	6.0%	5.4%	4.1%	6.4%	7.9%	6.3%	5.9%
Middle Scenario	16.6%	17.2%	25.8%	6.0%	5.8%	5.1%	6.2%	8.7%	5.9%	6.2%
High Scenario	17.0%	17.0%	24.0%	5.8%	6.2%	5.9%	5.9%	9.4%	6.2%	6.6%
Fee of \$2.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	15.6%	10.9%	7.5%	6.0%	5.3%	4.1%	6.3%	7.9%	6.2%	5.9%
Middle Scenario	16.2%	16.8%	25.4%	6.0%	5.8%	5.1%	6.2%	8.7%	5.9%	6.2%
High Scenario	16.6%	16.6%	23.7%	5.7%	6.2%	5.9%	5.9%	9.3%	6.1%	6.6%
Fee of \$3.00 Per GSF										
Low Scenario	15.1%	10.4%	7.1%	5.9%	5.3%	4.1%	6.3%	7.9%	6.2%	5.8%
Middle Scenario	15.7%	16.3%	24.9%	6.0%	5.8%	5.0%	6.1%	8.7%	5.9%	6.1%
High Scenario	16.3%	16.2%	23.3%	5.7%	6.2%	5.9%	5.9%	9.3%	6.1%	6.5%
Fee of \$5.00 Per GSF							0.070			
Low Scenario	14.1%	9.3%	6.3%	5.9%	5.3%	4.1%	6.3%	7.8%	6.1%	5.7%
Middle Scenario	14.9%	15.4%	24.1%	5.9%	5.7%	5.0%	6.1%	8.6%	5.8%	6.1%
High Scenario	15.5%	15.5%	22.6%	5.7%	6.1%	5.9%	5.8%	9.3%	6.1%	6.5%
Fee of \$7.00 Per GSE										
Low Scenario	13.2%	8.3%	5.6%	5.8%	5.2%	4.1%	6.2%	7.8%	6.1%	5.6%
Middle Scenario	14.1%	14.6%	23.3%	5.9%	5.7%	5.0%	6.0%	8.6%	5.8%	6.0%
High Scenario	14.8%	14.8%	21.8%	5.7%	6.1%	5.8%	5.8%	9.2%	6.1%	6.4%
0				5		5.070	5.670	5.270	5.170	5.1.70
	1		1			1				