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## Executive Summary

This study focuses on the redevelopment of 8821 Philadelphia Road. The property is currently operating as a 72,324 sf. Self-Storage facility. The development program entail taking the project thru the entitlement process and obtaining needed permits, raze the existing buildings, scrape the site, and construct, lease, and manage, two buildings of 50,400 sf. of Class B Flex-Warehouse.

This study was initiated by the fact that over the last several years the Self-Storage industry, locally and nationally, has experienced an increase in vacancy and lower profits. A current study conducted by Integra Realty Resources stated that more than 100 Self-Storage facilities in major U.S. Markets reported that their revenues decreased by 5.2 percent during 2010. Moreover, revenue continued to decrease by one percent in the first two quarters of 2011. (Swanson, 2011)

Self-Storage construction spiked around 1995, with a massive amount of development taking place. With historic strong returns for existing facilities, this property type caught on with not only existing Owners but also firsttimers wanting to enter the industry. (Swanson, 2011) However, now during the current slow economic environment, questions are being raised about resiliency of the industry.

A recent study conducted by Mt. Royal Management Company has determined that existing and potential renters have changed their behaviors towards renting Self-Storage units. The average consumer now looks upon a storage unit as a discretionary expenditure. Existing tenants opted to get rid of excess personal goods and vacated their units. The once loyal Commercial users of storage space who typically rented larger units left the market. These tenants included small contractors and businesspersons that used the facilities as an office and for storing inventory and equipment. Without construction jobs, the flooring, drywall, plumber and other contractors disappeared and their need for storage evaporated.

Climbing vacancy rates and lower profits continue to be a concern. The subject property reported that over the past five years vacancy has climbed from a respectable four percent to twenty-one percent today and it continues to climb.

The Cash Flow growth for the subject property is decreasing by 1 to $2 \%$ a year due to the pressure the market is putting on the rents. This will be the third year without an increase. However, expenses continue to go up approximately 3 to $5 \%$ a year depending on the line item.

The subject property was built in 1980, now 31 years old. The property has been well maintained The pavement, the roofs and painting are repaired as needed, a little at a time. There is no major capital improvements needed. However, the project is slowly becoming obsolete.

The project will continue to have difficulty competing with the newer more modernized storage projects. Consumers are now choosing the newer facilities that are more secure, being that they are Self-contained multistory buildings, and they are climate controlled.

An option other than redevelopment of the site is to sell it as a business. At this time with the market down, there is considerable interest from the National companies to purchase properties that are owned by smaller Owner/ operators. The published Reversion CAP rate is $10.84 \%$ based on the current year NOI the property should sell for $\$ 2.8$ million (+/-) depending on the value of the business.

This feasibility study of the Flex warehouse project examines the possibility of razing the existing facility and constructing 50,400 sf. of Flex space. This is accomplished by preparing Proformas models for a Best Case and an Expected Case of the proposed Flex project and a Current Case study of the Self-Storage Operation.

The study investigates the process and its related cost as it pertains to the complete progression from entitling the property for the appropriate use, continuing thru construction of the buildings, including leasing and, managing the project, and then ending with a sale of the property after 10 years of operations.

The process begins with the entitlement of the project. There are no concerns during this process since the property was improved in 1980 with almost all of the currently required offsite improvements. The existing stormwater pond will be abandoned and a new more efficient stormwater system will be built under ground. It is anticipated that the entitlement process and permits will take approximately eight months before construction can start. Since the area is mostly commercial use and zoning is not being changed, no community or government opposition is expected.

The existing site is very favorable for redevelopment into a Flex warehouse. The site itself is flat and drains well. The Philadelphia Rd is a major road with easy access to interstate highways and the ports. There is ample population to support any businesses from both a consumer level and a workforce.

Several notable construction specifications are identified in the Baltimore East Industrial Flex market as well as the Competitive market. Ceiling heights are in the 14 ft . to 19 ft . range with the majority of the projects at 16 ft . range. Most projects have either a drive-in door and or a loading dock in each bay. The amount of office space to warehouse was not available for the projects. However, a St. John Property leasing person stated that most Flex projects in the Crossroads project are being planned to be made up of approximately 40 to 50 percent of the overall space for office use.

The subject property is located in the Baltimore County East Industrial Market. The Submarket contains approximately 3.8 million sf. of Flex space. The vacancy, which is of much concern, is reported @ $14 \%$ and the average rent is quoted @ $\$ 8.06$ psf. Over the past several years, little to no improvement has been seen in this number.

The Expected Case Model uses the General Vacancy Rate of $14 \%$ as well. The average rent is $\$ 9.23 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $\$ 10.25 \mathrm{psf}$ office and $\$ 8.20$ psf warehouse). With those numbers, the project only produces a $4.31 \%$ IRR and a Net Present Value of negative $\$ 1.76$ Million dollars. Using a CAP rate of $8.5 \%$ the property value at reversion after 10 years of operation is $\$ 4.6$ million, less $3 \%$ selling fee. The goal for a Cash on Cash return is $10 \%$ on the $\$ 5.8$ Million dollar construction cost. This model does not work until year fifteen and that is only if inflation stays steady at $3 \%$ assuming development cost and expenses follow, and rents increase at a rate of $6.5 \%$ year after year.

The Best Case Model uses the does not use a General Vacancy Rate it allows the leases turn vacate at the end of their term with an $80 \%$ likelihood of renewal. The average rent is based on the newer projects on the market, such as Crossroads @ 95 by St Johns Property. The Best case rent is $\$ 10.80 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $\$ 12.00$ psf office and $\$ 9.60 \mathrm{psf}$ warehouse). With those numbers, the project produces a 10.85 IRR and a Net Present Value of $\$ 303,572$ dollars. Using a CAP rate of $8.5 \%$ the property value at reversion after 10 years of operation is $\$ 7.3$ million, less $3 \%$ selling fee. The goal for a Cash on Cash return is $10 \%$ on the $\$ 5.8$ Million dollar construction cost. This model does not work until year two based on inflation stays steady at $3 \%$ assuming development cost and expenses follow, and rents increase at a rate of $3.5 \%$ year after year.

The following proformas are prepared with the possibility of the Flex market improving in the next several years. The proformas values the land at $\$ 125,000$ an acre for a total value of $\$ 662,500$. Development site costs estimates were supplied by a local site development construction company total $\$ 44.14 \mathrm{psf}$. A local general contractor that specializes in commercial construction supplied the building construction costs detailed in the report. The building construction cost estimates are $\$ 49.15$ psf. In summary, total Development cost with the land and contingencies is $\$ 116.63 \mathrm{psf}$

The owners have elected not to carry Debt Service on the Flex project the $\$ 5.9$ million is paid out-of- pocket over the first 2 years of the development project. Another upside of the proposed development of the Flex building is the Owner/ Developer is to fund the entire project in cash without any debt service. This will improve the Cash Flow by eliminating interest payments, reducing the required cost of reserves, and eliminate the delays, inspections, and the administrative work that is generated by the lenders.

Both Case Models for the Flex building do not meet the minimum requirement of $10 \%$ Cash on Cash return. The Best Case with the higher rents and lower vacancy accomplish the return goals in year 2 and the Expect e Case Model does not recognize 10\% Cash on Cash return until year 15 .

A note on CAP rates. The Cap rates on the Flex market are reported from $7.5 \%$ to $9.5 \%$ the proformas use the reversion cap rate of $8.5 \%$ in year 12 based on year thirteen NOI. At this time, the only better performing CAP rate is in the apartment industry at $8.62 \%$. As a comparison, the reported CAP rates for Self-Storage operations are currently reported @ 10.84\%. (RealityRates.com)

The upside side of the subject property is that the current Self-Storage operation, although sluggish, continues to maintain a positive Cash Flow and is profitable. This report will compare the future trends of the existing SelfStorage with the "expected case" proformas of the proposed Flex warehouse

This project however, may be feasible in the future. It is assumed that pent-up demand will increase the rent at a faster pace than inflation increases development cost and operating expenses. The Expected Case Model illustrates that rents increasing year over year at $6.5 \%$ and inflation holding Development cost and Expenses steady the project will recognize 10\% Cash on Cash return in 15 years from today's base numbers.

In closing, the section "Market Report" establishes that the current Flex market carries a high vacancy rate; it is very completive and over saturated. This in turn has triggered lower rents and more leasing concessions. As the following proformas illustrate, the subject property is too dependent upon the possibility of strong tenant interest, strong rent growth and it will likely be at a disadvantage as job growth and leasing are likely to remain sluggish.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Development Program ..... 12
Introduction ..... 13
Plan of Action ..... 13
Entitlement Process ..... 14
Concept Phase ..... 14
Development Plan Phase ..... 15
Judicial Judging process ..... 15
Entitlement Process Change ..... 16
Entitlement Concerns ..... 16
Permit Process ..... 16
Plans Examination ..... 16
Department of Public Works ..... 17
Summary ..... 18
Property Description ..... 19
Property Description, Existing Property ..... 20
Introduction ..... 21
Site Plan ..... 22
Transportation Network ..... 23
Access \& Egress ..... 24
Zoning ..... 25
Neighborhood ..... 26
Local Development ..... 26
Environmental ..... 26
Water Body ..... 26
Easements ..... 26
Property Description, Proposed Property ..... 27
Introduction ..... 28
Site Specifications ..... 28
Parking ..... 29
Shell Building ..... 29
Tenant Improvement Specifications ..... 29
Site Plan ..... 30
Summary, Property Description ..... 31
Market Analysis ..... 32
Baltimore Metro Market ..... 33
Introduction ..... 34
Baltimore Metro Market ..... 35
Market Overview ..... 36
Vacancy ..... 37
Rental Rates ..... 38
Flex Tenant Data ..... 39
Sales Industrial Building ..... 40
Cap Rates ..... 42
Inventory ..... 43
Summary ..... 44
Baltimore County East Industrial Market ..... 45
Introduction ..... 46
Market overview ..... 47
Flex Market Data ..... 47
CoStar Analytics Baltimore County East Flex Market ..... 48
Availability Analysis ..... 48
Absorption \& Leasing Activity ..... 49
History ..... 49
Vacancy Rate ..... 50
Rental Rate ..... 50
Summary ..... 51
Competitive Market Analysis ..... 52
Competitive Market ..... 53
Competitive Analysis ..... 54
Competitive Market Comparison Chart ..... 55
Competitive Market Property Summary Detail CoStar ..... 56
Competitive Market Property Details ..... 57
Tenants ..... 65
Summary ..... 66
Project Cost ..... 67
Project Cost, Introduction ..... 68
Site \& Building Construction Estimates ..... 68
Site Construction Cost ..... 69
Engineering ..... 69
Architect ..... 69
Attorney Fees ..... 69
Building Construction Estimates ..... 70
Philadelphia Road 19,800 SF. General Contractor Cost Estimate ..... 71
Philadelphia Road Building Shell Cost Estimates ..... 72
Yellow Brick Road 30,600 SF. General Contractor Cost Estimate ..... 73
Yellow Brick Road Building Construction Estimates ..... 74
Tenant Improvement Specs Cost Noted Above ..... 75
Construction Draw Schedule ..... 76
Summary ..... 77
Schedules ..... 78
Schedules ..... 79
Concept Plan Review ..... 80
Development Plan Phase ..... 81
Construction Schedule
Financials83
Financial Introduction ..... 84
Summary of Case Studies ..... 85
General Assumptions ..... 87
Best Case 1 Summary ..... 89
Best Case Summary ..... 90
Table 6 Best Case Argus Cash Flow Part 1 ..... 91
Table 7 Best Case Argus Cash Flow Part 2 ..... 92
Figure 55 Best Case 1 Reimbursable Expenses ..... 93
Table 8 Best Case 1 Sources \& Uses ..... 94
Table 9 Best Case 1 Resale ..... 95
Table 10 Best Case 1 Present Value ..... 96
Table 11 Best Case 1 Assumptions ..... 97
Table 12 Best Case 1 Market Assumptions ..... 98
Table 13 Best Case 1 Average Rent Rates ..... 99
Table 14 Best Case 1 Rent Roll ..... 100
Construction Viability Schedule ..... 101
Expected Case 2 ..... 103
Expected Case Summary ..... 104
Table 16 Expected Case Argus Cash Flow ..... 105
Table 17 Expected Case Argus Cash Flow part 2 ..... 106
Table 18 Expected Case Reimbursable Revenue ..... 107
Table 19 Expected Case Sources \& Uses ..... 108
Table 20 Expected Case Resale ..... 109
Table 21 Expected Case Present Value ..... 110
Table 22 Expected Case Assumptions ..... 111
Table 23 Expected Case Market Assumptions 2 ..... 112
Table 24 Expected Case Rent Roll ..... 113
Construction Viability Schedule ..... 114
Expected Case Construction Time Period ..... 115
Self-Storage Case 3 ..... 117
Self-Storage Case 3 ..... 118
Table 26 Self Storage Projected Cash Flow ..... 121
Self- Storage Properties For Sale ..... 122
Case Study Summary ..... 123
Project Management Plan ..... 126
Introduction ..... 127
Project Management Chart ..... 128
Conclusions \& Recommendations ..... 129
Conclusions \& RECOMMENDATION ..... 130
APPENDIX ..... 131
Tax \& Property Information ..... 132
Baltimore County Permit Fee Schedule ..... 133
Baltimore County Development Fees ..... 133
Baltimore County Permit Fees 2 ..... 134
Baltimore County Zoning Illustration ..... 135
Baltimore County Manufacturing Zones ..... 135
Baltimore County Master Plan ..... 136
Figure 61 Baltimore County Master Plan ..... 136
Figure 62 Baltimore County Priority Funding Area ..... 137
Figure 63 Perry Hall White Marsh Growth Plan ..... 138
Figure 64 Baltimore County Growth Area ..... 139
Figure 65 Baltimore County Demarcation Line ..... 139
Financing Options ..... 144
Demographics ..... 146
Definitions \& Terms Used in this Report ..... 149
Figures \& Tables ..... 150

## DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

- Development Program Introduction
- Plan of Action
- Entitlement Process

Concept Phase

- Development Plan Phase

Judicial Judging process
Entitlement Process Change

- Entitlement Concerns
- Permit Process
- Plans Examination
- Department of Public Works
- Summary


## INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on the redevelopment of 8821 Philadelphia Road. The property is currently operating as a 72,324 sf Self-Storage facility. The development programs entails taking the project thru the entitlement process and obtaining permits to raze the existing buildings, scrape the site, and construct two buildings intended for 50,400 sf Class B Flex-Warehouse. A detailed description of the proposed site improvements and building construction is located on page 30.

## PLAN OFACTION

The redevelopment project starts with the preparation of the development strategies, engineering plans, architectural plans, and the entitlement process. Once that phase is complete, permits will be secured for, demolition, site development, building construction, and finally use and occupancy.

Once the feasibility is determined and the entitlement process complete the closing of the Self-Storage facility will begin. All of the leases are month-to-month. Per the lease agreements, the tenants will be given the required 30-day notice to vacate. There are no long-term leases for rental units. The small percentage that has prepaid their rent will be refunded. It is anticipated that it will take three months to close the operation.

Upon completion of the closing of the Self-Storage facility and the permits are in hand, the demolition of the existing structures will begin. Once the site is scraped and that phase complete, the project will move into the site development construction phase. During this phase, the site will be improved by the construction of the underground stormwater-management system and the installation of the underground utilities. Once the underground work is complete, the construction of the buildings will begin along with the other site improvements including the parking lots, driveways and landscaping.

In summary, thoughtful consideration must be given to the length of time and the expense of the Entitlement \& Permit Process. The estimated time for the Entitlement Process and securing permits for demolition, site work and building construction spans several months. It is projected that the entire Development process from the closing of the Self-Storage will take two years. One last consideration is the impact on the community and their support or rejection of the project. Any negative comments or additional requirements placed on the Developer/ Owner may and will cost additional money.

The anticipated development time will span a period of fourteen months. A detailed Development Schedule is located on page 82

## ENTITLEMENT PROCESS

Baltimore County, web site:
"Overseeing the development and use of land is one of the most important duties of local government, and that's where Permits, Approvals and Inspections (PAI) come in. Our Development Management Division reviews new development plans to make sure they comply with land use regulations and fit in with existing communities and infrastructure. Development Plans Review reviews the necessary public improvements each project requires, and Land Acquisition deals with the related rights-of-way, easements, etc. When the project is ready to go, Permit Processing, Building Plans Review, and Zoning Review take in permit applications and check for compliance with building and zoning codes. Building, Electrical and Plumbing Inspection make sure what is built is what was approved, and the Electrical and Plumbing Boards test and license the electricians and plumbers. "

Below are the various stages a development project in Baltimore County follows.

## CONCEPT PHASE

The first phase of the entitlement process is the Concept Phase. This process begins with a meeting between the Development Team and the County officials. After this meeting, the plan is submitted to the County for review and commented on. This phase takes approximately four months.

| Action | Development Team Responsibility | County Responsibility | County Time Allotment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Informational <br> Conference - | Meets with the County to discuss policies standards and <br> legislation and processes |  |  |
| Concept Plan Check <br> Print | Supplies the County with 2 copies of a concept plan <br> check print submitted to the PAI | Review and return the <br> comments to the <br> Developer |  |
| Concept Plan | Submitted - with the Development fee - to the County <br> for distribution to agencies | Preliminary review the <br> plan and offer the <br> Development Team <br> comments | Within 5 working days |

Table 1 Concept Phase

| Action | Development Team | County | Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Notification of the Community Input Meeting | Schedule the CIM \& date, time \& location. Give written notice of the meeting to adjacent property Owners as well as those community organizations identified during the CPC |  | Within 10 working days of the Concept Plan Conference |
| Invite County representatives to the CIM, if needed | Both | Both | 10 working days prior to meeting |
| Post Property CIM sign |  |  | 21 calendar days prior to CIM |
| Community Input Meeting | Present project to the Public and have a Q \& A session | Attend if requested by Developer or Public |  |

Table 2 Community Input Meeting
Refer to the Development Schedule for more detail on page 82

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN PHASE

The Development Plan Phase also spans approximately four months. The process starts roughly 30 -days after the Community Input Meeting. The Plan will go back-and- forth between the County and the Development Team until all parties are satisfied and all the comments have been addressed.

Refer to the Schedules section page 80 for a more detailed timeline.

| Development Plan Process (DPC) | Development | County | Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Action |  |  |  |
| Submit Development Plan Check print | submit 2 copies to the PAI to review the plan | PAI to review the plan with general conformance with the presentation at the CIM | Within 12 months of last CIM |
| Development Plan |  | Accept and distribute for review by agencies | Within 15 days of receipt of the Development Plan |
| Schedule of Development Hearing |  |  | Between 21 to 30 days after the plan has been accepted for review |
| Post Sign for Development Hearing | Advise the public of date, time and location |  | At least 20 working days before the Hearing |
| Advertisement for Development Hearing | Advertise for zoning or special exceptions if needed |  | 15 days prior to the Development Hearing |
| Development Plan Conference | Resolve any conflict between agency or public | Post Notice of Development hearing in County Office Building | 10 working days prior to Development Hearing |
| Administrative Judge |  | Agency comments, responses, compatibility issues, recommendations, critical area findings, submitted | At least 5 working days prior to Development Plan Hearing |

Table 3 Development Plan Process

## JUDICIAL JUDGING PROCESS

|  | Development Team | County | Time Allotted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative hearings before the Baltimore County Administrative Law Judge | Zoning relief or special hearings, if required, can be scheduled as part of the development plan hearing. | Scheduled if needed before the judge, who has final approval authority on development plans submitted for consideration The hearings are quasi-judicial and are held during the day at the government complex in Towson | The property is posted for 20 working days prior to the hearing. |
| Administrative Law Judge |  | Make a decision on the Development Plan or the Plan is deemed Approved | Within 15 days of the Hearing |
| Appeals | Both | Both | Within 30 days of final action |
| Notice of Appeal |  |  | 10 days of notice of the appeal |
| Board of Appeals Hearing |  |  | Not less than 45 days and no more than 60 days from final action |

Table 4 Judicial Judge Process

## ENTITLEMENT PROCESS CHANGE

It is important to comment that the County has changed its Entitlement policy over the years. The County Review Group (CRG) process was the process for reviewing and approving proposed development in Baltimore County between 1982 and 1992. The process consisted of a Developer submitting a concept plan to Baltimore County for consideration of approval. Within 10 days, a pre-CRG meeting was scheduled where the agencies of the County who review development, primarily the departments of planning, zoning, environmental protection and public works, provide written comments on the plan's general compliance with the development and other pertinent regulations. A CRG meeting was then scheduled approximately 10 days later where the Developer received written comments and a recommendation of approval or denial of the plan. At the CRG meeting citizen have the opportunity to provide testimony on the proposed development. The CRG is co-chaired by a representative of the Department of Planning and the Department of Public Works. Since March 1992, the only CRGs held are ones that are proposing material changes to the previously approved plan.

## ENTITLEMENT CONCERNS

It is important to mention that various players can extend any of these processes. For example, there may be problems if the public gives negative feedback about the project. If this happens, the plans will need to be revised and reviewed by the County. Another concern, the County may delay the process waiting on responses back from the Development Team. Furthermore, the County or the Public can object to the proposed development and a ruling will need to be made by the Judicial Judge on the matter. Depending on that outcome the process could be put back to earlier processing stage. The case study proformas for the subject property do not take into consideration undo delays for the project timeline/ schedule. However, there is not any anticipated Community or County opposition.

The Entitlement process is to be completed prior to the Developer applying for construction permits.

## PERMIT PROCESS

The Building Permit process in Baltimore County is reported to take three to six months from submission, through comments response to approvals. The entire process begins with an application filed at the County offices and all fees paid. Upon completion of application, the process begins.

Zoning does an initial review of the project for compliance with the Zoning Ordinance of Baltimore County before plans are submitted and will either give an approval at that time or accept the project for "filing only" and reserve approval pending the resolution of certain questions. In the case of a zoning violation, a zoning appeal would be required. A zoning appeal is a formal process heard before the Zoning Board on a specific scheduled date.

## PLANS EXAMINATION

The Department of Permits serves as the focal point for the plans review process. The plan sets are stamped and routed by way of a designated courier to the pertinent County departments. These departments include the Department of Public Works, the Health Department, the Planning Department, and the Fire Department.

Plans are reviewed and coordinated for each department. If revised plans are required, they must be brought to Plans Examining office, and then rerouted to the other departments.

There may be a fee associated with revised plans. Ultimately, the various departments will transmit their comments and approvals back to Plans Examining for the final site and construction plan set assembly and building permit fee assessment.

The Plans Examining reviews the construction plans for architectural, structural, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing code compliance. Each project is assigned an architectural/structural, an electrical, and a mechanical/plumbing plans examiner. The engineers and architects of Plans Examining work directly with the project design engineers and architects

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Within the Department of Public Works (DPW), there are 10 possible sections, which may need to review the project. A plans disseminator at DPW does a preliminary review of the job, puts the DPW stamps on the plan sets, and determines to which sections the plans must circulate.

The County has separate requirements for properties that are being redeveloped and the specifics will entail a more detailed investigation by the engineer. In summary, the requirement for constructing new stormwater storage volume accumulators and the various infrastructures that goes along with that is modified greatly. The amount of stormwater that the property must handle is also not as great as if the project were brand new. This should offer some additional cost savings as the project moves further.

The subject property disturbs more than 5,000 square feet of surface and is required to submit stormwater management and sediment and erosion control plans. After the project has circulated through the pertinent DPW sections, approved site plan sets are returned to Plans Examining.

Other permits or approvals, which may be required and are obtained directly from DPW include Developer's agreements, right of entry permits, easements, curb cuts, street closure permits, and utility agreements and permits.

## SUMMARY

- Purpose
o Redevelopment of the existing 72,324 sf. Self-Storage operation
o Propose to build 2 Class B Flex builds total 50,400 sf of space
- Plan of Action
o Prepare development strategies
o Prepare a feasibility study
- Entitle the property
o Concept Phase-4 months
o Development Phase-4 months
o Community input meeting
o Judicial Judge
- Secure permits
o site work and building construction - 6 months
- Close the Self-Storage Operation 3-months
- Construction
o Raze the buildings
o Site work
o Building construction
o Tenant Improvements
- Time frame from closing the Self-Storage operation thru $1^{\text {st }}$ moveins 2 years
- Concerns or Possible setbacks
o Entitlement delays
o Pubic rejection
o Design Problems Purpose
For a schedule of fees and additional engineering plats that are required, refer to page 133 in the Appendix
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## INTRODUCTION

The site is 5.313 acres. It is currently operating as a 72,324 sf Self-Storage business. The entire site is relatively level and appears to be sufficiently drained terrain. The majority of the area is paved with the exceptions of the buildings and the storm-water-management pond.

There are existing utilities that include public water and sewer, electrical power, natural gas, Comcast Cable, and telephone service.

As indicated by the engineer, offsite road improvements, such as road widening and sidewalks will not be required for the construction of the new buildings. They were completed in 1980 during the construction of the SelfStorage facility.

Figure 1 Philadelphia Road


Figure 2 Aerial View of Subject Property


Figure 3 Self-Storage Site Plan

## TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

The property is strategically located in Eastern Baltimore County Maryland with quick access to major interstates, the Port of Baltimore, airport and city. Map radius 1 mile, 5 miles, and 10 miles.


Figure 4 Aerial View 1, 510 Mile Radius

| Travel Distance |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 mile | Interstate 695 |
| 1 mile | Thterstate 95 |
| 7 miles | Baltimore City |
| 8 miles | Interstate 295 |
| 10 miles | BWI Airport |
| 14 miles | Washington D.C. |
| 40 miles |  |

## ACCESS \& EGRESS

The subject property is currently served by Philadelphia Road. A fence with a traffic gate currently secures the secondary entrance at the rear of the property on Yellow Brick Road. The front of the property runs 240 If along Philadelphia Road and the rear of the property runs 407 If along Yellow Brick Road.

Due to the heavy traffic on Philadelphia Road there is concern regarding vehicles turning left out of the property. It may be necessary to limit tractor-trailers exiting left from this entrance.


Figure 5 Access Egress


Figure 6 Traffic Pattern

## ZONING

The property is currently Zoned "ML" - Light Manufacturing this is the required zoning for a Flex Warehouse.

| Zoning ML |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Front <br> Building Setback | 50 ft front property <br> line on dual highway |
| Minimum Side <br> Setback | 30 ft |
| Minimum Rear <br> Setback | 30 ft |
| Floor Area Ratio | 2.0 |
| Height | Unlimited except <br> within 100 If of a <br> business or residential <br> zone then 3 stories or <br> 40 ft |
| Landscape Buffer | 25 ft of the perimeter <br> of the property |

Figure 8 ML Zoning Setback Requirements


Figure 7 Zoning Designation

The property is located within the Perry Hall-White Marsh Growth Area and the Philadelphia Road Corridor. The County Council adopted the Perry Hall-White Marsh Plan in 1985. The plan was set in place to provide convenient access to I-95 and I-695. The Philadelphia Road Corridor has been identified as a location for a wide variety of industrial use as well as other types of development. Since the majority of the area is developed, the 2020 Master Plan is amended to rename and relocate the boundaries of the plan "The Middle River Redevelopment Area

Refer to pages listed below for more detail:
Baltimore County Master Plan Page 136
Baltimore County Priority Funding Plan Page 137
White Mash Growth Area Plan Page 139

Baltimore County Demarcation Line Page 139

## NEIGHBORHOOD

The immediate surrounding neighborhood is mostly commercial use. The subject property is bordered to the north by industrial properties, to the east a hotel and warehouse, to the south offices and retail, and to west, across the street on Philadelphia Rd. is a vacant wooded lot. There are some multi-family apartments and single-family homes in the area.


Figure 98800 Philadelphia Road

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

As shown in this map the immediate area is mostly developed. There are a few scattered undeveloped parcels.

The parcel directly across from the subject property, known as 8800 Philadelphia Road is a wooded lot, 6.9 acres. University Boulevard LLC purchased the property in 2008 for $\$ 270,000$. The property is zoned DR 3.5 . It is now Listed with Prudential Properties for \$375,000. roughly $\$ 53,571$ an undeveloped acre, Nov 2011.

## ENVIRONMENTAL

As of this study, a phase 1 or 2 environmental study has not been completed. There are no identifiable wetlands, underground storage tanks, or chemicals of concern.


Figure 10 Water Body on Site

## WATER BODY

A stream runs along the southern border of the property. Protection of this stream may be required during development and therefore may delay construction. In 2009, the County required the Owner to shore up and rebuild the stormwater manage pond and the stream.

## EASEMENTS

Easements and other like requirements were made during the construction of the Self-Storage project. Further investigation is needed to determine if any additional county easements may be required.

Refer to the Existing Site Drawing on page 22 for the current easements
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## INTRODUCTION

Many features of the existing property enhance the proposed Flex-Warehouse, specifically, the zoning, offsite traffic improvements, the contour of the land, the traffic network, location and utility availability.

Much of the engineering "footwork" has been completed for the subject property and will need to be updated. It is anticipated that there will be some additional cost savings associated.

The existing 10-block building will be razed and the existing stormwater management pond will be abandoned.
The building specifications and the site specifications are such that they are not only of high quality they also are in line with the new competitive products as identified in the Market Survey on page 55

For a complete detail and itemized Development / Construction Cost, refer to pg. 68

## SITE SPECIFICATIONS

The flowing data are estimates of the square footage of the various aspects of the project. It is with that in mind the proposed site plan is drafted.
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## PARKING

Parking is a major marketing feature for Flex-Warehouses. The Baltimore County Zoning requirements are 3.3 spaces per 1,000 sf of rentable space. The Baltimore Market is four spaces per 1,000 sf rentable space. This project meets the market standard of four parking spots per 1,000 sf of leasing space. There is parking in the front of each building and in lots around the property.


Figure 12 Parking Calculation

## SHELL BUILDING

A Flex building is an industrial building designed to allow its occupants Flexibility of alternative uses of the space. The intended allowable business uses intended for these buildings are service center/showroom/ offices \& retail uses. The ratio between office space and warehouse spaces demand varies based on the tenant needs.

The building is a Class B Flex warehouse. To meet market standards the building highlights are - clear ceiling height of 16 ft at the eaves. Each 30 -foot bay will have its own loading dock with a roll up door. Leasing bays are 30 If wide and 120 If deep. Two of the bays are 45 ft wide and 120 ft deep.

The general specifications of the "The Shell" building s are a concrete slab floor, exterior building wall, exterior windows and glass storefront entry, roof on enclosed premises. It includes a pedestrian door at the rear of each bay, and has a loading dock.

Refer to page 68 for a complete line item estimate.

## TENANT IMPROVEMENT SPECIFICATIONS

Tenant fit out includes in the price a glass entry, carpet, paint graded walls, drop acoustical ceilings, florescent lighting, electrical power installed according to code, and data service brought to desk area. Meeting Room, glass entry, carpet, walls paint grade, ceilings, drop acoustical, florescent lighting, electrical power installed according to code, data service brought to specified area. Individual offices are a standard rated wood door, carpet; walls paint grade, drop acoustical ceilings, florescent lighting, electrical power installed according to code, and data service brought to desk area. Rest rooms - two with standard fixtures. Kitchenette with six If of builder grade cabinets, laminate counter top, sink and required electrical power as required by code. Computer Room is at an additional cost built to request. Additional work such as custom woodwork, lights etc., will be at extra cost to the tenant.


Figure 13 Proposed Site Plan Building Specifications

- Property Description, Existing Property
o Site
- 5.3 acres,
- relatively flat, well drained
- 10 buildings, one storm pond, mostly paved
- offsite road improvements completed in 1980
o Access \& Egress
- access good at main entry on Philadelphia Road
- Secondary entrance/ exit on Yellow Brick Road
o Transportation Network
- Very good quick and easy access to major interstates, cities, ports
o Zoning
- ML correct zoning for Flex use
o Neighborhood
- Properties are similar to subject
o Local Development
- Vacant lot 6.9 acres across Philadelphia Rd selling \$375,000
o Environmental
- No problems visibly
o Water Body
- Natural stream on the west side of the property
o Easements
- Majority resolved during construction in 1980
- Property Description, Proposed Property
- Site Plan
- 2 one story buildings Class B Flex
- 200 parking spaces, 4 per thousand sf of parking
- Shared truck port
- Cub side parking in front of each space
- Underground stormwater management
- Buildings
- Brick on block shell construction
- 16 ft clear ceilings
- Glass front entries
- Loading docks at rear
- Rental Bays 30 foot wide $\times 120$ foot deep
- Tenant Improvements
o Standard finishes
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## INTRODUCTION

This Market Analysis report has been prepared to determine if the property is suitable, both physically, financially, and competitively to support a Flex Warehouse project.

The report looks at the Industrial Market with a concentration on the Flex Market. It identifies such things as rental rates, vacancy rates, net absorption, sales, construction activity, inventory, construction specification, and trends.

The report is divided in three sections. First, it examines the macro market known as the, Baltimore Metro Area Industrial Market. Second, it analyzes the Sub Market, the Baltimore County East Industrial Market. Third, the report identifies comparative properties identified in this report as the Competitive Market.

The Competitive Market boundary definitions utilized in this report are as defined by CoStar and Colliers International.
Data referenced is from the published CoStar Midyear and Third Quarter reports for 2011. In addition, published reports by Colliers International for the Second Quarter, 2011 are referenced as well. Much of the data for the Flex Market and the Demographics are from the CoStar Analytic reports available on line.

Comments and opinions in the report include interviews with key industry professionals. Companies supplying information include representatives from St Johns Properties, Mt. Royal Management Company, and Colliers International. They include Owners, Property Managers, and Leasing Professionals.

It is important to point out that this study does not take into consideration other uses that may be suitable for this location such as retail space, warehousing, multi-family or office buildings.

## BALTIMORE METRO MARKET

The subject property is located in the Baltimore Metro Area Industrial Market, and the Submarket of Baltimore County East Industrial Market.


[^2]Figure 14 Baltimore Metro Industrial Market

## MARKET OVERVIEW

The report looks at the Industrial Market with a concentration on the Flex Market. It identifies such things as rental rates, vacancy rates, net absorption, sales, construction activity, inventory, construction specifications, and trends.

Reports indicate that the Baltimore Metro Area Industrial Market showed signs of a slowdown in the first half of 2011. This follows a relatively strong rebound in 2010 following the economic downturn.

The Baltimore Metro Flex projects reported a vacancy rate of at the end of the third quarter 2011@10.9\%, the end of the second quarter 2011 @ 11.5\%, the end of the first quarter 2011 @ $11.3 \%$, and at the end of the fourth quarter 2010 @ 11.4\%. (CoStar, 2011)

The Flex building market recorded net absorption of positive 309,696 square feet in the third quarter 2011, compared to negative $(18,807)$ square feet in the second quarter 2011, positive 36,847 in the first quarter 2011, and positive 42,364 in the fourth quarter 2010. (CoStar, 2011)

Overall, industrial new construction and deliveries remained low as builders continue to hold back on new projects during the slow economic recovery. However, there are reported future product deliveries of Flex space being developed by St. Johns Properties as part of a 1,000-acre mix use project of retail, industrial, and residential properties located in nearby White Marsh. There is also a new Flex project coming on line, an 18,000 sf Flex project on 7.9 acres of land project located in Perry Hall.

The charts and data to follow breakdown and quantify the specifications for the markets

| OTAL InDUS' | RIAL | ARKET | ATISTI |  |  |  |  | Third Quarter 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market | Existing Inventory |  | Vacancy |  |  | YID Net Absorption | YTD <br> Deliveries | Under | Quoted |
|  | \# Blds | Total RBA | Direct SF | Total SF | Vac \% |  |  | Const SF | Rates |
| Raltimore City Ind | 1.539 | 57.472088 | 4.575.300 | 5.064.015 | 8.8\% | (297.811) | 0 | 0 | \$4.40 |
| Baltimore County East Ind | 462 | 25,298,234 | 2,553,198 | 2,601,798 | 10.3\% | 129,818 | 30,000 | 0 | \$4.34 |
| Baltimore County West Ind | 432 | 21,248,572 | 1,853,826 | 1,917,906 | 9.0\% | $(265,946)$ | 0 | 211,600 | \$5.09 |
| Carroll County Ind | 194 | 8,621,920 | 819,172 | 819,172 | 9.5\% | 22,815 | 61,160 | 0 | \$5.01 |
| Cecil County Ind | 84 | 9,726,329 | 1,430,441 | 1,430,441 | 14.7\% | 184,695 | 0 | 0 | \$4.18 |
| Columbia Ind | 186 | 13,507,313 | 1,729,561 | 1,749,973 | 13.0\% | 334,998 | 0 | 0 | \$6.60 |
| Harford County Ind | 121 | 14,437,340 | 1,780,648 | 1,961,648 | 13.6\% | 101,621 | 0 | 0 | \$5.13 |
| Kent County Ind | 12 | 348,926 | 90,736 | 90,736 | 26.0\% | $(2,998)$ | 0 | 0 | \$4.41 |
| Queen Annes County Ind | 40 | 1,098,377 | 276,997 | 276,997 | 25.2\% | $(13,938)$ | 0 | 0 | \$6.45 |
| Route 1/BWI Area Ind | 704 | 47,447,821 | 6,572,822 | 6,686,366 | 14.1\% | 85,404 | 0 | 0 | \$5.84 |
| Route 2 Corridor Ind | 170 | 9,435,574 | 439,170 | 449,070 | 4.8\% | 65,205 | 0 | 0 | \$5.71 |
| Route 83 Corridor Ind | 229 | 11,057,226 | 496,729 | 508,889 | 4.6\% | 56,825 | 0 | 0 | \$7.83 |
| Southern Anne Arundel Ind | 221 | 5,132,640 | 319,174 | 323,429 | 6.3\% | 64,968 | 0 | 0 | \$12.82 |
| Totals | 4,394 | 224,832,361 | 22,937,774 | 23,880,440 | 10.6\% | 465,656 | 91,160 | 211,600 | \$5.43 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5 Total Industrial Market for the Baltimore Metro Area

| FLEX | ARK | STATIS |  |  |  |  |  |  | Third Quarter 2011 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Existing Inventory |  | Vacancy |  |  | Net Absorption | Deliveries |  | UC Inventory |  | Quoted <br> Rates |
|  | \# Bids | Total RBA | Direct SF | Total SF | Vac\% |  | \# Blds | Total RBA | \# Blds | Total RBA |  |
| 201139 | 1,299 | 47,934,795 | 5,074,391 | 5,216,128 | 10.9\% | 309,696 | 1 | 30,000 | 3 | 211,600 | \$10.12 |
| 201129 | 1,298 | 47,904,795 | 5,354,587 | 5,495,824 | 11.5\% | (18,807) | 1 | 61,160 | 4 | 241,600 | \$10.12 |
| 201119 | 1,297 | 47,843,635 | 5,236,587 | 5,415,857 | 11.3\% | 36,847 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 272,760 | \$10.13 |
| 2010 4q | 1,297 | 47,843,635 | 5,293,532 | 5,452,704 | 11.4\% | 42,364 | 1 | 51,120 | 1 | 61,160 | \$10.27 |
| 201039 | 1,296 | 47,792,515 | 5,289,004 | 5,443,948 | 11.4\% | (47,490) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 112,280 | \$10.41 |
| 201029 | 1,296 | 47,792,515 | 5,243,439 | 5,396,458 | 11.3\% | $(83,782)$ | 6 | 211,184 | 1 | 51,120 | \$10.74 |
| 201019 | 1,290 | 47,581,331 | 4,897,378 | 5,101,492 | 10.7\% | (220,962) | 0 | 0 | 7 | 262,304 | \$11.14 |
| 2009 | 1,290 | 47,581,331 | 4,633,273 | 4,880,530 | 10.3\% | $(322,694)$ | 8 | 283,640 | 7 | 262,304 | \$11.26 |
| 2008 | 1,283 | 47,445,471 | 4,200,681 | 4,421,976 | 9.3\% | 257,410 | 14 | 523,978 | 5 | 253,480 | \$11.51 |
| 2007 | 1,269 | 46,921,493 | 3,967,380 | 4,155,408 | 8.9\% | 530,803 | 17 | 754,000 | 12 | 526,778 | \$11.46 |
| 2006 | 1,252 | 46,167,493 | 3,815,322 | 3,932,211 | 8.5\% | 1,007,857 | 21 | 767,530 | 15 | 672,220 | \$11.62 |
| 2005 | 1,233 | 45,411,213 | 3,962,778 | 4,183,788 | 9.2\% | 1,038,507 | 19 | 603,656 | 11 | 522,522 | \$10.88 |
| 2004 | 1,215 | 44,817,685 | 4,210,050 | 4,628,767 | 10.3\% | 782,321 | 14 | 614,759 | 9 | 318,080 | \$10.13 |
| 2003 | 1,202 | 44,285,926 | 4,281,804 | 4,879,329 | 11.0\% | 171,495 | 12 | 422,640 | 6 | 236,200 | \$9.25 |
| 2002 | 1,190 | 43,863,286 | 4,042,278 | 4,628,184 | 10.6\% | 116,124 | 22 | 794,095 | 10 | 331,440 | \$8.20 |
| 2001 | 1,168 | 43,069,191 | 3,387,858 | 3,950,213 | 9.2\% | 239,956 | 29 | 1,259,002 | 18 | 666,977 | \$8.83 |

Figure 15 Baltimore Flex Market Statistic History (CoStar, 2011)

## VACANCY

Flex projects in the Baltimore Metro Market reported a vacancy rate of $10.9 \%$ at the end of the third quarter 2011, $11.5 \%$ at the end of the second quarter 2011, 11.3\% at the end of the first quarter 2011, and $11.4 \%$ at the end of the fourth quarter 2010. (CoStar, 2011)

Baltimore's Flex projects reported vacant sublease space of 141,737 square feet at the end of third quarter 2011, up from the 141,237 square feet reported at the end of the second quarter 2011. There were 179,270 square feet of sublease space vacant at the end of the first quarter 2011, and 159,172 square feet at the end of the fourth quarter 2010. (CoStar, 2011)

This may indicate the possibility that the overall Industrial Market may have approached its peak in terms of overall vacancy rates in 2010. In 2011 vacancy should remain steady or decline in the near future, as long as economic conditions remain stable, absorption remains steady, and new construction deliveries remains low.

Shown below is the fluctuation in the Industrial vacancy rates over the years in the Baltimore Metro area.

Vacancy Rates by Building Type 1994-2011


Figure 16 Baltimore Industrial Vacancy by Building Type

Vacancy by Building Type
Percent of All Vacant Space by Building Type


Figure 17 Baltimore Metro Vacancy by Type

## RENTAL RATES

The average quoted rate within the Flex sector was $\$ 10.12$ per square foot at the end of the third quarter 2011, while Warehouse rates stood at $\$ 4.60$. At the end of the second quarter 2011, Flex rates were $\$ 10.12$ per square foot, and Warehouse rates were $\$ 4.60$. Historical Flex rents show a decline of approximately $10 \%$ over the period 1 quarter 2010 to the period 2 quarter 2011. It appears now to be similar to the overall trend of the total Market. (CoStar, 2011)

## Historical Rental Rates

Based on Quoted Rental Rates


Source: Costay Propery (0)
Figure 18 Baltimore Metro Industrial Vacancy by Type
(CoStar, 2011)
Industrial Rental Rates Flex and Warehouse combined average

## Quoted Rental Rates

Historical Analysis, Flex and Warehouse


Source: CoStar Propetyo
Figure 19 Baltimore Metro Rental Rates


Figure 20 Baltimore Metro Flex Tenants by Size

Figure 21 Baltimore Metro Flex Tenants by Lease Expiration

## SALES INDUSTRIAL BUILDING

Sales Activity - Tallying industrial building sales of 15,000 square feet or larger, Baltimore industrial sales figures rose during the second quarter 2011 in terms of dollar volume compared to the first quarter of 2011 . In the second quarter, 12 industrial transactions closed with a total volume of $\$ 122,028,209$. The 12 buildings totaled $1,408,497$ square feet and the average price per square foot equated to $\$ 86.64$ per square foot. That compares to 11 transactions totaling $\$ 65,732,000$ in the first quarter. The total square footage was $1,698,483$ for an average price per square foot of $\$ 38.70$. Total year-to-date industrial building sales activity in 2011 is up compared to the previous year. In the first six months of 2011, the market saw 23 industrial sales transactions with a total volume of $\$ 187,760,209$. The price per square foot has averaged $\$ 60.43$ this year. In the first six months of 2010, the market posted 15 transactions with a total volume of $\$ 77,250,122$. The price per square foot averaged \$42.52.

Industrial Property Asking Price Index - Sale Trends

Asking Prices Industrial for Sale Baltimore, MD (S/SF)


|  | Oct 11 |  | ps. 3 mon |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | prior | Y-O-Y |  |
| $=$ State | $\$ 82.70$ | $-1.5 \%$ | $+0.4 \%$ |
| $=$ Metro | $\$ 78.98$ | $-3.4 \%$ | $-6.8 \%$ |

The average asking price for industrial properties in the metro area for the month was $\$ 78.98$ per square foot. This represents a decrease of $6.8 \%$ year-over-year as well as a decrease of $2 \%$ compared to the end of the third quarter of 2011. Asking prices for industrial properties are the lowest they have been in three years. The previous three-year low was $\$ 80.62$, set last month. The three-year high for asking prices was set in March 2009 at $\$ 96.48$.

Figure 22 Industrial Property Asking Price by LOOPNET
The Optimist Sales Index average of Two Highest Price/sF's and Two Lowest Cap Rates Per Quarter


[^3]Figure 23 Optimist Sales Index Baltimore Metro

## Flex Building Sales (price given)

| $v$ | Address | zip | County | Sales Company | Sales Contact | For Sale Price 7 | \$Price/SF | Sale status | Land(AC) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | 7941-7949 Corporate Dr | 21237 | Baltimore County | Cassidy Turley | Jarred Testa (410) 953-6683 | 8,378,390 | 145.00 | Active | 8.07 |
| $\square$ | 11620 Crossroads Cir | 21220 | Baltimore County | St. John-Properties | Jerry Wit (410) 369-1221 | 5,265,000 | 125.00 | Active | - |
| $\square$ | 806 Race Rd | 21221 | Baltimore County | Gold and Company, LLC | Mitch Gold (410) 578-1300 | 949,000 | 70.30 | Active | 2.38 |
| $\square$ | 7620 Llilian Holt Dr | 21237 | Baltimore County | Century 21 Horizon Realty, Inc, | Adrian Cox (410) 256-3800 | 798,000 | 316.67 | Active | 2.80 |

## Flex Sale

| Location | Submarket | Price | PSF | Building Size SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9145 Liberty Road | Carroll County | $\$ 7,250,000$ | $\$ 95.94$ | 76,360 sf |
| 7519 Solley Road | Annapolis | $\$ 5,650,000$ | $\$ 97.41$ | $58,000 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| 9472-9494 Deereco Road | 1-83 Corridor | $\$ 4,155,000$ | $\$ 103.48$ | $40,151 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| 6798 Oak Hall Lane <br> (Unit A - Condo) | Columbia | $\$ 819,540$ | $\$ 142.90$ | $5,735 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| 2014 Renard Court <br> (Unit F - Condo) | Annapolis | $\$ 233,250$ | $\$ 186.60$ | $1,250 \mathrm{sf}$ |

http://www.mackenziecommercial.com/marketreport/_media/downloads/2011/QTR3/Industrial_Q3_2011_Overview.pdf

## Sales Analysis by Building Size

Based on Industrial Bldg Sales From July 2010 - June 2011

| Bldg Size | \# | RBA |  | Volume | Price/SF | Cap Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<25,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | 31 | 308,196 | $\$$ | 32,919,290 | \$ 106.81 | - |
| 25K-99K SF | 28 | 1,417,314 | \$ | 81,774,909 | \$ 57.70 |  |
| $100 \mathrm{~K}-249 \mathrm{~K}$ SF | 7 | 1,011,087 | \$ | 78,015,000 | \$ 77.16 | 7.90\% |
| >250k SF | 7 | 3,065,108 | \$ | 154,040,000 | \$ 50.26 | 7.69\% |

Figure 24 Baltimore Metro Sales Index

| RealtgRates.com MARKET SURYEY - 4th Quarter 2011Nationvide - Class A \& B Industrial Buildings |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3rd Q11 |  | 2nd Q11 |  | \% Change |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{Y H} \\ & \text { Dist } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flez } \\ & \text { Rta } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VH } \\ & \text { Dist } \end{aligned}$ | Flez <br> R*ㅁ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VH } \\ & \text { Dist } \end{aligned}$ | Flez <br> Rt.D |
| Operating Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asking Rent | \$4.39 | \$8.53 | \$4.46 | \$8.66 | -1.7\% | -1.5\% |
| Effective Rent | \$4.00 | \$7.74 | \$4.07 | \$7.87 | -1.8\% | -1.6\% |
| Reimbur sable Exp. | \$1.89 | \$4.15 | \$1.87 | \$4.11 | 1.0\% | 1.0\% |
| Total lncome | \$5.89 | \$11.89 | \$5.94 | \$11.98 | -0.9\% | -0.7\% |
| Vacancy Rate | 10.8\% | 11.3\% | 10.6\% | 11.3\% | 1.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Effective Gross Income (EGl) | \$5.25 | \$10.55 | \$5.31 | \$10.63 | -1.0\% | -0.7\% |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Expenses | \$2.00 | \$4.40 | \$1.98 | \$4.35 | 1.0\% | 1.0\% |
| Expense Ratio | 38.07\% | 41.65\% | 37.31\% | 40.96\% | 2.1\% | 1.7\% |
| Net Operating Income (NOI) | \$3.25 | \$6.16 | \$3.33 | \$6.28 | -2.3\% | -1.9\% |
| Investment Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg Sale Price | \$34 |  | \$34 | \$66 | -1.0\% | -1.3\% |
| Overall Cap. Rate [OAR] | 9.6\% | 9.5\% | 9.7\% | 9.5\% | -1.2\% | -0.6\% |
| Gross Rent Multiplier [GRM) | 8.47 | 8.41 | 8.41 | 8.38 | 0.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Effective Gross Income Multiplier [EGIM) | 6.44 | 6.17 | 6.44 | 6.20 | 0.0\% | -0.6\% |

## CAP RATES

Industrial buildings Cap rates have been lower in 2011, averaging 7.49\%, compared to the first six months of last year when they averaged 7.91\%. (CoStar, 2011) Reality Rates report Flex CAP rates Nation Wide @ $9.5 \%$ and a recent report from Integra Realty Resources report the Baltimore Flex CAP rate @ 8.5\%

| RealtgRates.com INVESTOR SURVEY - 4th Quarter 2011CURRENT \& HISTORICAL CAP RATE INDICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Method-Veighted* Property Category Indices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Apts |  | Golf |  | Healthcare Senior Housing |  | Industrial |  | Lodging |  | MHRV <br> Park |  | Office |  | Retail |  | Restaurant |  | Self Storage |  | Special Purpose |  | Veighted* <br> Composite <br> Indices |  |
|  | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ | Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BP } \\ & \text { Chg } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2011 | 8.62 |  | 11.38 |  | 9.32 |  | 9.54 |  | 10.85 |  | 9.48 |  | 9.39 |  | 9.28 |  | 11.64 |  | 10.8 |  | 11.12 |  | 983 |  |
| 3rdQu. | 8.28 | . 39 | 11.78 | -14 | 9.07 | . 24 | 9.32 | . 20 | 10.44 | . 49 | 9.09 | -47 | 9.33 | 3 | 9.11 | -11 | 11.47 | . 13 | 10.50 | . 39 | 10.96 | -13 | 9.60 | . 23 |
| 2nd Qut. | 8.67 | -22 | 11.92 | . 30 | 9.31 | -31 | 9.53 | . 8 | 10.93 | -12 | 9.56 | 1 | 9.31 | . 23 | 9.23 | -31 | 11.80 | . 24 | 10.88 | 17 | 11.09 | -21 | 9.82 | -188 |
| 1 st Qu . | 8.91 | 30 | 12.18 | 30 | 9.57 | 12 | 9.76 | 32 | 11.17 | 39 | 9.80 | 35 | 9.54 | 6 | 9.50 | 13 | 1185 | 16 | 11.14 | 56 | 11.32 | 28 | 10.07 | 25 |
| 2010 | 8.89 | 4 | 12.22 | 5 | 9.62 | 15 | 9.60 | 12 | 11.05 | 7 | 9.55 | 22 | 9.54 | 16 | 9.54 | 25 | 11.84 | 12 | 10.72 | 21 | 11.30 | 0 | 10.00 | 13 |
| 2009 | 8.85 | 8 | 12.17 | 16 | 9.47 | 10 | 9.48 | 10 | 10.98 | . 7 | 9.33 | 1 | 9.38 | 29 | 9.29 | 20 | 11.72 | 15 | 10.50 | 37 | 11.30 | 8 | 9.87 | 14 |
| 2008 | 8.77 | 4 | 12.01 | 29 | 9.37 | -16 | 9.38 | -14 | 11.05 | 56 | 9.32 | -5 | 9.09 | -16 | 9.09 | -11 | 11.57 | -28 | 10.13 | 20 | 11.22 | .7 | 9.74 |  |
| 2007 | 281 | . 45 | 1172 | -21 | 9.53 | -65 | 9.52 | . 25 | 10.49 | -28 | 9.37 | . 26 | 9.25 | . 47 | 9.20 | -12 | 1185 | 61 | 9.93 | . 38 | 11.29 | -24 | 9.75 | .28 |
| 2006 | 9.26 | 12 | 11.93 | 47 | 10.18 | 15 | 9.77 | 35 | 10.77 | 27 | 9.63 | 41 | 9.72 | 26 | 9.32 | 30 | 1124 | 18 | 10.31 | 27 | 11.53 | 9 | 10.03 | 26 |
| 2005 | 9.14 | 14 | 11.46 | 80 | 10.03 | -18 | 9.42 | . 30 | 10.50 | -21 | 9.22 | 19 | 9.46 | 6 | 9.02 | 16 | 1106 | 5 | 10.04 | 13 | 11.44 | -30 | 9.77 | 2 |
| 2004 | 9.00 | -19 | 10.66 | 28 | 10.19 | -37 | 9.72 | 19 | 10.71 | . 98 | 9.03 | -48 | 9.40 | . 4 | 8.86 | -19 | 11.01 | -15 | 9.91 | -13 | 11.74 | -30 | 9.75 | -19 |
| 2003 | 9.19 | . 2 | 10.38 | . 32 | 10.56 | 64 | 9.53 | 33 | 11.69 | 56 | 9.51 | -11 | 9.44 | 1 | 9.05 | -18 | 11.16 | 8 | 10.04 | . 53 | 12.04 | 105 | 9.94 | 12 |
| 2002 | 9.21 | -40 | 10.70 | 18 | 9.92 | . 39 | 9.20 | -61 | 11.13 | 26 | 9.62 | -60 | 9.43 | . 35 | 9.23 | -62 | 1108 | -3 | 10.57 | -12 | 10.99 | -177 | 9.82 | -41 |
| 2001 | 9.61 | 64 | 10.52 | 133 | 10.31 | 90 | 9.81 | 16 | 10.87 | 98 | 10.22 | -68 | 9.78 | . 35 | 9.85 | -53 | 11.11 | 47 | 10.69 | 13 | 12.76 | 32 | 10.23 | 21 |
| 2000 | 8.97 |  | 9.19 |  | 3.41 |  | 9.65 |  | 9.89 |  | 10.90 |  | 10.13 |  | 10.38 |  | 10.64 |  | 10.56 |  | 12.44 |  | 10.01 |  |
| - Veighted by methodology: Band-of-Inves <br> - Further weighted by property oategory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## U.S. Cap Rate Comparison

Based on Industrial Building Sales of 15,000 SF and Larger


[^4]
## INVENTORY

The Flex sector consisted of 47,934,795 square feet in 1,299 projects. The Warehouse sector consisted of 176,897,566 square feet in 3,095 buildings. Within the Industrial market there were 456 Owner-occupied buildings accounting for $41,595,095$ square feet of Industrial space. (CoStar, 2011)

## Existing Inventory Comparison

Based on Total RBA
By Building Type
By Tenancy Type



DFlex DWarehouse
-Multi - Single

Source: Colar Propertyo

Figure 25 Baltimore Metro Building Inventory Comparisons

## SUMMARY

- Subject property Market Area
o Baltimore Metro Industrial Market
o Baltimore County East Industrial Submarket
- Study focuses on Flex Market
- Sources of data used for reference
o CoStar Midyear Industrial Report Baltimore Metro
o Colliers International Midyear report Baltimore Metro Industrial
o CoStar Analytics focusing on the Baltimore County East Industrial Market Flex Space
o Interview with industry professionals
- Baltimore Metro Flex Market

0 1,299 Buildings
o 47.9 million rentable are
o YTD absorption 409,696 sf

- Vacancy

0 in Flex Market is higher that the Warehouse market
o Vacancy has increased from 8\% in 2009 to $10.9 \% 3^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter 2011
o Vacancy low in 2006 with a $8.5 \%$ rate
0 Since quarter 1 in 20110 in the low $\$ 10$. Psf range

- Rental Rates
o Quoted average rental rate $\$ 10.12$ psf $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter 2011
0 Rental rates in $1^{\text {st }}$ quarter 2009 approximately $\$ 11.26$ psf
o Rents continue to show a steady decline year after year
- Tenant type
o $30 \%$ of the Flex market is in rental spaces 2,499 sf or less
o $19.8 \%$ of the lease expire in 2012
O 2015 14.2\% of the existing Flex Leases expire
- Sales
o Flex building sales increasing in Metro Area approximately $\$ 98.00 \mathrm{psf}$
- CAP Rates
o CoStar Industrial properties 7.5\%
o Realty Rates. Com report a 9.5\% rate for Flex product
o Integra Realty repots the Flex rate @ 8.5\%
0 (Self-Storage @ 10.84\%)


## Market overview, Baltimore County East

- Flex Market data Baltimore County East Industrial
- CoStar Analytics Baltimore County East Flex Market
- Availability Analysis, Baltimore County East Flex
- Absorption \& Leasing Activity, Baltimore County East Flex
- History, Baltimore County East Flex
- Vacancy Rate, Baltimore County East Flex
- Rental Rate, Baltimore County East Flex


## INTRODUCTION

The Baltimore County East Submarket encompasses the northeast and southeast portions of Baltimore City as well as the eastern portion of Baltimore County. The submarket is geographically defined by the boundaries of I-695, I-95, the Ports of Baltimore and 183

Industrial buildings in this submarket include bulk storage, warehouse, and Flex Buildings used for industrial purposes. The submarket's proximity to the ports of Baltimore and I-95 has made it a very successful and strong place for industrial use buildings for many years. This area is historically one of the strongest and most stable in the region and includes 828 buildings and just less than 56,000,000 square feet of industrial use space. The Flex Market in this Submarket includes approximately 3.8 million sf., vacancy is reported in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter 2011 @ $13.6 \%$ and the average rent is quoted @ $\$ 8.06$ psf.


Baltimore County East Office Submarket
Copyright \$1997-2009 CoStar Realty Information, Inc. All rights reserved

Figure 26 Baltimore County East Industrial Submarket
(CoStar, 2011)

| FLEX SUBMARKET STATISTICS |
| :--- |
| \begin{tabular}{\|l|r|r|r|r|r|r|r|r|r|r|}
\hline
\end{tabular} |
| Market |

Figure 27 Baltimore County East Flex Market Statistics

## FLEX MARKET DATA

## BALTIMORE COUNTY EAST MARKET

Deliveries, Absorption \& Vacancy historical analysis, Flex and warehouse


Source: Costar Property

Figure 28 Baltimore County East Delivery, Absorb, and Vacancy
(CoStar, 2011)

The follow data is from the CoStar online analytics program. The Flex Buildings that are in the Costar charts and reports have been tallied into one report for further review.

Overview of the Flex Space Baltimore County East Industrial Submarket


Figure 29 Baltimore East Flex Market Overview
AVAILABILITY ANALYSIS


Figure 30 Baltimore County East Flex Market Availability Analysis


Figure 31 Baltimore County East Flex Market Absorb, \& Leasing Activity

## HISTORY

| Historical Timeline |  |  | Detailed Overview - 3 Years $\square_{\text {peering }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | export |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Total |  | Existing Inventory |  |  |  |  |  | Existing Inventory |  |  |  |  |  | Existing Inventory |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | SF Vacant Ava |  |  | lable \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | SF |  |  |  |  |  |  | SF |  |  | \% |  |  |
|  |  |  | Direct | Sublet | Total | Direct | s iblet | Total | Direct | Sublet | Total | Direct | Sublet | Total | Direct | Sublet | Total | Direct | Sublet | Total |
| QTD | 132 | 3,790,820 |  |  |  | 540,058 | 0 | 540,05 8 | 14.2\% | 9.0\% | 14.2\% | 651,983 | 27,600 | 679,583 | 17.2\% | 0.7\% | 17.9\% | 518,240 | 0 | 518,240 | 13.7\% | 0.0\% | 13.79 |
| 2011 3Q | 132 | 3,790,820 | 528,661 | 0 | 528,661 | 13.9\% | 0.0\% | 13.9\% | 644,094 | 0 | 644,094 | 17.0\% | 0.0\% | 17.0\% | 522,324 | 0 | 522,324 | 13.8\% | 0.0\% | 13.89 |
| 2011 2Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 549,030 | 0 | 549,030 | 14.6\% | 0.0\% | 14.6\% | 675,305 | 0 | 675,305 | 18.0\% | 0.0\% | 18.0\% | 499,843 | 0 | 499,843 | 13.3\% | 0.0\% | 13.39 |
| 2011 1Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 517,636 | 0 | 517,636 | 13.8\% | 0.0\% | 13.8\% | 731,097 | 0 | 731,097 | 19.4\% | 0.0\% | 19.4\% | 503,476 | 0 | 503,476 | 13.4\% | 0.0\% | 13.49 |
| 2010 4Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 485,663 | 0 | 485,663 | 12.9\% | 0.0\% | 12.9\% | 705,775 | 1,800 | 707,575 | 18.8\% | 0.0\% | 18.8\% | 465,255 | 0 | 465,255 | 12.4\% | 0.0\% | 12.49 |
| 2010 3Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 428,342 | 0 | 428,342 | 11.4\% | 0.0\% | 11.4\% | 623,608 | 1,800 | 625,408 | 16.6\% | 0.0\% | 16.6\% | 418,799 | 0 | 418,799 | 11.1\% | 0.0\% | 11.19 |
| 2010 2Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 424,445 | 0 | 424,445 | 11.3\% | 0.0\% | 11.3\% | 640,660 | 0 | 640,660 | 17.0\% | 0.0\% | 17.0\% | 391,295 | 0 | 391,295 | 10.4\% | 0.0\% | 10.49 |
| 2010 1Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 462,571 | 0 | 462,571 | 12.3\% | 0.0\% | 12.3\% | 661,592 | 0 | 661,592 | 17.6\% | 0.0\% | 17.6\% | 437,450 | 0 | 437,450 | 11.6\% | 0.0\% | 11.6\% |
| 2009 4Q | 131 | 3,760,820 | 425,480 | 0 | 425,480 | 11.3\% | 0.0\% | 11.3\% | 646,359 | 0 | 646,359 | 17.2\% | 0.0\% | 17.2\% | 421,530 | 0 | 421,530 | 11.2\% | 0.0\% | 11.29 |
| 2009 3Q | 130 | 3,740,820 | 384,924 | 0 | 384,924 | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 540,172 | 0 | 540,172 | 14.4\% | 0.0\% | 14.4\% | 384,924 | 0 | 384,924 | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 10.39 |
| 2009 2Q | 130 | 3,740,820 | 370,312 | 4,648 | 374,960 | 9.9\% | 0.1\% | 10.0\% | 592,812 | 4,648 | 597,460 | 15.8\% | 0.1\% | 16.0\% | 357,775 | 4,648 | 362,423 | 9.6\% | 0.1\% | 9.79 |
| 2009 1Q | 129 | 3,730,225 | 261,121 | 0 | 261,121 | 7.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.0\% | 513,567 | 0 | 513,567 | 13.8\% | 0.0\% | 13.8\% | 258,021 | 0 | 258,021 | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 6.99 |

Figure 32 Baltimore County East Flex Market History


Figure 33 Baltimore County East Market History 2


Figure 34 Baltimore County East Flex Market Vacancy History
RENTAL RATE


Figure 35 Baltimore County East Flex Market Rental Rates

## SUMMARY

Baltimore County East Industrial Submarket

- Baltimore Metro Flex Market

O 129 Buildings
o 3.75 million rentable are
o YTD absorption negative

- Vacancy
o CoStar $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter 2011 @ $14 \%$
o CoStar Analytics 14.2\%
o $20091^{\text {st }}$ quarter vacancy $7 \%$ now $14 \%$
- Rental Rates
o Quoted average rental rate $\$ 8.06$ psf $_{3}{ }^{\text {rd }}$ quarter 2011
0 CoStar Analytics range from $\$ 6.84$ to $\$ 11.12$ average
$01^{\text {st }}$ quarter 2009 @ $\$ 10.50$ psf today $\$ 7.35$ psf
- Lease Types
o $20 \%$ of leases are NNN
o $63 \%$ list negotiable, most likely NNN
- Time on the market
o CoStar analytics has $28 \%$ of the space has been on the market over 22 months


## COMPETITIVE MARKET ANALYSIS

- Competitive Market
- Competitive Analysis
- Competitive Market Comparison Chart
- Competitive Market Property Summary Detail
- Competitive Market Property Details
- Tenants:
- Competitive Market Summary

The Baltimore County East Flex Market is very competitive. This competition has been created by what appears to be very little demand for the current availability. This in turn caused a reported $14 \%$ vacancy rate, which in turn has forced down rental rates from a high of $\$ 10.50$ psf average in $Q_{3} 2009$ to less than an average $\$ 8.00$ psf average in $Q_{3} 2011$.

Due to the various negative impacts on the Real Estate market in this area, very few new Flex projects have been brought on to the market other than the two mentioned St Johns Properties has the most notable new project known as the Crossroads @ 95. This is a mix use project located on 1,000 acres and it includes 680,000 sf of Flex space that is in various stages of development. This property along with another new project located at 4205 Forge Rd. Perry Hall, an 18,000 sf. Flex project on 7.9 acres of land, is most likely to be the most direct competitors of the subject property.

There is approximately 3.8 million sf. of rentable space in the submarket. The properties that have been selected for the competitive market analysis are properties for which the most current data could be obtained.

Very few projects have been built in this market over the last several years the age of the competitive properties range from 10 to 33 years old. The projects rentable square feet range from $20,000 \mathrm{sf}$. building to $81,000 \mathrm{sf}$. The construction is similar, brick on block and glass storefront entries.

Several notable construction specifications are identified in the Baltimore East Industrial Flex market as well as the Competitive market. Ceiling heights are in the 14 ft . to 19 ft . range with the majority of the projects at 16 ft . range. Most projects have either a drive-in door and or a loading dock in each bay. The average drive-in door measures 10 ft . x 12 ft . in height. Only a few select properties identified the loading docks as having levelers for unloading freight. The amount of office space to warehouse was not available for the projects. However, a St. John Property leasing person stated that most Flex projects in the Crossroads project are being planned to be made up of approximately 40 to 50 percent of the overall space for office use.

Another notable amenity not only with the competitive projects but also in all most all of the Baltimore County East Flex market was the parking ratio. The majority of the listings show a parking ratio of four spaces per 1,000 sf. The newer projects average four spaces per 1,000 sf. and the majority of the existing projects also average four spots per 1,000. Some existing projects offer anywhere from 1.5 spaces per thousand to 4.5 spaces per 1,000. The County zoning requirements for the subject property is 3.3 spots per 1,000.

The average sf. rent for the newer space is quoted at $\$ 12.00 \mathrm{psf}$. for the office and $\$ 9.50 \mathrm{psf}$. for the warehouse space. The leases for the comparable properties are all triple net

Most lease terms with regard to the length of the contract vary however, five-year lease terms appear to be the market norm at this time.


Figure 36 Competitive Market


Figure 37 Competitive Market Comparison Chart

| Address |  | Total SF Avail Building Type | RBA <br> Land Area | Ceiling Ht Stories | Drive Ins Docks | Sprinklers Crane | Power Rail Line | Parking Expenses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1) 7900-7998 E Baltimore St / Canton Industrial Park, Eastpoint Business Center <br> Dundalk, MD 21224 <br> For Sale Info: <br> Leasing Co Info: <br> CBRE 4,277 (s |  | $4,277 \mathrm{SF}$ <br> Class B Flex | $\begin{aligned} & 81,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ & 5.81 \mathrm{AC} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19-10^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{w} \mathrm{x} \\ & 12^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{h} \\ & 12 \text { ext } \end{aligned}$ | Wet <br> None | None | 145 free Surface Spaces are available; Ratio of $1.72 / 1,000 \mathrm{SF}$ 2008 Combined Tax/Ops @ \$1.25/sf |
|  | 4321 Fitch Ave <br> Nottingham, MD 21236 <br> For Sale Info: <br> Leasing Co Info: | $25,000 \mathrm{SF}$ <br> Class B Flex <br> ealty, LLC 25,000 1-5568×2 / D. M | $\begin{aligned} & 25,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ & 5.80 \mathrm{AC} \\ & \\ & \text { st space: } 25,0 \\ & \text { Smith } 443-330 \end{aligned}$ | 1 <br> max contig: 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{w} \mathrm{x} \\ & 12^{2} 0^{\prime h} \mathrm{~h} \\ & 2 \mathrm{ext} \end{aligned}$ <br> Direct 30 Days | None <br> \$6.75/nnn | None <br> Richard F. | 70 free Surface Spaces are available 2009 Tax @ \$1.07/sf <br> Jr., SIOR 443-330-4801 / Paul F. |
|  | 8907-8909 Kelso Dr / Pulaski Industrial Park, Automatic Sprinkler BIdg Essex, MD 21221 <br> For Sale Info: <br> Leasing Co Info: Trout Daniel \& As | 9,491 SF Class B Flex <br> sociates 9,491 (s | $\begin{aligned} & 9,491 \mathrm{SF} \\ & 1.59 \mathrm{AC} \end{aligned}$ | $20^{\prime \prime} 0^{\prime \prime}$ <br> 1 <br> contig: 9,491 | $\begin{aligned} & 2-10^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} w x \\ & 12^{\prime} 0^{\prime h} \\ & \text { None } \\ & \text { t 03/2012 nego } \end{aligned}$ | None <br> le - / Matt | 220a 3p <br> None <br> elnick 410-4 | 20 Surface Spaces are available; Ratio of $2.62 / 1,000 \mathrm{SF}$ 2008 Tax @ \$0.88/sf <br> 04×244 / Wendy Adams |
|  | 1116 Middle River Rd / Hidden Grove Bus Park, Hidden Grove Bus Park <br> Rossville, MD 21220 <br> For Sale Info: <br> Leasing Co Info: Jones Lang LaSa | 27,600 SF Class B Flex <br> le 27,600 (smalle | $\begin{aligned} & 76,800 \mathrm{SF} \\ & 15.99 \mathrm{AC} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1 \\ & \\ & : 27,600) \mathrm{Su} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{w} \mathrm{x} \\ & 12^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime h} \\ & 4 \mathrm{ext} \end{aligned}$ <br> Days negotiab | None <br> Todd C. | None | 225 free Surface Spaces are available 2008 Combined Tax/Ops @ \$1.90/sf |
|  | 9629 Philadelphia Rd / Enterprise Business Park <br> White Marsh, MD 21237 <br> For Sale Info: <br> Leasing Co Info: <br> ABG Enterprises, | $2,900 \mathrm{SF}$ <br> Class B Flex <br> LLC 2,900 (smal | $\begin{aligned} & 20,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ & 1.69 \mathrm{AC} \\ & \mathrm{e}: 2,900 / \mathrm{ma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1 \\ & \\ & \text { ig: } 2,900 \text { ) Dir } \end{aligned}$ | 5-12'0"w x $14^{\prime \prime} 0^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{h}$ <br> None <br> cant @ \$11.75 | None | None | 90 Surface Spaces are available 2008 Tax @ \$0.70/sf |
|  | 806 Race Rd  <br> Essex, MD 21221  <br> For Sale Info: For Sale at \$949, <br> Gold and Compa <br> Gold and Compa | 13,500 SF Class B Flex <br> 000 (\$70.30/SF) y, LLC: Mitch Go <br> y, LLC 13,500 (s | $\begin{aligned} & 13,500 \mathrm{SF} \\ & 2.38 \mathrm{AC} \\ & 578-1300 \times 1 \text {, } \\ & \text { pace: } 1,500 / \end{aligned}$ | 1 <br> hivers (410) <br> contig: 13,50 | 1 <br> None <br> $00 \times 2$ <br> ct 30 Days @ | 0/nnn - / M | None <br> Gold 410 | 20 free Surface Spaces are available; Ratio of $1.48 / 1,000 \mathrm{SF}$ 2004 Est Tax @ \$0.40/sf <br> 1300x1 / Jim Chivers 410-578-1300x2 |

## 7900-7998 E Baltimore St - Canton Industrial Park



## 4321 Fitch Ave



## 9629 Philadelphia Rd - Enterprise Business Park



## 7830-7850 Rossville Blvd





LT Personal Training, Inc © $\square$
7830-7850 Rossville Blyd
Rossville Center
AKA 4425 Fitch Ave/SE Corner


Baltimore, MD 21236


rimafy contact information bul
Best Leasing Contact:




The listing for Crossroads is to identify the sf. of future availability in addition to using one of the 40,000 sf buildings as a competitive product.

This space is located in a master-planned, mixed-use community of 1,000 acres. Located on Maryland Rt. 43 between U.S. Rt. 40 and Eastern Blvd. Tenant size from 2,520 to 42,120 sq. ft. it offers businesses economical and high-utility space in a campus-like business environment The total project consist of 680,000 sf. of Flex space.


Forge Road is not use in the competitive analysis.
It is reported that the asking rent for Flex space in this project is \$16 psf. NNN

## TENANTS

The competitive market listed the following types of tenants and rents. The tenant mix consists of manufacturing companies, personal service offices, retailers and wholesalers of various products. The tenants also include a children's gym, a computer service company, and an insurance agent office. The rents existing tenants pay range from $\$ 5.50 \mathrm{psf}$ for manufacturing to $\$ 24.00 \mathrm{psf}$. for a children's play gym.

The identifiable asking rents for some of the tenants are as follows:

| Industry | \# Employees | SF . Occupied | Lease Terms | Reported Rent psf .. NNN | Current Asking <br> Rent psf.. <br> NNN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Machine service company | 8 | 3,750 |  | \$5.60 | \$5.50 |
| Document Printing | 40 | 4,000 |  | \$7.70 | \$6.75 |
| Design Company | n/a | 1,562 |  | \$15.00 | \$12.79 |
| Gymboree | n/a | 2,242 |  | \$24.00 | \$12.79 |
| Karate Studio |  | 1,150 | 3 years | \$10.30 | \$12.79 |
| Personal Training | n/a | 1,375 | 5 years | \$14.00 | \$12.79 |
| Manufacturing Company | 15 | 5,280 |  | \$5.50 | \$5.00 |

## Competitive Market summary

o Properties selected from the Baltimore County East Industrial Market
o Market very competitive
o 6 properties selected

- Size range 25 to 80,000 sf
- Building age from 33 years old to new
- Lease all NNN
- Rents average range from $\$ 4.50$ to $\$ 12.00 \mathrm{psf}$
- Lease terms are negotiable
- Building construction brick on block, one story
- All sprinkler and all utilities
- Tenant types
- Offices rents $\$ 12$ to $\$ 13$ psf,
- Children's gym $\$ 13$ psf
- Printing service $\$ 7.75$ psf
- Manufacturing Company $\$ 5.00 \mathrm{psf}$
o 2 new projects coming on line
- St Johns Crossroads @ 95
- various sizes available
- 110,000 sf project
- $\quad \$ 12$ psf NNN rents
- Forge Rd,
- 18,000 sf
- $\quad \$ 16$ psf NNN rents


## PROJECT COST

- Introduction

Site Construction Hard Cost

- Development Soft Cost
- Engineering
- Architect
- Attorney Fees
- Site Development Hard Cost
- Site Construction Estimates
- Building Construction Estimates
- Tenant Improvement Cost
- Summary


## PROJECT COST, INTRODUCTION

The following estimates are to redevelop the subject property currently operating as a $72,324 \mathrm{sf}$. Self-Storage facility. The cost estimates are to meet the requirements of the development program to raze the existing buildings, scrape the site, and construct two buildings for 50,400 sf. Class B Flex Warehouse. The development cost is estimates provided by local professionals in their respective fields. (Refer to the breakdown and definitions of the budget Line items below)

The summary of estimated costs for the project:

| Development Costs | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total | 50,400 Building Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hard/Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Total Hard/Construction Costs | $\$ 1,826,820$ | $\$ 2,875,000$ | $\$ 4,701,820$ | $\$ 93.29$ PSF |
| Total Soft/Development Costs | $\$ 329,352$ | $\$ 184,730$ | $\$ 514,082$ | $\$ 10.20$ PSF |
| Total Development Costs | $\$ 2,156,172$ | $\$ 3,059,730$ | $\$ 5,215,902$ | $\$ 103.49$ PSF |
| Land Value | $\$ 125,000$ | an acre | $\$ 662,500$ |  |
| Total Project Cost with Land |  |  | $\$ 5,878,402$ | $\$ 116.63$ PSF |

Figure 38 Summary of Total Development Cost

## SITE \& BUILDING CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATES

| Development Costs | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total | 50,400 | Building Siz |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard/Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demolition | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$500,000 | \$9.92 | PSF |
| Earth work \& Sed Control | \$200,000 | \$25,000 | \$225,000 | \$4.46 | PSF |
| SWM | \$400,000 | \$350,000 | \$750,000 | \$14.88 | PSF |
| Storm Drain \& Utilities | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$400,000 | \$7.94 | PSF |
| On Site Paving | \$300,000 | \$50,000 | \$350,000 | \$6.94 | PSF |
| Construction of Yellow Shell | \$446,856 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,446,856 | \$28.71 | PSF |
| Construction of Phil | \$29,964 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,029,964 | \$20.44 | PSF |
| Total Hard/Construction Costs | \$1,826,820 | \$2,875,000 | \$4,701,820 | \$93.29 | PSF |
| Soft/Development Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permits | \$6,832 |  | \$6,832 | \$0.14 | PSF |
| Architectural | \$100,000 | \$26,000 | \$126,000 | \$2.50 | PSF |
| Eng, Geo, Traffic, Enviro | \$110,000 | \$16,000 | \$126,000 | \$2.50 | PSF |
| Legal | \$15,000 | \$5,000 | \$20,000 | \$0.40 | PSF |
| Marketing During Construction | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$20,000 | \$0.40 | PSF |
| Appraisal |  |  | \$0 | \$0.00 | PSF |
| Taxes | \$22,835 | \$35,938 | \$58,773 | \$1.17 | PSF |
| Construction Contingency | \$18,268 | \$28,750 | \$47,018 | \$0.93 | PSF |
| Dev Contingency | \$3,294 | \$1,847 | \$5,141 | \$0.10 | PSF |
| Developer Fee | \$43,123 | \$61,195 | \$104,318 | \$2.07 | PSF |
| Total Soft/Development Costs | \$329,352 | \$184,730 | \$514,082 | \$10.20 | PSF |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$2,156,172 | \$3,059,730 | \$5,215,902 | \$103.49 | PSF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Cost with Land |  |  | \$5,878,402 | \$116.63 | PSF |

Figure 39 Development Cost

## SITE CONSTRUCTION COST

The site construction costs are estimates supplied by Grey and Sons, a local land development construction company. The estimated prices are based on the preliminary site plan for the two buildings, $50,400 \mathrm{sf}$. located on 5.31 acres . It was assumed by the contractor and the engineer that based on the drawings of the existing property on page 22 and current County regulations, no off-site improvements are needed.

Their cost includes the labor and materials to complete the - Demolition, Earthwork, Sediment Control, Stormwater Management, Storm Drain, Water \& Sewer, on-site Paving cost.

He points out this number can fluctuate greatly depending on such things as opposition from neighboring property Owners, conflicts with the County on matters such as traffic, engineering, stormwater management etc...,

## ENGINEERING

A local engineer from the firm Preston Scheffenacker Properties that is familiar with Baltimore County regulations made a cursory review of the proposed site plan. The engineer feels the plan is feasible; however, the engineer stresses a much more thorough study will need to be undertaken once the project moves forward. The engineer also felt that the shared truck port between buildings is sufficient. Keeping in mind that due to SWM regulations, the paved surfaces may be required to be constructed of a permeable pavement material.

The proposed stormwater management system being located underground is not preferable however, allowable. Recommendations were made for an allowance of 25 ft around each building for drainage. The lot drainage requirements can be combined with the assumed landscape setback of 25 - ft . There is no parking permitted in this area.

The recommended budgeted fees for engineers, traffic, environmental scientists, geotechnical, etc. are budgeted @ $\$ 2.25$ to $\$ 3.00 / \mathrm{SF}$. of building. For the purpose of this study $\$ 2.50 \mathrm{psf}$. is used

## ARCHITECT

The Architect Firm E \& G Consulting recommended using $\$ 2.50$ psf. of building. In addition, a general contractor, from Heffner \& Weber, Tom Huber recommended that $5 \%$ of the estimated construction cost be used a good guideline as well. Both numbers roughly equate to $\$ 2.50 \mathrm{sf}$.

ATTORNEY FEES
A local attorney that specializes in the land development projects, Bernie Denick of Offit Kurman, suggests that $\$ 15,000$ should be budgeted for a project of this size and caliber. Legal and lender fees for loans and settlements are not calculated in this line item.

## BUILDING CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATES

The building construction cost detailed below were supplied Dave Huber a local general contractor that specializes in commercial construction. The buildings are estimated assuming they will both be constructed at the same time. The construction schedule is on page 82

The cost identified in this report as, "The Shell Construction" denotes the concrete slab floor, exterior building wall, exterior windows and glass storefront entry, roof on an enclosed premise. It includes a pedestrian door at the rear of each bay, a drive-in entry door and each has a loading dock. The service items are brought to the front or rear of the building at each bay location.

PHILADELPHIA ROAD 19,800 SF. GENERAL CONTRACTOR COST ESTIMATE

| Phil Rd 19,800 sf Description | UNIT UM | QTY | PRICE | Labor | TOTAL | Remarks |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building \& other permits/fees | Est | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | by Owner |  |
| Temp. toilets | Mo | 7 | \$95.00 |  | \$665.00 | avg 1 for project |  |
| Supt. truck | Mo | 7 | \$600.00 |  | \$4,200.00 | monthly allowance |  |
| Asst. Supt. truck | Mo | 0 | \$300.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| P.M. Auto | Mo | 9 | \$360.00 |  | \$3,240.00 | 60\% monthly allowance |  |
| AP.M. Auto | Mo | 0 | \$200.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Trailer setup/down | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Office rental | Mo | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Storage rental | Mo | 7 | \$150.00 |  | \$1,050.00 | no fit out at this point |  |
| Trailer security | Mo | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Site Security | Mo | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | by Owner |  |
| Security Fencing | LF | 0 | \$2.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Office supplies | Mo | 9 | \$20.00 |  | \$180.00 | precon incl |  |
| Postage/courier | Mo | 9 | \$20.00 |  | \$180.00 | precon incl |  |
| Office equip. | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Office furn. | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Computer Leasing | Mo | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Communication setup | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | phone and computer |  |
| Tel/faxinternet monthly | Mo | 9 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | precon and site |  |
| Cell Phones | Mo | 7 | \$100.00 |  | \$700.00 |  |  |
| Surveying/layout | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | Div 2 use 35k |  |
| Testinspection | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | Div 2 use 40k |  |
| Superintendent | Wk | 34 | \$0.00 | - | \$0.00 |  | \$2,321.15 |
| Asst. Super | Wk | 34 | \$1,500.00 | 51,000 | \$51,000.00 |  | \$1,501.92 |
| Clerical/Accounting | Wk | 0 | \$987.00 | - | \$0.00 | 25\% time | \$986.54 |
| Cleanup labor | WK | 15 | \$800.00 | 12,000 | \$12,000.00 |  |  |
| Carpenter | Wks | 0 | \$1,002.76 | - | \$0.00 | in div 6 |  |
| Liability insurance | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | in div 17 |  |
| Prints | Est | 1 | \$500.00 |  | \$500.00 | printing by GC |  |
| Photographs | Mo | 7 | \$20.00 |  | \$140.00 | non-professional |  |
| Electricla Useage | Est | 1 | \$3,500.00 |  | \$3,500.00 | 750/5mo,2500/3mo |  |
| Temp electric bldg set up | Mo | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | set up temp in Div 16 |  |
| Temp water | Mo | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | office/concrete operations |  |
| Equip. rental | Mo | 7 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | div 2 or by trade |  |
| Hand tools | Est | 1 | \$250.00 |  | \$250.00 |  |  |
| Safety consultant | Mo | 4 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | consultant only, work in Div2 |  |
| Punch list | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | div 6 |  |
| Dumpster | Ea | 10 | \$550.00 |  | \$5,500.00 |  |  |
| Trash Chute | Mo | 0 | \$1,500.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Final cleanup | GSF | 19800 | \$0.08 |  | \$1,584.00 | floors/windows |  |
| Scheduling services | Est | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | in house |  |
| Senior Project Manager | Wk | 15 | \$1,500.00 | 22,500 | \$22,500.00 |  | \$3,276.92 |
| Asst PM | Wk | 0 | \$1,783.58 | - | \$0.00 |  | \$1,638.46 |
| Project Engineer | Wk | 6 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  | \$1,310.77 |
| General Super | Wk | 0 | \$2,941.44 | - | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Project Executive | Wk | 0 | \$6,016.59 | - | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Misc Mat. | Est | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | in Div 2-17 |  |
| Preconstruction | Est | 1 | \$5,000.00 |  | \$5,000.00 |  |  |
| Project Signs | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 85,500 | \$112,189.00 | Total |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$16,027.00 | gcs per month |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$3,727.21 | gcs per week |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$532.46 | gcs per day |  |

Figure 40 Phil Rd GC Cost

PHILADELPHIA ROAD BUILDING SHELL COST ESTIMATES

| Shell construction 19800 GSF flex at 16' |  | budget to be used with budget for 30,600 SF bldg assume built as same time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCOPE ITEM | Budget Amount | REMARKS |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS | \$112,189.00 |  |
| WINTER PROTECTION | \$0.00 | assume start to avoid winter protection requirements |
| SURVEYING \& Construction Stakeout | \$20.00 |  |
| TESTING INSPECTIONS | \$12,500.00 |  |
| EARTHWORK | \$15,000.00 | site work is in a different estimate, assume prepared pad backfill and re-grade |
| SEDIMENT CONTROL MAINTENANCE | \$5,000.00 |  |
| ACCESS ROAD | \$10,000.00 |  |
| SITE UTILITIES | \$0.00 | excluded |
| ASPHALT PAVEMENTw/stone base | \$0.00 | includes stone base,stripping |
| PAVEMENT STRIPING | \$0.00 | signs, bumpers |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL | \$0.00 |  |
| SITE CONCRETE | \$0.00 |  |
| TRUCK PAVING AT BUILDING | \$0.00 | No allowance for dolly pads or other site concrete in site estimate |
| Precast Wheel Stops | \$0.00 |  |
| MONUMENT SIGN | \$5,000.00 |  |
| LANDSCAPING/IRRIGATION/SEEDING | \$0.00 |  |
| BUILDING CONCRETE | \$108,900.00 |  |
| MASONRY | \$184,680.00 |  |
| STEEL /JOISTS/ DECK | \$108,900.00 |  |
| MISCELLANEOUS METALS |  | Included in price for Steel |
| ROUGH CARPENTRY/GENERAL LABOR | \$30,000.00 | labor \& lumber |
| ROOFNG | \$59,400.00 | EPDM remainder for flashing, lift charges |
| MISCELLANEOUS CAULKING | \$2,800.00 |  |
| MATERIAL DOORS/PRAMES/HARDW ARE | \$7,000.00 |  |
| INSTALL DOORS FRAMES HARDWARE | \$0.00 | Included in price for Rough Carpentry |
| OVERHEAD SECTIONAL DOORS | \$9,900.00 | 6 doors, |
| ALUMINUM WINDOWS/STOREFRONTS | \$46,626.00 | 1227 |
| SEAL CONCRETE | \$1,980.00 |  |
| DRYWALL COMMON ROOMS | \$10,000.00 |  |
| PAINTING | \$4,000.00 |  |
| FIRE DEPARTMENT ACCESS SYSTEM | \$250.00 | KNOXBOXES |
| Building SIGNAGE ALLOW ANCE | \$12,500.00 | 2.5K per tenant |
| LOADING DOCK EQUIPMENT | \$0.00 | Included in price for Overhead Sectional Doors |
| DOCK SEALS | \$0.00 | Included in price for Overhead Sectional Doors |
| WINDOW TREATMENTS | \$0.00 | excluded |
| D/B ESFR RRE SPRINKLERS SYSTEM | \$32,670.00 |  |
| D/B PLUMBING | \$40,000.00 | main down the front of the space, meter room |
| D/B HVAC | \$39,600.00 | space heaters |
| D/B ELECTRICAL | \$39,600.00 |  |
| SUBTOTAL: | \$898,515.00 |  |
| Contingency: | \$44,925.75 | Contingency 5\% |
| Builder's Risk Insurance: | \$0.00 | by Owner, Deductibles by Owner |
| General Liability Insurance: | \$7,075.81 |  |
| Performance and Payment Bonds; | \$0.00 | excluded |
| Overhead | \$28,515.50 | 0.03 |
| Profit | \$50,931.60 | 0.05 |
| Total Bid Amount: | \$1,029,963.65 |  |
| Price per GSF: | \$52.02 |  |
|  |  |  |
| Teanant Improvement |  |  |
| Demising walls (each) | \$10,800.00 | each |
| Allow for office fitout (each) | \$45,000.00 | average 1,000 gsf per tenant @ \$45 |

Figure 41 Phil Rd Construction Estimates

YELLOW BRICK ROAD 30,600 SF. GENERAL CONTRACTOR COST ESTIMATE

| Yellow 30,600 sf Description | UNIT |  |  | Labor | TOTAL | Remarks |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building \& other permits/fees | Est | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | by Owner |  |
| Temp. toilets | Mo | 0 | \$190.00 |  | \$0.00 | avg 4 for project |  |
| Supt. truck | Mo | 0 | \$600.00 |  | \$0.00 | monthly allowance |  |
| Asst. Supt. truck | Mo | 0 | \$300.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| P.M. Auto | Mo | 9 | \$360.00 |  | \$3,240.00 | 60\% monthly allowance |  |
| AP.M. Auto | Mo | 0 | \$200.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Trailer setup/down | Est | 1 | \$2,000.00 |  | \$2,000.00 |  |  |
| Office rental | Mo | 0 | \$350.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Storage rental | Mo | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | no fit out at this point |  |
| Trailer security | Mo | 0 | \$150.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Site Security | Mo | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | by Owner |  |
| Security Fencing | LF | 0 | \$2.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Office supplies | Mo | 9 | \$50.00 |  | \$450.00 | precon incl |  |
| Postage/courier | Mo | 9 | \$50.00 |  | \$450.00 | precon ind |  |
| Office equip. | Est | 1 | \$500.00 |  | \$500.00 |  |  |
| Office furn. | Est | 1 | \$500.00 |  | \$500.00 |  |  |
| Computer Leasing | Mo | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Communication setup | Est | 1 | \$1,500.00 |  | \$1,500.00 | phone and computer |  |
| Tel/faxinternet monthly | Mo | 9 | \$150.00 |  | \$1,350.00 | precon and site |  |
| Cell Phones | Mo | 0 | \$170.00 |  | \$0.00 | 100\% Super; $40 \%$ for PM |  |
| Surveying/layout | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | Div 2 use 35k |  |
| Testinspection | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | Div 2 use 40k |  |
| Superintendent | Wk | 4 | \$1,800.00 | 7,200 | \$7,200.00 |  | \$2,321.15 |
| Asst. Super | Wk | 0 | \$1,500.00 | - | \$0.00 |  | \$1,501.92 |
| Clerical/Accounting | Wk | 0 | \$987.00 | - | \$0.00 | 25\% time | \$986.54 |
| Cleanup labor | WK | 15 | \$800.00 | 12,000 | \$12,000.00 |  |  |
| Carpenter | Wks | 0 | \$1,002.76 | - | \$0.00 | in div 6 |  |
| Liability insurance | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | in div 17 |  |
| Prints | Est | 1 | \$500.00 |  | \$500.00 | printing by GC |  |
| Photographs | Mo | 0 | \$20.00 |  | \$0.00 | non-professional |  |
| Electricla Useage | Est | 1 | \$5,000.00 |  | \$5,000.00 | 750/5mo,2500/3mo |  |
| Temp electric bldg set up | Mo | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | set up temp in Div 16 |  |
| Temp water | Mo | 0 | \$100.00 |  | \$0.00 | office/concrete operations |  |
| Equip. rental | Mo | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | div 2 or by trade |  |
| Hand tools | Est | 1 | \$250.00 |  | \$250.00 |  |  |
| Safety consultant | Mo | 4 | \$400.00 |  | \$1,600.00 | consultant only, work in Div2 |  |
| Punch list | Est | 1 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | div 6 |  |
| Dumpster | Ea | 10 | \$550.00 |  | \$5,500.00 |  |  |
| Trash Chute | Mo | 0 | \$1,500.00 |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Final cleanup | GSF | 30600 | \$0.08 |  | \$2,448.00 | floors/windows |  |
| Scheduling services | Est | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | in house |  |
| Senior Project Manager | Wk | 30 | \$1,500.00 | 45,000 | \$45,000.00 | based on 50\% | \$3,276.92 |
| Asst PM | Wk | 0 | \$1,783.58 | - | \$0.00 | 0 | \$1,638.46 |
| Project Engineer | Wk | 6 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | 0 | \$1,310.77 |
| General Super | Wk | 0 | \$2,941.44 | - | \$0.00 | 0 |  |
| Project Executive | Wk | 0 | \$6,016.59 | - | \$0.00 |  |  |
| Misc Mat. | Est | 0 | \$0.00 |  | \$0.00 | in Div 2-17 |  |
| Preconstruction | Est | 1 | \$12,000.00 |  | \$12,000.00 |  |  |
| Project Signs | Est | 1 | \$300.00 |  | \$300.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 64,200 | \$101,788.00 | Total |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$14,541.14 | gcs per month |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$3,381.66 | gcs per week |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$483.09 | gcs per day |  |

Figure 42 GC Construction Cost for Yellow Brick Rd

YELLOW BRICK ROAD BUILDING CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATES

| Shell construction 30600 GSF flex at 16' |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCOPE ITEM | Budget Amount | REMARKS |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS | \$101,788 |  |
| WINTER PROTECTION | \$0.00 | assume start to avoid winter protection requirements |
| SURVEYING \& Construction Stakeout | \$25,000 |  |
| TESTING INSPECTIONS | \$15,000.00 |  |
| EARTHWORK | \$25,000 | site work is in a different estimate, assume prepared pad backfill and re-grade |
| SEDIMENT CONTROL MAINTENANCE | \$5,000.00 |  |
| ACCESS ROAD | \$20,000 |  |
| SITE UTILITIES | \$0.00 | excluded |
| ASPHALT PAVEMENTw/stone base | \$0 | includes stone base,stripping |
| PAVEMENT STRIPING | \$0.00 | signs, bumpers |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL | \$0 |  |
| SITE CONCRETE | \$0.00 |  |
| TRUCK PAVING AT BUILDING | \$0 | No allowance for dolly pads or other site concrete in site estimate |
| Precast Wheel Stops | \$0.00 |  |
| MONUMENT SIGN | \$10,000 | ALLOWANCE (includes panels (9662) foundation, electrical, painting \& logos) |
| LANDSCAPING/IRRIGATION/SEEDING | \$0.00 |  |
| BUILDING CONCRETE | \$168,300 |  |
| MASONRY | \$243,000.00 |  |
| STEEL /JOISTS/ DECK | \$168,300 |  |
| MISCELLANEOUS METALS |  | Included in price for Steel |
| ROUGH CARPENTRY/GENERAL LABOR | \$35,000 | labor \& lumber |
| ROOFING | \$91,800.00 | EPDM remainder for flashing, lift charges |
| MISCELLANEOUS CAULKING | \$3,750 |  |
| MATERIAL DOORS/FRAMES/HARDWARE | \$10,800.00 | 12 |
| INSTALL DOORS FRAMES HARDWARE | \$0 | Included in price for Rough Carpentry |
| OVERHEAD SECTIONAL DOORS | \$21,210.00 | 9 doors, 2 sets edge dock, 2 seals, 2 loading dock others drive in |
| ALUMINUM WINDOWS/STOREFRONTS | \$58,900 | 1550 sf |
| SEAL CONCRETE | \$3,060.00 |  |
| DRYWALL COMMON ROOMS | \$10,000 |  |
| PAINTING | \$5,000.00 |  |
| FIRE DEPARTMENT ACCESS SYSTEM | \$250 | KNOX BOXES |
| Building SIGNAGE ALLOWANCE | \$22,500.00 | 2.5K per tenant |
| LOADING DOCK EQUIPMENT | \$0 | Included in price for Overhead Sectional Doors |
| DOCK SEALS | \$0.00 | Included in price for Overhead Sectional Doors |
| WINDOW TREATMENTS | \$0 | excluded |
| D/B ESFR FIRE SPRINKLERS SYSTEM | \$45,900.00 |  |
| D/B PLUMBING | \$50,000 | main down the front of the space, meter room |
| D/B HVAC | \$61,200.00 | space heaters |
| D/B ELECTRICAL | \$61,200 |  |
| SUBTOTAL: | \$1,261,958.00 |  |
| Contingency: | \$63,098 | Contingency 5\% |
| Builder's Risk Insurance: | \$0.00 | by Owner, Deductibles by Owner |
| General Liability Insurance: | \$9,938 |  |
| Performance and Payment Bonds; | \$0.00 | excluded |
| Overhead | \$40,050 | 0.03 |
| Profit | \$71,812.18 | 0.05 |
| Total Bid Amount: | \$1,446,856 |  |
| Price per GSF: | \$47.28 |  |
|  |  |  |
| Teanant Improvement |  |  |
| Demising walls (each) | \$10,800 | each |
| Allow for office fitout (each) | \$45,000 | average 1,000 gsf per tenant @ \$45 |
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Figure 44 TI Fit out Specs
Cash Flow During Pre Occupancy

| Category |  | Jan-13 | Feb-13 | Mar-13 | Apr-13 | May-13 | Jun-13 | Jul-13 | Aug-13 | Sep-13 | Oct-13 | Nov-13 | Dec-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Month 13 | Month 14 | Month 15 | Month 16 | Month 17 | Month 18 | Month 19 | Month 20 | Month 21 | Month 22 | Month 23 | Month 24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architecture \& Engineering, Geo, Legal | \$272,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$27,500 | \$27,500 | \$27,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permits | \$6,832 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demolition | \$500,000 | \$125,000 | \$125,000 | \$125,000 | \$125,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Earthwork \& Sediment Control | \$225,000 | \$37,500 | \$37,500 | \$37,500 | \$37,500 | \$37,500 | \$37,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strom Drain, Water \& Sewer | \$400,000 |  | \$66,667 | \$66,667 | \$66,667 | \$66,667 | \$66,667 | \$66,667 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWM Underground | \$750,000 |  |  | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Site Paving | \$350,000 |  |  | \$44,000 | \$87,250 | \$87,500 |  |  |  |  | \$43,750 | \$43,750 | \$43,750 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction | \$2,476,820 | \$210,820 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 | \$206,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | So |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marketing | \$20,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other, Conting etc | \$215,250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

All estimates are based on 2012 us dollar values
o Site development of 5.3 acres
o Building construction 2 Flex warehouse shells 50,400 sf total

- Philadelphia Rd 19,800 sf
- Yellow Brick Rd 30,600 sf
- Total Development Cost $\$ 116.63$ psf
o Site Construction
- \$44.14 psf total \$ 2,224,656
- Raze 10 existing buildings
- Abandoned existing stormwater management pond
- Earth work \& sediment control
- Site utilities
- Streets, sidewalks and landscaping
- Underground stormwater management
o Building Construction
- \$49.15 psftotal \$ 2,477,160
- Shell building
- Basic Tenant Improvements
- Soft Cost
- \$10.20 psf total \$514,082
- Construction \& development contingency
- Legal, architect engineers, permits, marketing, taxes contingency and developer fee
- Land Cost
o Valued at $\$ 125,000$ acre Total $\$ 662,500$ per square foot of building $\$ 13.14 \mathrm{psf}$
- Contractors
o Site Gray \& Son
o Building Construction Dave Huber local commercial General Contractor
o Local professionals contacted about their professional fees used in the budget
- Construction Draw schedule prepared for two year Cash Flow / budget
- Concern
o All construction prices are based on 2012 dollars. Any inflation in products goods or services will fluctuate these numbers.


## SCHEDULES

\author{

- Introduction
}
- Entitlement process
- Concept Plan
- Development
- Permit Process
- Construction Schedule

Summary

## SCHEDULES

The following schedules are estimate time lines provided by the County and contractors. Other time sensitive items are estimates based on market studies and interview with industry professionals.

## Schedule Highlights:

- Total project span 2 years from the close of the Self-Storage
o Entitlement Process
- Concept Plan Review 4 months
- Development Phase 4 months
- Permit Process 3 months
- Closing Self-Storage
once Entitlement Complete 3 months
- Site Development
o Demolition 3 months
o Site work 3 months
- Building Construction

0 Shell 7 months
o Tenant Improvements on going

- Marketing \& Lease on going
Construction Schedule

| Category |  | Jam-12 | Feb-12 | Mar-12 | Apr-12 | May-12 | Jum-12 | Jul-12 | Aus-12 | Sep-12 | Oct-12 | Nov-12 | Dec-12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Month 1 | Month 2 | Month 3 | Month 4 | Month 5 | Month 6 | Month 7 | Month 8 | Month 9 | Month 10 | Month 11 | Month 12 |  |
| Architecture \& Engineering | Duration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement Process | 8 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Closing of the Self-Storage | 3 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Permit Process | 3 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demolition | 3 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Earthwork \& Sediment Control | 3 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strom Drain, Water \& Sewer | 3 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWM Underground | 3 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Site Paving | 2 Months \& | rn for Top |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction | 7 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | Start after | Complition | Continues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Hard Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marketing | Duration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leasing/ Preleasing | Duration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS | 24 Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 50 Constructio

Figure 51 Construction Schedule
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## FINANCIAL INTRODUCTION

The continued turmoil in the economy remains a strong influence on all types of investments. On November 16, 2011, the current 10-year Treasury yield was @ 2.01 percent. This very low rate is encouraging investors to look elsewhere for higher returns. One of the asset classes investors are looking to is commercial real estate. The rates for construction and permanent loans are as low as $3 \%$ and as high as $8.6 \%$ these low interest rates make proformas look very attractive.

The downside to the low rates is the lenders have tightened the lending requirements. They are now only interested in the most stable and highly qualified investors. Moreover, the lenders are only writing loans on commercial real estate with a good location, strong tenant rent rolls, high occupancy rates, and low cost to maintain. This has caused a realignment of the market, which should in theory washout the speculators, which in turn leaves the most resilient, and experienced Developers in the market.

In addition to the favorable interest rates, the CAP rates of the Flex market are favorable as well. In the 3rd quarter of 2011, CAP rates were reported from $7.5 \%$ to $9.54 \%$ for Flex properties. At this time, the only better performing CAP rate is in the apartment industry at $8.62 \%$. As a comparison, the reported CAP rates for Self-Storage operations are currently reported @ 10.84\%. (RealityRates.com)

The upside side of the subject property is that the current Self-Storage operation, although sluggish, continues to maintain a positive Cash Flow and is profitable. This report will compare the future trends of the existing Self-Storage with the "expected case" and best-case proformas of the proposed Flex warehouse.

Another upside of the proposed development of the Flex building is the Owner/ Developer is to fund the entire project in cash without any debt service. This will improve the Cash Flow by eliminating interest payments, reducing the required cost of reserves, and eliminate the delays, inspections, and the administrative work that is generated by the lenders.

As demonstrated in the section "Market Report", the Flex market currently carries a high vacancy rate, it is very completive and over saturated. This in turn has triggered lower rents and more leasing concessions. As the following proformas illustrate, the subject property is too dependent upon the possibility of strong tenant interest, strong rent growth and it will likely be at a disadvantage as job growth and leasing are likely to remain sluggish.

The following proformas are prepared with the possibility of the Flex market improving in the next several years. They outline three different variations for the proposed Flex building, the best case, the expected case and the worst case. In addition, financial information about the existing Self-Storage operation is provided for comparison.

| $l$ | Best | Expected | Storage |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| NOI Year 13 |  |  |  |
| Resale | $\$ 621,964$ | $\$ 390,903$ | $\$ 308,219$ |
| Reversion Cost (Less) | $\$ 7,317,224$ | $\$ 4,598,859$ | $\$ 2,843,349$ |
| Reversion | $\$ 219,517$ | $\$ 137,966$ | $\$ 85,300$ |


| Unleveraged |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| IRR Before Tax w/ Reversior | $10.85 \%$ | $4.31 \%$ |  |
| Present Value | $\$ 303,572$ | $(\$ 1,761,191$ | $\$ 2,896,536$ |


| Land Value | $\$ 662,500$ | $\$ 662,500$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Development Cost | $\$ 5,878,402$ | $\$ 5,878,402$ |
| Total Development Cost | $\$ 6,540,902$ | $\$ 6,540,902$ |
| Cash on Cash Return or |  | $9.69 \%$ |
| Overall Return |  | $-31.38 \%$ |


| Expenses | $\$ 243,489$ | $\$ 237,142$ | $\$ 277,976$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EGI | $\$ 791,570$ | $\$ 579,991$ | $\$ 654,456$ |
| Effective Gross Income $\%$ | $31 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $42 \%$ |


| Gross Potential Income | $\$ 556,081$ | $\$ 474,128$ | $\$ 789,280$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Rent Multiplier | 11.76 | 13.80 |  |
| Effective Gross Income Mul. | 8.26 | 11.28 |  |

The NOI Growth comparison is illustrated below. Even though the Cash Flow growth is negative, decreasing by $2 \%$ a year for the Self-Storage the property offers a stronger Present value and a stronger IRR. (Assuming the land value is used as the cash outlay at the beginning of the project for comparison purposes)

Figure 52 Case Study Models Cash Flow w/o Reversion


Figure 53 NOI Cash Flow With Reversion


## GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in the case studies to follow.
The Case Study Models were set up with several data points, the chart below outlines those items

| Assumptions |  | General Assumptions |  | Best Case | Expected <br> Case |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Size | Rentable | 50,400 | sf. |  |  |
| Property Size | Acre | $5 \cdot 3$ |  |  |  |
| Start Date | Project Year | Jan-12 |  |  |  |
| Start Date | Operation Year | Jan-14 |  |  |  |
| Years of Reporting |  | 12 total. 2 years development 10 years operations |  |  |  |
| Purchase Price | Total | \$125,000 Acre | \$662,500.0 |  |  |
| Resale | CAP RATE | 8.5\% |  |  |  |
| Resale Adjustment |  | 3.00\% |  |  |  |
| Resale Value CAP |  | CAP Year 13 NOI (10 years of operation) |  |  |  |
| Commissions, Sales |  | $3 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Present Value Discounting |  | 10\% |  |  |  |
| Unleveraged Discount Rate |  | 10\% |  |  |  |
| Inflation | General | 3\% |  |  |  |
| Reimbursements Method | Fiscal using Fiscal Inflation |  |  |  |  |
| Expenses | Management Fee | 3\% | Effective Gross Income |  |  |
| Expenses | RE TAX | \$0.70 | \$ Area PSF |  |  |
| Expenses | CAM | \$2.02 | \$ Area PSF |  |  |
| Expenses | Utilities | \$1.02 | \$ Area PSF |  |  |
| Expenses | Insurance | \$1.09 | \$ Area PSF |  |  |
| Vacancy |  |  |  | Natural roll over | $14 \%$ <br> general |
| Rent Roll Data |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lease Terms | Refer to Rent Roll Summary |  |  |  |
|  | Abatement |  |  | 1 Month Free | 2 Months Free |
|  | Rent Amount Office | - |  | \$12.00 | \$10.25 |
|  | Avg Rent Amount Warehouse |  |  | \$9.60 | \$8.20 |
| Collection Loss |  |  |  | 1\% | $3 \%$ |
| Tenant Improvement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | New |  |  | \$22.50 | \$22.50 |
|  | Renew |  |  | \$10.00 | \$10.00 |
| Market Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Renewal |  |  | 80\% | 75\% |


| Assumptions | General Assumptions | Best Case <br> Case |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Market Rent |  | $\$ 12.00$ |
|  | Months Vacant |  | 30.25 |
|  | Tenant Improvement | Office Space Only | 6 |
|  | Leasing Commissions | New | 22.50 |
|  | Leasing Commissions | Renew | $6 \%$ |
|  | Rent Abatement | New | $2 \%$ |
|  | Rent Abatement | Renew | $2 \%$ |
|  | Reimbursements |  | $2 \%$ Month |
|  | Term Length |  | 2 Months |

Figure 54 Case Study Assumptions
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## BEST CASE SUMMARY

The Best Case Model illustrates the project for the most favorable rents, expenses and vacancy. The model is based on the highest possible rent of $\$ 12.00 \mathrm{psf}$ office and $\$ 9.60 \mathrm{psf}$ warehouse. The project is occupied in full by the end of the first full year of operation. Vacancy is not calculated as a General Vacancy number, it is calculated on the natural rollover of the actual leases with an $80 \%$ renewal possibility.

This model offers the highest present value reversion.
Even with the higher rents and lower vacancy, this project is not feasible at this time because the returns are too low. However, based on the schedules that follow. If rents increase in this market due to pent up demand, and inflation and development cost stay equal, the project offers a $10 \%$ return in year two of those scenarios.

|  | Best |
| :--- | ---: |
| NOI Year 13 | $\$ 621,964$ |
| Resale | $\$ 7,317,224$ |
| Reversion Cost (Less) | $\$ 219,517$ |
| Reversion | $\$ 7,097,707$ |


| Unleveraged |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| IRR Before Tax w/ Reversior | $10.85 \%$ |
| Present Value | $\$ 303,572$ |
|  |  |
|  | $\$ 662,500$ |
| Land Value | $\$ 5,878,402$ |
| Development Cost | $\$ 6,540,902$ |
| Total Development Cost | $9.69 \%$ |
| Cash on Cash Return or |  |
| Overall Return | $\$ 243,489$ |
|  | $\$ 791,570$ |
| Expenses | $31 \%$ |
| EGI |  |
| Effective Gross Income \% | $\$ 556,081$ |
|  |  |
| Gross Potential Income | 11.76 |



|  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \mathscr{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | 第 |  <br>  | $\mid$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت1 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 号 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}\right.$ |


| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{5} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega}{ }_{\sim}^{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { on } \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{gathered}\right.$ | No <br>  |  | O | 商 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $\stackrel{\substack{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}}}{\circ}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { ® } \\ & \underset{\sim}{A} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \hat{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  | $\cdots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 㰴 | $\begin{gathered} \text { İ } \\ \text { 岛 } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { a } \\ \text { 呺 } \\ \text { 荗 } \end{gathered}\right.$ |  <br>  | $\left\lvert\,\right.$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 卆 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{心} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | N |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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TABLE g BEST CASE 1 RESALE


## TABLE 10 BEST CASE 1 PRESENT VALUE

| Best Case Assumption w/o construction loan scenario \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Best Case Present Values |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| For the |  | P.V. of | P.V. of | P.V. of | P.V. of | P.V. of |
| Analysis Year | Annual | Cash Flow | Cash Flow | Cash Flow | Cash Flow | Cash Flow |
| Period Ending | Cash Flow | @ 9.50\% | @ 10.00\% | @ 10.50\% | @ 10.50\% | @ 11.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 Dec-2012 | (\$2,156,172) | $(\$ 1,978,139)$ | $(\$ 1,969,107)$ | $(\$ 1,960,156)$ | $(\$ 1,951,287)$ | $(\$ 1,942,497)$ |
| Year 2 Dec-2013 | (\$3,059,730) | $(\$ 2,575,314)$ | (\$2,551,848) | (\$2,528,703) | (\$2,505,870) | $(\$ 2,483,346)$ |
| Year 3 Dec-2014 | (\$1,087,037) | $(\$ 839,392)$ | $(\$ 827,946)$ | $(\$ 816,707)$ | $(\$ 805,671)$ | $(\$ 794,832)$ |
| Year 4 Dec-2015 | \$548,081 | \$388,274 | \$381,231 | \$374,347 | \$367,618 | \$361,038 |
| Year 5 Dec-2016 | \$561,192 | \$364,737 | \$356,485 | \$348,456 | \$340,643 | \$333,040 |
| Year 6 Dec-2017 | \$574,620 | \$342,627 | \$333,346 | \$324,358 | \$315,651 | \$307,215 |
| Year 7 Dec-2018 | \$588,397 | \$321,873 | \$311,725 | \$301,941 | \$292,506 | \$283,407 |
| Year 8 Dec-2019 | \$531,624 | \$266,804 | \$257,212 | \$248,006 | \$239,170 | \$230,686 |
| Year 9 Dec-2020 | \$543,513 | \$250,249 | \$240,151 | \$230,503 | \$221,283 | \$212,472 |
| Year 10 Dec-2021 | \$554,925 | \$234,406 | \$223,920 | \$213,947 | \$204,462 | \$195,436 |
| Year 11 Dec-2022 | \$565,888 | \$219,300 | \$208,533 | \$198,341 | \$188,688 | \$179,547 |
| Year 12 Dec-2023 | \$534,681 | \$190,098 | \$179,939 | \$170,365 | \$161,342 | \$152,834 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Cash Flow | (\$1,300,018) | (\$2,814,477) | (\$2,856,359) | $(\$ 2,895,302)$ | (\$2,931,465) | (\$2,965,000) |
| Property Resale @ 8.50\% Cap | \$7,097,707 | \$2,523,481 | \$2,388,629 | \$2,261,548 | \$2,141,760 | \$2,028,814 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Property Present Value |  | (\$290,996) | $(\$ 467,730)$ | $(\$ 633,754)$ | $(\$ 789,705)$ | $(\$ 936,186)$ |
|  |  | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== |
| Rounded to Thousands |  | $(\$ 291,000)$ | $(\$ 468,000)$ | $(\$ 634,000)$ | $(\$ 790,000)$ | $(\$ 936,000)$ |
|  |  | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per SqFt |  | (\$5.77) | (\$9.28) | (\$12.57) | (\$15.67) | (\$18.58) |
| Percentage Value Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assured Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prospective Income |  | 967.19\% | 610.69\% | 456.85\% | 371.21\% | 316.71\% |
| Prospective Property Resale |  | -867.19\% | -510.69\% | -356.85\% | -271.21\% | -216.71\% |
|  |  | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== |
|  |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

TABLE 11 BEST CASE 1 ASSUMPTIONS

| Timing \& Inflation |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reporting Period: | January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2023; 12 years |
| Inflation Month: | Analysis Start |
| General Inflation Rate: | $3.00 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Property Size \& Occupancy |  |
| Property Size: | 50,400 Square Feet |
| Alternate Size: | 1 Square Foot |
| Number of rent roll tenants: | $600.00 \%$ |
| Total Occupied Area: | 0 Square Feet, 0.00\%, during first month of analysis |
|  |  |
| General Vacancy | Percent of Potential Gross Revenue |
| Method: | $0.00 \%$ |
| Rate: |  |
|  |  |
| Credit \& Collection Loss | Percent of Potential Gross Revenue |
| Method: | $1.00 \%$ |
| Rate: |  |
| Property Purchase \& Resale | $\$ 662,500$ |
| Purchase Price: | Capitalize Net Operating Income |
| Resale Method: | $8.50 \%$ |
| Cap Rate: | Year 13 |
| Cap Year: | $\$ 219,517$ |
| Commission/Closing Cost: | $\$ 7,097,707$ |
| Net Cash Flow from Sale: |  |
|  | Annually (Endpoint on Cash Flow \& Resale) |
| Present Value Discounting | $10.00 \%$ |
| Discount Method: | $\$ 633,754)$ at 10.00\% |
| Unleveraged Discount Rate: |  |
| Unleveraged Present Value: |  |

TABLE 12 BEST CASE 1 MARKET ASSUMPTIONS

| General Market AssumptRenewal Probability |  | Year 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 80.00\% |
| Market Rent | \$/SqFt/Yr |  |
|  | New: | \$12.00 |
|  | Renewal: | \$12.00 |
|  | Result: | \$12.00 |
| Months Vacant | New: | 3 |
|  | Renewal: | 0 |
|  | Rounded: | 1 |
| Tenant Improvements | \$/SqFt |  |
|  | New: | \$22.50 |
|  | Renewal: | \$10.00 |
|  | Result: | \$12.50 |
| Leasing Commissions | Percent |  |
|  | New: | 6.00\% |
|  | Renewal: | 2.00\% |
|  | Result: | 2.80\% |
| Rent Abatements | Method: | 1Month Fr |
| Non-Weighted Items |  |  |
| Rent Changes |  | Yes |
| Retail Rent Changes |  |  |
| Reimbursements |  | Net |
| Term Lengths in Year |  | 5 |



## TABLE 14 BEST CASE 1 RENT ROLL

8821 Philadelphia Road Best Case Assumption w/o construction loan scenario \#1

| Tenant Name <br> Type \& Suite Number <br> Lease Dates \& Term | Floor SqFt Bldg Share | Rate \& Amount per Year per Month | Changes on | Changes to | CPI \& Current <br> Porters' Wage <br> Miscellaneous | Months <br> to <br> Abate | Pont to <br> Abate | Description of Operating Expense Reimbursements | Imprvmnts <br> Rate <br> Amount | Commssns <br> Rate <br> Amount | Assumption about subsequent terms for this tenant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 TENANTA <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi <br> Jul-2014 to Jun-2019 <br> 60 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12.00 \\ \$ 43,200 \\ \$ 1.00 \\ \$ 3,600 \end{array}$ | Jul-2015 <br> Jul-2016 <br> Jul-2017 <br> Jul-2018 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 12.36 \\ & \$ 12.73 \\ & \$ 13.11 \\ & \$ 13.51 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{gathered} \$ 23.87 \\ \$ 85,933 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3.39 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 12,191 \end{gathered}$ | Market @80\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 2 TENANT B <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi Aug-2014 to Jul-2020 72 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12.00 \\ \$ 43,200 \\ \$ 1.00 \\ \$ 3,600 \end{array}$ | Aug-2015 <br> Aug-2016 <br> Aug-2017 <br> Aug-2018 <br> Aug-2019 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 12.36 \\ & \$ 12.73 \\ & \$ 13.11 \\ & \$ 13.51 \\ & \$ 13.91 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | \$23.87 <br> \$85,933 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4.14 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 14,895 \end{gathered}$ | Market @80\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 3 TENANTC <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi <br> Jan-2014 to Dec-2020 <br> 84 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12.00 \\ \$ 43,200 \\ \$ 1.00 \\ \$ 3,600 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 Jan-2016 Jan-2017 Jan-2018 Jan-2019 Jan-2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 12.36 \\ & \$ 12.73 \\ & \$ 13.11 \\ & \$ 13.51 \\ & \$ 13.91 \\ & \$ 14.33 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | \$23.87 <br> \$85,933 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4.91 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 17,681 \end{gathered}$ | Market @80\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 4 TENANTD <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi Jan-2014 to Dec-2021 96 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 360000.00 \% \\ 7.14 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12 \\ \$ 43,200.00 \\ \$ 1 \\ \$ 3,600 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 <br> Jan-2016 <br> Jan-2017 <br> Jan-2018 <br> Jan-2019 <br> Jan-2020 <br> Jan-2021 | $\$ 12.36$ $\$ 12.73$ $\$ 13.11$ $\$ 13.51$ $\$ 13.91$ $\$ 14.33$ $\$ 14.76$ | - | 1 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 23.87 \\ \$ 85,933 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5.71 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 20,550 \end{gathered}$ | Market @80\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 5 TENANTE <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi <br> Jan-2014 to Dec-2022 <br> 108 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 5,400 \\ 10.71 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12 \\ \$ 64,800 \\ \$ 1.00 \\ \$ 5,400.00 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 <br> Jan-2016 <br> Jan-2017 <br> Jan-2018 <br> Jan-2019 <br> Jan-2020 <br> Jan-2021 <br> Jan-2022 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 12.36 \\ & \$ 12.73 \\ & \$ 13.11 \\ & \$ 13.51 \\ & \$ 13.91 \\ & \$ 14.33 \\ & \$ 14.76 \\ & \$ 15.20 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 23.87 \\ \$ 128,899 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 7 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 35,257 \end{array}$ | Market @80\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 6 TENANTF <br> Industrial, Suite: Yel Jan-2014 to Dec-2023 120 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 30,600 \\ 60.71 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 12.00 \\ \$ 367,200 \\ 1 \\ \$ 30,600 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 Jan-2017 Jan-2018 Jan-2019 Jan-2020 Jan-2021 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 12.24 \\ & \$ 12.48 \\ & \$ 12.73 \\ & \$ 12.99 \\ & \$ 13.25 \\ & \$ 13.51 \\ & \$ 13.78 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 23.87 \\ \$ 730,430 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 7.04 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 215,467 \end{gathered}$ | Market @90\% See assumption: Average Market |

## CONSTRUCTION VIABILITY SCHEDULE

The following Graph shows the various scenarios based on the Best Case Assumptions.
Projected Goal is a $10 \%$ return on Investment. This value is calculated as follows.


As of today, the returns do not accomplish the Owner's goals of a $10 \%$ return on Development cost vs. the Capital investment. This model illustrates when the goal will be achieved base on a ( $3 \%$ steady increase on Development cost following inflation) and (Increasing Rent based on increase of pent up demand) (less expenses following inflation = NOI)

NOI divided by the CAP rate = property value
The property value less Development cost equals the return objective


Table 15 Best Case Development Year

| Rent Increase to Increase NOI |  |  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Rent Best Case PSH | \$10.87 | \$11.20 | \$11.54 | \$11.88 | \$12.24 |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Rent Best Case |  | \$11.26 | \$11.65 | \$12.06 | \$12.48 |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Rent Best Case |  | \$11.31 | \$11.76 | \$12.23 | \$12.72 |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Rent Best Case |  | \$11.36 | \$11.88 | \$12.41 | \$12.97 |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Rent Best Case |  | \$11.42 | \$11.99 | \$12.59 | \$13.22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3\% | Development Cost PSF | \$116.63 | \$120.13 | \$123.74 | \$127.45 | \$131.27 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | NOI CAP | \$127.94 | \$131.77 | \$135.73 | \$139.80 | \$143.99 |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | NOI CAP | \$127.94 | \$132.41 | \$137.05 | \$141.85 | \$146.81 |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | NOI CAP | \$127.94 | \$133.05 | \$138.38 | \$143.91 | \$149.67 |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | NOI CAP | \$127.94 | \$133.69 | \$139.71 | \$146.00 | \$152.57 |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | NOI CAP | \$127.94 | \$134.33 | \$141.05 | \$148.10 | \$155.51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Profit FromDev SF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Profit PSF | \$11.30 | \$11.64 | \$11.99 | \$12.35 | \$12.72 |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Profit PSF |  | \$12.28 | \$13.31 | \$14.40 | \$15.54 |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Profit PSF |  | \$12.92 | \$14.64 | \$16.46 | \$18.39 |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Profit PSF |  | \$13.56 | \$15.97 | \$18.55 | \$21.29 |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Profit PSF |  | \$14.20 | \$17.31 | \$20.65 | \$24.23 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Profit From Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Profit Dollars | \$569,610 | \$586,698 | \$604,299 | \$622,428 | \$641,101 |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Profit Dollars |  | \$618,938 | \$670,875 | \$725,537 | \$783,049 |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Profit Dollars |  | \$651,178 | \$737,773 | \$829,648 | \$927,069 |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Profit Dollars |  | \$683,418 | \$804,993 | \$934,764 | \$1,073,181 |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Profit Dollars |  | \$715,658 | \$872,536 | \$1,040,891 | \$1,221,405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash on Cash Return |  |  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Percent Rent Increase | 9.32\% | 9.69\% | 9.69\% | 9.69\% | 9.69\% |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Percent Rent Increase |  | 10.22\% | 10.76\% | 11.30\% | 11.84\% |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Percent Rent Increase |  | 10.75\% | 11.83\% | 12.92\% | 14.01\% |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Percent Rent Increase |  | 11.29\% | 12.91\% | 14.55\% | 16.22\% |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Percent Rent Increase |  | 11.82\% | 13.99\% | 16.20\% | 18.46\% |

Argus Cash Flow

- Sources \& Uses
- Resale
- Present Value
- Assumptions

Market Assumptions

- Average Rent Rates
- Rent Roll
- Tax \& Depreciation Assumptions
- Deprecation Calculation
- Tax Calculation
- Return Calculations
- Ratios
- Return Calculations
- Construction Projection Model


## EXPECTED CASE SUMMARY

The Expected Case Model illustrates the project for the more realistic rents, expenses and vacancy. The model is based on the average rent in the market of $\$ 10.25$ psf office, $\$ 8.20$ Warehouse for an average rent of $\$ 9.22$ psf. The project is occupied in full by the end of the second full year of operation. Vacancy is calculated at the going rate of $14 \%$ as a General Vacancy with a $75 \%$ renewal possibility.

This project is not feasible until year 15 if rents increase year over year @ 6.5\% and development cost and inflation stay below or at inflation.

|  | Expected |
| :--- | ---: |
| NOI Year 13 | $\$ 390,903$ |
| Resale | $\$ 4,598,859$ |
| Reversion Cost (Less) | $\$ 137,966$ |
| Reversion | $\$ 4,460,893$ |


| Unleveraged |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| IRR Before Tax w/ Reversior | $4.31 \%$ |
| Present Value | $(\$ 1,761,191)$ |


| Land Value | $\$ 662,500$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Development Cost | $\$ 5,878,402$ |
| Total Development Cost | $\$ 6,540,902$ |
| Cash on Cash Return or | $-31.38 \%$ |
| Overall Return |  |


| Expenses | $\$ 237,142$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| EGI | $\$ 579,991$ |
| Effective Gross Income $\%$ | $41 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Gross Potential Income | $\$ 474,128$ |
|  |  |
| Gross Rent Multiplier | 13.80 |
| Effective Gross Income Mul. | 11.28 |


| $\stackrel{\substack{n \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \hline}}{ }$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} \text { nin } \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right.$ |  | $\tilde{N}$ $\tilde{\sim}$ $\sim$ $\sim$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & i n \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{0} \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \stackrel{N}{n} \end{gathered}\right.$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-1}{5} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |



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


｜ror
$\left|\begin{array}{l}\text { 券 } \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0\end{array}\right|$


華









| $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\otimes}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}}+$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0_{0}^{2}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | w |  | $\stackrel{3}{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


邁


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


8.5\% CAP
Project Life
Operation Year
Leasing \& Capital Costs Tenant Improvements Leasing Commissions Total Leasing \& Capital Costs
Development Costs Hard/Construction Costs Demolition \& Sed Control Earth work \& Sed Control
SWM Storm Drain \& Utilities Construction of Yellow Shell Construction of Yellow Shell
Construction of Phil Total Hard/Construction Costs , Soft/Devel opment Costs
Architectural
Eng, Geo, Traffic, Enviro
Legal
Marketing During Construction
Apprasil
Tacs Apprasil
Taxes
Construction Contingency Developer Fee
Total Soft/Development Costs
Total Soft/Development Costs
Total Development Costs
Cash Flow Before Debt Service
\& Taxes


|  | Entitlement/ Construction |  | Stabilized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reversion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year 1 Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| Reimbursable Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RETAX |  | \$37,429 | \$38,551 | \$39,708 | \$40,899 | \$42,126 | \$43,390 | \$44,692 | \$46,032 | \$47,413 | \$48,836 | \$50,301 |
| CAM |  | \$108,008 | \$111,248 | \$114,586 | \$118,023 | \$121,564 | \$125,211 | \$128,967 | \$132,836 | \$136,821 | \$140,926 | \$145,154 |
| UTILITIES |  | \$54,539 | \$56,175 | \$57,860 | \$59,596 | \$61,384 | \$63,225 | \$65,122 | \$67,076 | \$69,088 | \$71,161 | \$73,296 |
| INSURANCE |  | \$13,367 | \$13,768 | \$14,181 | \$14,607 | \$15,045 | \$15,496 | \$15,961 | \$16,440 | \$16,933 | \$17,441 | \$17,965 |
| MGT FEES |  | \$13,102 | \$17,400 | \$18,321 | \$18,870 | \$19,437 | \$20,020 | \$20,395 | \$20,762 | \$21,596 | \$22,031 | \$20,957 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Reimbursable Expenses |  | \$226,445 | \$237,142 | \$244,656 | \$251,995 | \$259,556 | \$267,342 | \$275,137 | \$283,146 | \$291,851 | \$300,395 | \$307,673 |
|  | ========== | ======= | ======= | ========= | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========= | ========== | ======= | ======= | ======= |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Resulting Fiscal Year Proper | ty Expense Re | imbursemen | t Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Year 1 Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 |
| For the Years Ending | Dec-2012 Dec-2013 | Dec-2014 | Dec-2015 | Dec-2016 | Dec-2017 | Dec-2018 | Dec-2019 | Dec-2020 | Dec-2021 | Dec-2022 | Dec-2023 | Dec-2024 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expense Reimbursements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RETAX |  | \$32,080 | \$38,323 | \$39,706 | \$40,898 | \$42,127 | \$43,389 | \$44,158 | \$44,936 | \$46,850 | \$47,962 | \$47,756 |
| CAM |  | \$92,578 | \$110,585 | \$114,587 | \$118,022 | \$121,564 | \$125,212 | \$127,433 | \$129,673 | \$135,192 | \$138,409 | \$137,809 |
| UTILITIES |  | \$46,748 | \$55,839 | \$57,860 | \$59,596 | \$61,386 | \$63,225 | \$64,347 | \$65,480 | \$68,265 | \$69,891 | \$69,585 |
| INSURANCE |  | \$11,458 | \$13,684 | \$14,181 | \$14,605 | \$15,047 | \$15,497 | \$15,771 | \$16,049 | \$16,733 | \$17,130 | \$17,055 |
| MGT FEES |  | \$11,231 | \$17,296 | \$18,322 | \$18,871 | \$19,435 | \$20,020 | \$20,153 | \$20,269 | \$21,340 | \$21,639 | \$19,897 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Expense Reimbursement |  | \$194,095 | \$235,727 | \$244,656 | \$251,992 | \$259,559 | \$267,343 | \$271,862 | \$276,407 | \$288,380 | \$295,031 | \$292,102 |
|  | ====== ========== | ========== | $=$ | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ======= | ========== |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of Reimbursabl | Expenses Co | llected as Exp | pense Reimbu | ursement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Year 1 Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 |
| For the Years Ending | Dec-2012 Dec-2013 | Dec-2014 | Dec-2015 | Dec-2016 | Dec-2017 | Dec-2018 | Dec-2019 | Dec-2020 | Dec-2021 | Dec-2022 | Dec-2023 | Dec-2024 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expense Reimbursements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RETAX |  | 85.71\% | 99.41\% | 99.99\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 98.81\% | 97.62\% | 98.81\% | 98.21\% | 94.94\% |
| CAM |  | 85.71\% | 99.40\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 98.81\% | 97.62\% | 98.81\% | 98.21\% | 94.94\% |
| UTILITIES |  | 85.71\% | 99.40\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 98.81\% | 97.62\% | 98.81\% | 98.22\% | 94.94\% |
| INSURANCE |  | 85.72\% | 99.39\% | 100.00\% | 99.99\% | 100.01\% | 100.01\% | 98.81\% | 97.62\% | 98.82\% | 98.22\% | 94.93\% |
| MGT FEES |  | 85.72\% | 99.40\% | 100.01\% | 100.01\% | 99.99\% | 100.00\% | 98.81\% | 97.63\% | 98.81\% | 98.22\% | 94.94\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Expense Reimbursement |  | 85.71\% | 99.40\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 98.81\% | 97.62\% | 98.81\% | 98.21\% | 94.94\% |
|  | =========== =========10 | ====== | ======= | ======== | $=$ | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ====== |

TABLE 19 EXPECTED CASE SOURCES \& USES


TABLE 20 EXPECTED CASE RESALE


## TABLE 21 EXPECTED CASE PRESENT VALUE

|  | Exp Case Assumption w/o construction loan scenario \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| For the |  | P.V. of | P.V. of | P.V. of | P.V. of | P.V. of |
| Analysis Year | Annual | Cash Flow | Cash Flow | Cash Flow | Cash Flow | Cash Flow |
| Period Ending | Cash Flow | @ 9.00\% | @ 9.50\% | @ 10.00\% | @ 10.50\% | @ 11.00\% |
| Year 1 Dec-2012 | (\$2,156,172) | $(\$ 1,978,139)$ | $(\$ 1,969,107)$ | $(\$ 1,960,156)$ | $(\$ 1,951,287)$ | $(\$ 1,942,497)$ |
| Year 2 Dec-2013 | (\$3,059,730) | $(\$ 2,575,314)$ | (\$2,551,848) | (\$2,528,703) | (\$2,505,870) | $(\$ 2,483,346)$ |
| Year 3 Dec-2014 | (\$1,074,428) | $(\$ 829,656)$ | $(\$ 818,342)$ | $(\$ 807,234)$ | $(\$ 796,325)$ | $(\$ 785,612)$ |
| Year 4 Dec-2015 | \$143,023 | \$101,322 | \$99,483 | \$97,687 | \$95,930 | \$94,213 |
| Year 5 Dec-2016 | \$366,037 | \$237,899 | \$232,517 | \$227,280 | \$222,185 | \$217,226 |
| Year 6 Dec-2017 | \$377,015 | \$224,801 | \$218,712 | \$212,815 | \$207,102 | \$201,567 |
| Year 7 Dec-2018 | \$388,330 | \$212,430 | \$205,732 | \$199,275 | \$193,048 | \$187,043 |
| Year 8 Dec-2019 | \$399,979 | \$200,736 | \$193,520 | \$186,593 | \$179,945 | \$173,561 |
| Year 9 Dec-2020 | \$339,079 | \$156,121 | \$149,821 | \$143,803 | \$138,051 | \$132,554 |
| Year 10 Dec-2021 | \$273,619 | \$115,580 | \$110,409 | \$105,492 | \$100,814 | \$96,365 |
| Year 11 Dec-2022 | \$358,266 | \$138,840 | \$132,023 | \$125,570 | \$119,460 | \$113,672 |
| Year 12 Dec-2023 | \$326,206 | \$115,977 | \$109,780 | \$103,939 | \$98,434 | \$93,243 |
| Total Cash Flow | $(\$ 3,318,776)$ | $(\$ 3,879,403)$ | $(\$ 3,887,300)$ | (\$3,893,639) | $(\$ 3,898,513)$ | (\$3,902,011) |
| Property Resale @ 8.50\% Cap | \$4,460,893 | \$1,586,002 | \$1,501,248 | \$1,421,378 | \$1,346,091 | \$1,275,105 |
| Total Property Present Value |  | (\$2,293,401) | (\$2,386,052) | (\$2,472,261) | (\$2,552,422) | (\$2,626,906) |
| Rounded to Thousands |  | (\$2,293,000) | (\$2,386,000) | (\$2,472,000) | (\$2,552,000) | (\$2,627,000) |
|  |  | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assured Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prospective Income |  | 169.16\% | 162.92\% | 157.49\% | 152.74\% | 148.54\% |
| Prospective Property Resale |  | -69\% | -63\% | -57\% | -53\% | -49\% |
|  |  | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== | =========== |
|  |  | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |


| Timing \& Inflation |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Reporting Period: | January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2023; 12 years |
| Inflation Month: | Analysis Start |
| General Inflation Rate: | 3.00\% |
| Property Size \& Occupancy |  |
| Property Size: | 50,400 Square Feet |
| Alternate Size: | 1 Square Foot |
| Number of rent roll tenants: | 6.00 |
| Total Occupied Area: | 0 Square Feet, $0.00 \%$, during first month of analysi |
| General Vacancy |  |
| Method: | Percent of Potential Gross Revenue |
| Rate: | 14.00\% |
| Credit \& Collection Loss |  |
| Method: | Percent of Potential Gross Revenue |
| Rate: | 3.00\% |
| Property Purchase \& Resale |  |
| Purchase Price: | \$662,500 |
| Resale Method: | Capitalize Net Operating Income |
| Cap Rate: | 8.50\% |
| Cap Year: | Year 13 |
| Commission/Closing Cost: | \$137,966 |
| Net Cash Flow from Sale: | \$4,460,893 |
| Present Value Discounting |  |
| Discount Method: | Annually (Endpoint on Cash Flow \& Resale) |
| Unleveraged Discount Rate: | 10.00\% |
| Unleveraged Present Value: | (\$2,472,261) at 10.00\% |

TABLE 23 EXPECTED CASE MARKET ASSUMPTIONS 2

| Renewal Probability |  | 75.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Rent |  | \$/SqFt/Yr |
|  | New: | \$10.25 |
|  | Renewal: | 10.25 |
|  | Result: | 10.25 |
| Months Vacant | New: | \$6.00 |
|  | Renewal: | \$0.00 |
|  | Rounded: | \$2.00 |
| Tenant Improvements |  | \$/SqFt |
|  | New: | \$22.50 |
|  | Renewal: | \$10.00 |
|  | Result: | \$13.13 |
| Leasing Commissions |  | Percent |
|  | New: | 6.00\% |
|  | Renewal: | 2.00\% |
|  | Result: | 3.00\% |
| Rent Abatements | New: | 2 Month Fr |
|  | Renewal: |  |
|  | Result: |  |
| Non-Weighted Items |  |  |
| Rent Changes |  | Yes |
| Retail Rent Changes |  |  |
| Reimbursements |  | Net |
| Term Lengths |  | 5 |
|  |  | Years |
| Term Overrides |  | No |

## TABLE 24 EXPECTED CASE RENT ROLL

8821 Philadelphia Road exp Case Assumption w/o construction loan scenario \#1

| Tenant Name <br> Type \& Suite Number Lease Dates \& Term | Floor SqFt Bldg Share | Rate \& Amount per Year per Month | Changes on | Changes to | CPI \& Current Porters' Wage Miscellaneous | Months to Abate |  | Description of Operating Expense Reimbursements | Imprvmnts Rate Amount | Commssns <br> Rate <br> Amount | Assumption about subsequent terms for this tenant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 TENANTA <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi Jan-2015 to Dec-2019 60 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.25 \\ \$ 36,900 \\ \$ 0.85 \\ \$ 3,075 \end{array}$ | Jan-2016 <br> Jan-2017 <br> Jan-2018 <br> Jan-2019 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10.56 \\ & \$ 10.87 \\ & \$ 11.20 \\ & \$ 11.54 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1-2 | $100 \%$ | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{gathered} \$ 24.59 \\ \$ 88,511 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2.85 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 10,247 \end{gathered}$ | Market @75\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 2 TENANT B <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi <br> Feb-2015 to Jan-2021 <br> 72 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.25 \\ \$ 36,900 \\ \$ 0.85 \\ \$ 3,075 \end{array}$ | Feb-2016 <br> Feb-2017 <br> Feb-2018 <br> Feb-2019 <br> Feb-2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10.56 \\ & \$ 10.87 \\ & \$ 11.20 \\ & \$ 11.54 \\ & \$ 11.88 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1-2 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{gathered} \$ 24.59 \\ \$ 88,511 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3.49 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 12,557 \end{gathered}$ | Market @75\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 3 TENANT C <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi Jan-2014 to Dec-2020 84 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.25 \\ \$ 36,900 \\ \$ 0.85 \\ \$ 3,075 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 <br> Jan-2016 <br> Jan-2017 <br> Jan-2018 <br> Jan-2019 <br> Jan-2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10.56 \\ & \$ 10.87 \\ & \$ 11.20 \\ & \$ 11.54 \\ & \$ 11.88 \\ & \$ 12.24 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1-2 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{gathered} \$ 23.87 \\ \$ 85,933 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4.15 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 14,936 \end{gathered}$ | Market @75\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 4 TENANT D <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi Jan-2014 to Dec-2021 96 Months | $\begin{aligned} & 3,600 \\ & 7.14 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 10.25$ $\$ 36,900$ $\$ 0.85$ $\$ 3,075$ | Jan-2015 Jan-2016 Jan-2017 Jan-2018 Jan-2019 Jan-2020 $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10.56 \\ & \$ 10.87 \\ & \$ 11.20 \\ & \$ 11.54 \\ & \$ 11.88 \\ & \$ 12.24 \\ & \$ 12.61 \end{aligned}$ | - | 1-2 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{gathered} \$ 23.87 \\ \$ 85,933 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4.83 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 17,387 \end{gathered}$ | Market @75\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 5 TENANTE <br> Industrial, Suite: Phi Jan-2014 to Dec-2022 108 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 5,400 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.25 \\ \$ 55,350 \\ \$ 1 \\ \$ 4,613.00 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 <br> Jan-2016 <br> Jan-2017 <br> Jan-2018 <br> Jan-2019 <br> Jan-2020 <br> Jan-2021 <br> Jan-2022 | $\$ 10.56$ $\$ 10.87$ $\$ 11.20$ $\$ 11.54$ $\$ 11.88$ $\$ 12.24$ $\$ 12.61$ $\$ 12.98$ | - | 1-2 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 24 \\ \$ 128,899 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 6 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 29,866 \end{gathered}$ | Market @75\% See assumption: Average Market |
| 6 TENANT F <br> Industrial, Suite: Yel Jan-2014 to Dec-2023 120 Months | $\begin{array}{r} 30,600 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.25 \\ \$ 313,650.00 \\ \$ 1 \\ 26,138 \end{array}$ | Jan-2015 <br> Jan-2016 <br> Jan-2017 <br> Jan-2018 <br> Jan-2019 <br> Jan-2020 <br> Jan-2021 <br> Jan-2022 <br> Jan-2023 | $\$ 10.56$ $\$ 10.87$ $\$ 11.20$ $\$ 11.54$ $\$ 11.88$ $\$ 12.24$ $\$ 12.61$ $\$ 12.98$ $\$ 13.37$ | - | 1-2 | 100\% | Net: Pays a full pro-rata share of all reimbursable expenses. |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 6.25 \\ 6.00 \% \\ \$ 191,342 \end{gathered}$ | Market @80\% See assumption: Average Market |
| Total Occupied SqFt <br> Total Available SqFt | 0 50,400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CONSTRUCTION VIABILITY SCHEDULE

The following Graph shows the various scenarios based on the Best Case Assumptions.
Projected Goal is a $10 \%$ return on Investment. This value is calculated as follows.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| These are numbers I used for the Best Case |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential | \$10.80 | Rent Aveg PSF | 50,400 | sf | \$544,320 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOI |  |  |  |  | \$548,081 |
| Stablized Year |  |  | cap | 8.50\% | \$6,448,012 |
| Development Cost |  |  |  |  | \$5,878,402 |
|  | Profit |  |  |  | \$569,610 |
|  |  |  | Return |  | 9.69\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Owner Goal is $10 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

As of today, the returns do not accomplish the Owner's goals of a 10\% return on Development cost vs. the Capital investment. This model illustrates when the goal will be achieved based on a ( $3 \%$ steady increase on Development cost following inflation) and (Increasing Rent based on increase of pent up demand)( less expenses following inflation = NOI)

NOI divided by the CAP rate = property value
The property value less Development cost equals the return objective


| Rent Increase to Increase NOI |  |  | Year 15 | Year 16 | Year 17 | Year 18 | Year 19 | Year 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Rent Best Case PSH | \$10.29 | \$10.60 | \$10.92 | \$11.24 | \$11.58 | \$11.93 |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Rent Best Case | \$11.01 | \$11.40 | \$11.80 | \$12.21 | \$12.64 | \$13.08 |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Rent Best Case | \$11.78 | \$12.25 | \$12.74 | \$13.25 | \$13.78 | \$14.33 |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Rent Best Case | \$12.60 | \$13.16 | \$13.76 | \$14.38 | \$15.02 | \$15.70 |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Rent Best Case | \$13.47 | \$14.14 | \$14.85 | \$15.59 | \$16.37 | \$17.19 |
| Case 6 | 5.50\% | Rent Best Case | \$14.39 | \$15.19 | \$16.02 | \$16.90 | \$17.83 | \$18.81 |
| Case 7 | 6.00\% | Rent Best Case | \$15.38 | \$16.30 | \$17.28 | \$18.32 | \$19.42 | \$20.58 |
| Case 8 | 6.50\% | Rent Best Case | \$16.43 | \$17.50 | \$18.63 | \$19.84 | \$21.13 | \$22.51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3\% | Development Cost PSF | \$176.42 | \$181.71 | \$187.16 | \$192.78 | \$198.56 | \$204.52 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | NOI CAP | \$121.05 | \$124.68 | \$128.42 | \$132.28 | \$136.25 | \$140.33 |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | NOI CAP | \$129.54 | \$134.08 | \$138.77 | \$143.63 | \$148.66 | \$153.86 |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | NOI CAP | \$138.59 | \$144.13 | \$149.89 | \$155.89 | \$162.13 | \$168.61 |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | NOI CAP | \$148.21 | \$154.88 | \$161.85 | \$169.13 | \$176.74 | \$184.70 |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | NOI CAP | \$158.45 | \$166.38 | \$174.70 | \$183.43 | \$192.60 | \$202.23 |
| Case 6 | 5.50\% | NOI CAP | \$169.35 | \$178.67 | \$188.49 | \$198.86 | \$209.80 | \$221.34 |
| Case 7 | 6.00\% | NOI CAP | \$180.94 | \$191.80 | \$203.30 | \$215.50 | \$228.43 | \$242.14 |
| Case 8 | 6.50\% | NOI CAP | \$193.26 | \$205.82 | \$219.20 | \$233.45 | \$248.63 | \$264.79 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Profit FromDev SF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Profit PSF | (\$55.37) | (\$57.03) | (\$58.74) | (\$60.50) | (\$62.32) | (\$64.19) |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Profit PSF | (\$46.88) | (\$47.64) | (\$48.39) | (\$49.15) | (\$49.91) | (\$50.66) |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Profit PSF | (\$37.83) | (\$37.58) | (\$37.27) | (\$36.89) | (\$36.44) | (\$35.91) |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Profit PSF | (\$28.21) | (\$26.83) | (\$25.31) | (\$23.65) | (\$21.82) | (\$19.82) |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Profit PSF | (\$17.97) | (\$15.34) | (\$12.47) | (\$9.35) | (\$5.96) | (\$2.29) |
| Case 6 | 5.50\% | Profit PSF | (\$7.07) | (\$3.05) | \$1.33 | \$6.08 | \$11.23 | \$16.81 |
| Case 7 | 6.00\% | Profit PSF | \$4.52 | \$10.08 | \$16.14 | \$22.72 | \$29.87 | \$37.62 |
| Case 8 | 6.50\% | Profit PSF | \$16.84 | \$24.11 | \$32.04 | \$40.67 | \$50.06 | \$60.27 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Profit From Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Profit Dollars | (\$2,790,553) | (\$2,874,270) | (\$2,960,498) | (\$3,049,313) | (\$3,140,792) | (\$3,235,016) |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Profit Dollars | (\$2,362,578) | (\$2,400,810) | (\$2,439,046) | (\$2,477,247) | (\$2,515,370) | (\$2,553,370) |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Profit Dollars | (\$1,906,863) | (\$1,894,221) | (\$1,878,407) | (\$1,859,212) | (\$1,836,419) | (\$1,809,800) |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Profit Dollars | (\$1,421,758) | (\$1,352,363) | (\$1,275,844) | (\$1,191,760) | (\$1,099,648) | $(\$ 999,018)$ |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Profit Dollars | $(\$ 905,521)$ | $(\$ 772,965)$ | $(\$ 628,446)$ | (\$471,206) | (\$300,445) | $(\$ 115,315)$ |
| Case 6 | 5.50\% | Profit Dollars | $(\$ 356,318)$ | (\$153,625) | \$66,884 | \$306,390 | \$566,145 | \$847,472 |
| Case 7 | 6.00\% | Profit Dollars | \$227,786 | \$508,201 | \$813,444 | \$1,145,244 | \$1,505,441 | \$1,895,995 |
| Case 8 | 6.50\% | Profit Dollars | \$848,827 | \$1,215,207 | \$1,614,738 | \$2,049,855 | \$2,523,159 | \$3,037,430 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash on Cash Return |  |  | Year 15 | Year 16 | Year 17 | Year 18 | Year 19 | Year 20 |
| Case 1 | 3.00\% | Percent Rent Increase | -31.38\% | -31.38\% | -31.38\% | -31.38\% | -31.38\% | -31.38\% |
| Case 2 | 3.50\% | Percent Rent Increase | -26.57\% | -26.21\% | -25.86\% | -25.50\% | -25.13\% | -24.77\% |
| Case 3 | 4.00\% | Percent Rent Increase | -21.45\% | -20.68\% | -19.91\% | -19.14\% | -18.35\% | -17.56\% |
| Case 4 | 4.50\% | Percent Rent Increase | -15.99\% | -14.77\% | -13.53\% | -12.27\% | -10.99\% | -9.69\% |
| Case 5 | 5.00\% | Percent Rent Increase | -10.18\% | -8.44\% | -6.66\% | -4.85\% | -3.00\% | -1.12\% |
| Case 6 | 5.50\% | Percent Rent Increase | -4.01\% | -1.68\% | 0.71\% | 3.15\% | 5.66\% | 8.22\% |
| Case 7 | 6.00\% | Percent Rent Increase | 2.56\% | 5.55\% | 8.62\% | 11.79\% | 15.04\% | 18.39\% |
| Case 8 | 6.50\% | Percent Rent Increase | 9.55\% | 13.27\% | 17.12\% | 21.10\% | 25.21\% | 29.47\% |
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## SELF-STORAGE CASE 3

Over the last several years the Self-Storage industry, locally and nationally, has experienced an increase in vacancy and lower profits. A current study conducted by Integra Realty Resources stated that more than 100 Self-Storage facilities in major U.S. Markets reported that their revenues decreased by 5.2 percent during 2010. Moreover, revenue continued to decrease by one percent in the first two quarters of 2011. (Swanson, 2011)

Self-Storage construction spiked around 1995, with a massive amount of development taking place. With historic strong returns for existing facilities, this property type caught on with not only existing Owners but also first-timers wanting to enter the industry. (Swanson, 2011) However, now during the current slow economic environment, questions are being raised about resiliency of the industry.

A recent study conducted by Mt. Royal Management Company has determined that existing and potential renters have changed their behaviors towards renting Self-Storage units. The average consumer now looks upon a storage unit as a discretionary expenditure. Existing tenants opted to get rid of excess personal goods and vacated their units. The once loyal Commercial users of storage space who typically rented larger units left the market. These tenants included small contractors and businesspersons that used the facilities as an office and for storing inventory and equipment. Without construction jobs, the flooring, drywall, plumber contractors disappeared and their need for storage evaporated.

Climbing vacancy rates and lower profits continue to be a concern. A local Baltimore storage facility reports that over the 12-month period from 2008 to 2009 vacancy jumped from a respectable four percent to twenty-two percent, and it continues to climb. Moreover, the subject property has increased in vacancy as well. Year-end 2005 vacancy was five percent, 2006 it remained steady at five percent, 2007 it jumped to eleven percent, in 2008 up to fifteen percent, vacancy continued to climb to nineteen percent in 2009 and thru period November 2011 vacancy is now at twenty-one percent. For an overview of three local Self-Storage facilities, The Cash Flow growth is decreasing by 1 to $2 \%$ a year due to pressure the market is putting on the rents. This will be the third year without an increase. However, expenses continue to go up approximately 3 to $5 \%$ a year depending on the line item.

The subject property was built in 1980, now 31 years old. The project is slowly becoming obsolete. Based on the property's age, it will continue to need more and more maintenance. The property has been well maintained. At this time, there is no major capital improvements that are needed. The pavement, the roofs and painting are repaired as needed, a little at a time.

The project will continue to have difficulty competing with the newer more modernized storage projects. Consumers are now choosing the newer facilities that are more secure, being that they are Self-contained multistory buildings, and they are climate controlled.

An option other than redevelopment of the site is to sell it as a business. At this time with the market down there is much interest from the national companies to purchase properties that are owned by smaller Owner/ operators. The published Reversion CAP rate is $10.84 \%$ based on the current year NOI the property should sell for $\$ 2.9$ million (+/-) depending on the value of the business itself.

## Storage

| NOI Year 13 | $\$ 308,219$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Resale | $\$ 2,843,349$ |
| Reversion Cost (Less) | $\$ 85,300$ |
| Reversion | $\$ 2,758,048$ |

Unleveraged
IRR Before Tax w/ Reversion
Present Value $\$ 2,896,536$


Total Development Cost
Cash on Cash Return or
Overall| Return

| Expenses | $\$ 277,976$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| EGI | $\$ 654,456$ |
| Effective Gross Income \% | $42 \%$ |

Gross Potentiall Income
$\$ 789,280$

Gross Rent Multiplier
Effective Gross Income Mull


Table 25 Self-Storage Vacancy Trend

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Actual self storage Case Assumption } \\
& \text { Schedule of prosenective Cash flow In Inflated Dollars for the Fical Year Begining } 2012 \text { Stailized } \\
& \text { Entitlement/ Construction }
\end{aligned}
$$

## 501 N Mildred St - Jefferson Self Storage

## Ranson, WV 25438 - Jefferson County Ind Submarket

29,000 SF Available For Sale at \$2,400,000 (\$73.85/SF)
32,500 SF Class C Industrial Self-Storage Building Built in 2000

| Address | Name | Submarket | County | \|For Sale Price | \$Price/SF | Land(AC) | \% Leased | \|Yr Blt/Ren |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 501 N Mildred St | Jefferson Self Storage | Jefferson County... | Jefferson | 2,400,000 | 73.85 | 5.94 | 100 | 2000 |
| $\underline{21502}$ Great Mills Rd | Patuxant Self Storage | St Mary's County... | St Marys | 1,700,000 | 52.96 | 2.57 | 100 | 1987 |

## building notes

Property is a 33,000+- square foot self storage facility situated on 5.94+-acres located in Ranson, WV. The facility features 325 units as small as $5^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}$ to as large as $\mathbf{2 0}^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime} 0^{\prime}$. Unit count includes RV storage. It also has a 4,000+-sf block storage building with office area and room for expansion. The property is conveniently located near Charles
Town Races and Slots and numerous housing developments. Variable rate commission.
http://sale.svn.com/wvselfstorage

## 21502 Great Mills Rd - Patuxant Self Storage

Lexington Park, MD 20653 - St Mary's County Ind Submarket
Property For Sale, Fully Leased Building
32,100 SF Class C Industrial Self-Storage Building Built in 1987
The following table shows recent quarter-over-quarter changes in rental rates and occupancies based on a nationwide survey conducted by Integra Realty Resources. This reflects the nationwide market and illustrates current market conditions, which are unlike any historic trends.

| Period | Rental Rate | Occupancy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1Q 2010 | $-2.2 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| 2Q 2010 | $0.0 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| 3Q 2010 | $-5.2 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| $4 Q 2010$ | $-1.1 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ |
| 1 Q 2011 | $0.0 \%$ | $-3.5 \%$ |
| $2 Q 2011$ | $-2.2 \%$ | $-3.5 \%$ |

- Case Study
o Best Case Model
- Highest Rents
- Lowest Vacancy
o Expected Case Model
- Market Rents
- Market Vacancy
o Self-Storage Cash Flow Model
- Actual Rents
- Actual Vacancy
- Actual Expenses
- Case Study General Assumptions
o CAPrate Flex
8.5\%
o CAP Rate Self-Storage $10.84 \%$
0 Discount Rate 10.00\%
o No Debt Service all cash transactions
- Construction
o 2 years from Close of Self-Storage $\$ 5.8$ mil $\$ 114$. psf
o Construction Cost same
o Land Value Same
- Reversion
o CAP year 13 NOI (11 of operation)
- Inflation 3\%
- Case Study Variances
o Vacancy
- Best Case Natural Roll over
- Expected Case General Vacancy $4 \%$
- Lease types NNN
- Lease up Variances

0 Best Case 100\% by Year 2
o Expected Case $100 \%$ by Year 3

- Collection Loss

0 Best Case $\quad 1 \%$
o Expected Case
$3 \%$

- Ti
\$22.50
- Renewal

0 Best Case 80\%
0 Expected Case $\quad 75 \%$

- Rent

0 Best Case $\$ 12.00$ office $\$ 9.60$ Warehouse average $\$ 10.80$
0 Worst Case \$10.25 Warehouse \$\#\# average

- Lease Terms

05 years for 3,600 users
0 10 year for the Yellow Brick Building 30,600 sf tenant

## CASE STUDY SUMMARY CONTINUED

- Reports including
o Argus Cash Flow
o Reimbursable Expenses
o Sources \& Uses
o Resale Value
- Future Construction Viability
o Based on Formula
- NOI / CAP Rate = Property Value - Development Cost
- Development cost / total = Cash on Cash return
o Required Cash on Cash return 10\%
o Anticipating Pent-up demand causing rents to increase
o Inflation remain steady at 3\% causing Development Cost and Expenses to follow
o Best Case
- Rents increase 3.5\% year over year
- Year 2 accomplishes goal
o Expected Case
- Rents Increase 6.5\%
- Year 15 accomplish Goal
- Numbers based on stabilized year 4 for both Models
o NOI
- Best \$548,081
- Expected \$342,849
- Self-Storage $\$ 376,480$
o Value Stabilized Year
- Best \$6,448,012
- Expected \$4,035,518
- Self-Storage \$3,606,116

0 NOI year 13 for Reversion year 12 (10 years of operation for Flex)

- Best $\$ 621,964$
- Expected \$390,903
- Self-Storage \$317,087
$\cdot$
o Value Stabilized Year after fess and before taxes
- Best
- Expected
- Self-Storage
\$7,097,707
\$4,460,893
\$2,758,048
o Unleveraged IRR
- Best
10.85\%
- Expected
4.31\%
- Self-Storage
o Cash on Cash Return
- Best 9.69\%
- Expected negative $31 \%$
- Self-Storage
o Effective Gross Income
- Best Case $31 \%$
- Expected Case $41 \%$
- Self-Storage $42 \%$
o Gross Rent Multiplier
- Best Case $\quad 11.76$
- Expected Case 13.80
- Self-Storage
o Effective Gross Income \%
- Best

31\%

- Expected

41\%

- Storage

42\%
o NOI Growth

- Best Case yes
- Expected Case yes
- Self-Storage no


## PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN
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## INTRODUCTION

The Owner/ Developer employs an "in-house" Property Development Company as well as a Property Management Company. The Owners recognizes large cost saving by not using numerous outside contractors and consultants to handle the projects in which they are involved. In addition, several projects can be handled at one time by the same staff. This gives the Owner the ability to effectively manage a project from conception thru reversion, by monitoring cost, schedules and effective property management.

These in-house companies are responsible for the master planning of the projects to accommodate any anticipated future needs; including evaluation of project alternatives; identification of site requirements; funding requirements; budget authorization cycles and/or financial impacts; and project phasing.

The Project Management Plan is written and followed by the management team. The plan includes a definition of an Owner's program goals, technical requirements, schedules, resources, budgets, and management programs. It also provides a vehicle for including efficiencies in the design and construction phases of all buildings. It will also serve as the basis for completed construction documents and outline the commissioning plan for the engineering.

The Development Department oversees and is responsible for the Entitlement, Engineering, Architectural, Legal, Public interface, and Government responsibilities. In addition, they are responsible for hiring and overseeing the site construction team, and building construction general contractor. Upon completion, the development team hands over the building to the property management company.

Property Management oversees, leasing, maintenance, marketing and bookkeeping. They are responsible for the day to day operations of the projects and are held responsible for the income, expenses, and ensures the project is running as efficient and cost effectively as possible.


## CONCLUSIONS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in this feasibility report it is not advisable to redevelop the subject property into a Flex building at this time.

The Self-Storage operation although slowly becoming obsolete, still offers the owners a steady profitable Cash Flow each month. In addition, the Reversion Value today based on CAP rate of $10.84 \%$ values the property at $\$ 3.47$ million dollars. The Best Case present cap value for the proposed project is $\$ 303,572$. The Expected Case Model is a negative Present Value of $\$ 1.7$ million.

The Flex Warehouse project may be feasible in the future, as pent up demand absorbs some of the existing inventory and forces rents to escalate. However, in the expected case model for the project to be feasible in 15 years, with inflation holding steady, rents will need to increase at $6.5 \%$ year over year, the developer can recognize a $10 \%$ return on their money.

The Best Case Model offers insight as to the requirements it takes to complete a project of this magnitude. Specifically, the rents need to be at the highest level the market can tolerate. The expenses will need to be held constant or less than inflation. This is also impacted by the Development cost @ $\$ 103.49$ psf plus the value of the land for a total of $\$ 116.63 \mathrm{psf}$.
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Account Identifier: $\quad$ District - 15 Account Number - 1600001148

| Owner Information |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner Name: | GOLDEN RING MIN-STORAGE ASSOCLATES | Use: <br> Principal Residence: | INDUSTRIAL NO |
| Mailing Address: | 1233 MT ROYAL AVE BALTIMORE MO 21217-4133 | Deed Reference: | 1) $206175 / 00039$ |


| Location \& Structure Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Premises Address |  |  |  |  | Legal Description |  |  |  |  |
| 3821 PHILADELPHIA RD |  |  |  |  | 5.313 AC SES |  |  |  |  |
| 0-0000 |  |  |  |  | PHILADELPHIARD 1500 E RACE RD |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Map 0090 | Grid 0001 | Parcel 0732 | Sub District | Subdivision 0000 | Section | Block | Lot | Assessment Area 3 | Plat No: Plat Ref: |
| Special Tax <br> Areas |  | Town | NONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ad Valor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tax Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Primary Structure Built | Enclosed Area | Property Land Area | County Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1030 | 70587 | 5.3100 AC | 07 |
| Stories Basement |  |  |  |



|  |  | $01 / 01 / 2009$ | $07 / 01 / 2010$ | $07 / 01 / 2011$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Land | $1,002,000$ | $1,725,700$ |  |  |
| Improvements: | $1,732,700$ | $2,385,500$ |  |  |
| Total: | $2,794,700$ | $4,111,200$ | $3.872,367$ | $4,111,200$ |
| Preferential Land: | 0 |  |  | 0 |




Figure 56 Baltimore County Permit Fees 1

## BALTIMORE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT FEES

| Development Management Fees |
| :---: |
| (Effective Monday, December 6, 2010) |

Figure 57 Baltimore County Development Fees

| BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND <br> BUILDING PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Effective December 6, 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL PERMIT FEES ARE ROUNDED UP TO THE NEAREST DOLLAR Page 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| THIS SECTION PERTAINS TO ALL OTHER BUIL DING-RELATED PERMITS: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Rate |  |  | Rate |
| Antennas |  | \$30.00 | Satellite Dish (on roof or attached to building) |  |  |
| Blasting - $1^{\text {tr }} 60$ days |  | \$24.00 | - Residential |  | \$24.00 |
| - Each subsequert 60 days |  | \$12.00 | - Commercial |  | \$60.00 |
| - Annual |  | \$100.00 | Shell - Commerial 0 \$ 0.030 per sf (Does not indide tomant) | Minimum | \$100.00 |
| Bridge, private |  | \$70.00 | (See proper "Fee Category" for correct fee on al "Shell - Commercial" alterations) |  |  |
| Change of Occupancy |  | \$48.00 |  |  |  |
| Circus/Carnivals |  | \$35.00 | Solar Power System - Residential |  | \$70.00 |
| Fences - Residertial |  | \$12.00 | - Commercial |  | See Category |
| - Commerial |  | \$24.00 | Sprinkler System - Pipe $2^{*}$ or less |  | \$35.00 |
| Fireplaces, wood buring stoves |  | \$18.00 | - Larger Than $2^{\prime \prime}$ Pipe |  | \$ 82.00 |
| Foundation Only - Residential |  | \$120.00 | (Plus Fire Inspection Fee) |  |  |
| - Commercial |  | \$200.00 | Storm Water Management - Two years |  |  |
| Grading - Two years 0 ( $\$ 0.002$ sf |  |  | - Per Acre |  | \$50.00 |
| - Minimum |  | \$48.00 | - Minimum |  | \$50.00 |
| - Maximum |  | \$5,900.00 | - Maximum |  | \$450.00 |
| Mechanical, HVAC System - Residential |  |  | Suppression Tank |  | \$160.00 |
| - Less than 4,000 sf |  | \$30.00 |  |  |  |
| - All others |  | \$75.00 | Swimming Pool |  |  |
| Mechanical, HVAC System - Commerdal |  |  | - Residential - Above Ground |  | \$30.00 |
| - Less than 4,000 sf |  | \$30.00 | - Residential - In-ground |  | \$430.00 |
| - All others |  | \$75.00 | - Commercial |  | \$120.00 |
| Miscellaneous, Non-Specified |  |  | Tank |  |  |
| (35 approved by Bulding's Engineer) |  | \$40.00 | - Residential |  | \$25.00 |
| Moving/Razing - Resdertial 0 ( $\$ 0.30$ per 100 sf | Minimum | \$10.00 | - Commercial |  | \$40.00 |
| - Accessory Structure, Residentisl (no water/sewer) $0 \$ .30$ per 100 sf | Minimum | \$5.00 | Tents / Temporary Structures - Up to 180 days (non-renewable) |  |  |
| - All Others © $\$ 0.50$ per 100 sf | Mrimum | \$15.00 | - Up to 3,000 sf |  | \$24.00 |
|  |  |  | - Esch additional 100 sf |  | \$1.00 |
| Percolation Test |  | \$60.00 | - Maximum |  | \$483.00 |
| Piers - Residential |  | \$70.00 |  |  |  |
| - Commerial |  | \$200.00 | Use and Occupancy (Per unit, condo/apt, etr.) |  |  |
| Pilings - Residentisl |  | \$20.00 | - Certificate/final |  | \$10.00 |
| - Commercial: 1 to 12 |  | \$40.00 | - Commercial/Fire Insp (per 5,000 sf or portion thereof) |  | \$17.00 |
| - Commercial: 13 ar more |  | \$80.00 |  |  |  |
| Plans - Preliminary Review (per $1 / 2$ hour) |  | \$48.00 | Windmills - (50\% \& under) |  | \$20.00 |
| Retaining Walls - Residertial |  | \$12.00 | -( $51^{\prime}-200{ }^{\prime}$ ) |  | \$60.00 |
| - Commercial |  | \$30.00 | - (201'\& over) |  | \$120.00 |
| Revisions - Without Drawings - 10\% of original fee | Minimum | \$18.00 |  |  |  |
| - With Drawings; No Ste Plans - $25 \%$ of original fee |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Residertial | Minimum | \$30.00 |  |  |  |
| - Commerial | Minimum | \$60.00 |  |  |  |
| - With Site Plans -5\% of oricinal fee | Minimum | \$15.00 |  |  |  |
| - Maximum Revision Fee |  | \$590.00 |  |  |  |
| - Change of Owner / Contractor |  | \$25.00 |  |  |  |
| - Address Change - 10\% of criginal fae | Minimum | \$5.00 |  |  |  |
|  | Maximum | \$20.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PDM APPP 15 |  | ge 2 |  |  | Rev 12/70 |

Figure 58 Baltimore County Permit Fees 2

# ML <br> Manufacturing, Light 



Height and Area Requirements


Intent: To provide areas for industrial uses that require assembling. compouding, manufacturing. packaging or processing of goods or services.

Typical Uses Permitted by Right: Industrial uses requiring assembly. production, processing, packaging. or treatment of various elements, laboratory, office, medical clinic, excavation not involving explosives, equipment and material storage yard, brewery.

Typical Uses Permitted by Special Exception: Excavation using explosives, landfill, truck stop and trucking facility.

Notes:
Various retail or service uses may be permitted by right when the ML zone is part of a planned industrial park at least 25 acres in net area or in an IM district.
Various automotive uses may be permitred by special exception when the ML zone is part of a planned industrial park at least 25 acres in net area or in an IM district.

Interim uses may be permitted under special conditions.

A Citizen's Guder to Zonnagin B.altanore Cotnty 149
Figure 59 Baltimore County Zoning Illustration

Manufacturing Zones
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Figure 60 Baltimore County Manufacturing Zones
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FIGURE 62 BALTIMORE COUNTY PRIORITY FUNDING AREA

Map 29
Perry Hall-White Marsh Growth Area Proposed Land Use


Prese 192

FIGURE 63 PERRY HALL WHITE MARSH GROWTH PLAN
county to receive substantial public input before final plan approval. The County map below locates th property in the Growth Area bordering the Employment Center.


FIGURE 64 BALTIMORE COUNTY GROWTH AREA
2010 Master Plan Land Urban Rural Demarcation Line:



| Mह |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation | Go Back |
| BALTIMORE COUNTY | View Map |
| Real Property Data Search | New Search |

District - 15 Account Number - 1600001148

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND STATE AND COUNTY REAL PROPERTY TAXES

| Parcel ID: | 15-00-001148 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year: | 2012 |
| Owner Name: | Golden Ring Min-Sarrage Asrocidtes |
| Maling Address: | 1233 Mt Roysl Ave, Baltimore, MD 21217 |
| Parcel/Situs Address: | 3821 Prilsodphis Rd |
| District: | 15 |
| Property Class: | 07 Induatrial |
| Semi-Annual Eligible: | No |
| Miscellaneous: |  |

Legal Description
5313 AC SES
PrLadenta RD

## Asseasment Information

Rull Year $\quad 4,111,200$
Tax rate for Rall Year: Courty $\$ 1.10000$, Sate 50.11200 per $\$ 100$ of Assensed Value

```
Tax Receivable Amounts
```

Ban Date: 07/01/2011

|  | Balled Ambunt | Paid | Outstanding | First SA | Second SA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taves/Charges | 50.714.96 | 50.714.96 | . 00 | , 0 | . 00 |
| Fees | . 00 | . 0 | . 00 | - | .00 |
| Grans/Bure | 50.714 .96 | 50,714.96 | . 0 | , 0 | . 00 |
| Discount Appled | (45223) | (452.23) | . 0 | . 0 | .00 |
| Now Discourt | . 00 | . 0 | . 00 | . 0 | . 00 |
| Interent Appled | . 00 | . 0 | . 0 | , 0 | . 0 |
| Now Inteest | . 00 | . 0 | . 00 | . 0 | . 00 |
| Total | 50.252 .73 | 50,262.73 | .00 | . 00 | . 00 |

## Payments Received

| Payment | Payment Type | Interest/Discount Calculation Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Full |  | Amount Paid |
|  | $07 / 25 / 2011$ | $50,252.73$ |

## Detailed Breakdown of Receivable Amounts

| Description | Amount | Tax Credits |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Courty Tax | $45,223.20$ |  |
| Sate Tax | $4,504.94$ |  |
| Bry Res Fee | 30.00 |  |
| Sever Beneft | 208.00 |  |
| Sever Service | 371.11 |  |
| Water Senefit | 130.00 |  |
| Water Dastribution | 98.11 |  |
| Total | 50.714 .96 |  |

The receivable tax amourts reflect the application of the tax credits listed.

Financing

# FINANCING OPTIONS 

- Interest Rates
- Financing types, terms
- Economic Indicators

FINANCING OPTIONS
If the owner would elect to take on debt service the following options are available
Warehouse/ bulk
distribution

Flex Warehouse/
Showroom

Heavy
Manufacturing

| Rate Estimates (As of: 11/15/2011) | $\qquad$ |  |  |  | 5 Year Fixed Rate(Indec. 5 Year Treasury, 0.91\%) |  |  |  | 3 Month Adjustable Rate (Index 3 MO Libor, 0.47\%) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Loan to Value |  |  |  | Loan to Value |  |  |  | Loan to Value |  |  |  |
|  | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% |
| Anchored Retail | 4.2\% | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.4\% | 5.4\% | 5.4\% | 5.6\% | 5.8\% |
| Apartment | 4.0\% | 4.1\% | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 2.9\% | 2.9\% | 3.1\% | 3.3\% | 5.2\% | 5.3\% | 5.4\% | 5.6\% |
| Auto Services | 4.8\% | 4.9\% | 5.0\% | NA | 3.6\% | 3.7\% | 3.9\% | NA | 6.0\% | 6.1\% | 6.3\% | NA |
| Condo-Conversion | 4.2\% | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.5\% | 3.1\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.4\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.6\% | 5.8\% |
| Congregate Care | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.9\% |
| Convenience Store | 4.8\% | 5.0\% | 5.1\% | NA | 3.7\% | 3.8\% | 4.0\% | NA | 6.1\% | 6.2\% | 6.4\% | NA |
| For Sale Housing | 4.8\% | 5.0\% | 5.1\% | NA | 3.7\% | 3.8\% | 4.0\% | NA | 6.1\% | 6.2\% | 6.4\% | NA |
| Golf Course | 4.8\% | 4.9\% | 5.1\% | 5.2\% | 3.7\% | 3.8\% | 3.9\% | 4.1\% | 6.1\% | 6.1\% | 6.3\% | 6.5\% |
| Industrial | 4.2\% | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.4\% | 5.4\% | 5.4\% | 5.6\% | 5.8\% |
| Lodging | 5.0\% | 5.2\% | 5.4\% | NA | 3.9\% | 4.0\% | 4.2\% | NA | 6.2\% | 6.4\% | 6.6\% | NA |
| Medical | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.9\% |
| Mini-storage | 4.4\% | 4.5\% | 4.7\% | NA | 3.3\% | 3.4\% | 3.5\% | NA | 5.6\% | 5.8\% | 5.9\% | NA |
| Mixed Use | 4.4\% | 4.5\% | 4.7\% | NA | 3.3\% | 3.4\% | 3.5\% | NA | 5.6\% | 5.8\% | 5.9\% | NA |
| Mobile Home Park | 4.2\% | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.4\% | 5.4\% | 5.4\% | 5.6\% | 5.8\% |
| Office | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.9\% |
| Religious Facility | 5.6\% | 5.8\% | 5.9\% | NA | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 4.8\% | NA | 6.9\% | 7.0\% | 7.2\% | NA |
| Research and Development | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.9\% |
| Restaurant | 5.2\% | 5.3\% | 5.4\% | NA | 4.0\% | 4.1\% | 4.3\% | NA | 6.4\% | 6.5\% | 6.7\% | NA |
| Special Purpos | 5.3\% | 5.4\% | NA | NA | 4.1\% | 4.3\% | NA | NA | 6.5\% | 6.7\% | NA | NA |

## http://www.realwebfunds.com/Commercial_Mortgage_Loan/Index_Rates

Financial-Indicatorsๆ


Typical Commercial Construction Financing Terms
Note: These are not terms of any specific lender. They represent terms that we frequently see in the marketplace and are not to be relied on as a commitment to provide any specific terms for any specific deal.

| specific terms for any specific deal. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum loan to cost: | $80 \%$ to $90 \%$ |
| Maximum loan to value: | $70 \%$ to $80 \%$ of completed value |
| Term: | Generally 1 to 2 years with extensions as necessary |
| Amortization: | Interest only |
| Typical Rates: | Prime plus $0.5 \%$ to $2.0 \%$ or LIBOR plus $3.0 \%$ to $4.0 \%$ |
| Prepayment terms: | No prepayment penalty - but these loans often have a $1 \%$ exit fee if permanent loan is not done with same lender |
| Projects: | All commercial property types can be financed. Developer and contractor must have experience at this type and scale of development. |
| Recourse: | Typically recourse. a few lenders offer non-recourse construction financing for larger loans. |
| Closing costs: | Borrowers are responsible for all due diligence and closings costs (e.g. Appraisal, Phase 1 Environmental, site inspection, title, etc) <br> - Loans under $\$ 3 \mathrm{M}$ - costs range from $\$ 6,000$ to $\$ 12,000$ |

Typical Commercial Real Estate Bridge Loan Terms

| Note: These are not terms of any specific lender. They represent terms that we frequently see in the marketplace and are not to be relied on as a commitment to provide any |
| :--- |
| specific terms for any specific deal. |
| Maximum loan to <br> cost: $80 \%$ to $90 \%$ <br> Maximum loan to <br> value: $70 \%$ to $80 \%$ of completed value <br> Holdbacks: In some cases the loan will be made at the future value but a portion will be "held back" until improvments are completed or vacancy is <br> decreased or some other value-add goal is met. <br> Term: Generally 1 to 3 years with extensions as necessary <br> Amortization: Interest only <br> Typical Rates: Prime plus $1.5 \%$ to 3.0\% or LIBOR plus $3.5 \%$ to $4.5 \%$ <br> Prepayment terms: No prepayment penalty <br> Projects: All commercial property types can be financed. Developer and contractor must have experience at this type and scale of developement. <br> Recourse: Typically recourse. a few lenders offer non-recourse construction financing for larger loans. <br> Closing costs: Borrowers are responsible for all due diligence and closings costs (e.g. Appraisal, Phase 1 Environmental, site inspection, title, etc) <br> - Loans under $\$ 3 M-$ costs range from $\$ 6,000$ to $\$ 12,000$ <br> - For loans over $\$ 3 M$ - costs can be $\$ 20,000$ or more |

## Typical Single Tenant, NNN, Property Financing Terms

| Note: These are not terms of any specific lender. They represent terms that we frequently see in the marketplace and are not to be relied on as a commitment to provide any specific terms for any specific deal. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Debt service coverage: | Credit tenant: as low as 1.03 times net operating income Non-credit tenant: 1.25 times net operating income |
| Maximum loan to value: | Credit tenant: "up to $100 \%$ LTV" (this is usually limited by the debt coverage ratio to around $85 \%$ ) Non-credit tenant: around 75\% LTV |
| Term: | 5,10 and 20 year terms and terms coterminous with lease are most common. |
| Amortization: | 25 or 30 years |
| Typical Rates: | Credit tenant: 10 year fixed $=10$ yr US T-bill $+1.1 \%$ to $2.0 \%$ <br> Non-credit tenant: 10 year fixed $=10$ yr US T-bill $+1.7 \%$ to $3.0 \%$ (lowest for retail, highest for restaurants) 5 year fixed rate and adjustable rate loans are also available at attractive rates. |
| Prepayment terms: | Prepayment based on "yield maintenance" or "defeasance". This kind of prepay can make it prohibitive to refinance or sell the property (prepayment fees can easily exceed $10 \%$ to $15 \%$ of the loan). <br> 5 yr fixed rate loans - typically have a decreasing prepayment each year (e.g. $5 \%, 4 \%, 3 \%, 2 \%, 1 \%$ ). <br> Adjustable rate loans - typically have a decreasing and smaller prepay (e.g. 3\%, 2\%, 1\%). |
| Lease term: | Generally the lease must be 10 years or longer. |
| Recourse: | Typically non-recourse. |
| Closing costs: | Borrowers are responsible for all due diligence and closings costs (e.g. Appraisal, Phase 1 Environmental, site inspection, titte, etc) <br> - Loans under $\$ 3 \mathrm{M}$ - costs range from $\$ 6,000$ to $\$ 12,000$ <br> - For loans over $\$ 3 \mathrm{M}$ - costs can be $\$ 20,000$ or more |

The following data from CoStar Analytics Nov 2011


| Busin for sale | \# Businesses |  |  | \# Employees |  |  | \# Emp/Bus |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radius | 1 Mile | 3 Mile | 5 Mile | 1 Mile | 3 Mile | 5 Mile | 1 Mile | 3 Mile | 5 Mile |
| Total Businesses | 691 | 3,421 | 7,992 | 11,572 | 41,459 | 82,896 | 17 | 12 | 10 |
| Total Retail | 151 | 893 | 2,056 | 2,472 | 13,615 | 25,096 | 16 | 15 | 12 |
| Home Improvement Stores | 12 | 51 | 116 | 298 | 1,274 | 1,776 | 25 | 25 | 15 |
| General Merchandise Stores | 9 | 35 | 74 | 217 | 2,079 | 2,904 | 24 | 59 | 39 |
| Food Stores | 13 | 82 | 196 | 101 | 1,023 | 2,960 | 8 | 12 | 15 |
| Auto Dealers \& Service Stations | 21 | 103 | 292 | 684 | 1,645 | 3,839 | 33 | 16 | 13 |
| Apparel \& Accessory Stores | 5 | 85 | 153 | 59 | 866 | 1,140 | 12 | 10 | 7 |
| Home Furniture, Furnishings \& Equipment | 23 | 82 | 172 | 156 | 734 | 1,242 | 7 | 9 | 7 |
| Eating \& Drinking Places | 27 | 241 | 556 | 463 | 4,068 | 7,584 | 17 | 17 | 14 |
| Miscellaneous Retail | 41 | 214 | 497 | 494 | 1,926 | 3,651 | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| Financial/Insurance/Real Estate | 37 | 291 | 702 | 247 | 1,881 | 3,929 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Banks, Saving \& Lending Institutions | 9 | 78 | 204 | 80 | 508 | 1,281 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| Securities Brokers and Investments | 2 | 14 | 29 | 2 | 26 | 108 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Insurance Carriers \& Agencies | 10 | 76 | 186 | 56 | 465 | 768 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| Real Estate/Trust/Holding Companies | 16 | 123 | 283 | 109 | 882 | 1,772 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Services | 261 | 1,335 | 3,240 | 5,244 | 15,312 | 33,267 | 20 | 11 | 10 |
| Hotels \& Lodging | 4 | 18 | 29 | 94 | 399 | 486 | 24 | 22 | 17 |
| Motion Picture \& Amusement | 12 | 60 | 173 | 27 | 367 | 1,173 | 2 | 6 | 7 |
| Health Services | 91 | 225 | 409 | 3,588 | 6,222 | 11,282 | 39 | 28 | 28 |
| Legal Services | 3 | 32 | 71 | 60 | 155 | 260 | 20 | 5 | 4 |
| Education Services | 6 | 50 | 145 | 502 | 2,492 | 6,539 | 84 | 50 | 45 |
| Auto Services | 12 | 133 | 336 | 116 | 669 | 1,622 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| Other Services | 133 | 817 | 2,077 | 857 | 5,008 | 11,905 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Agriculture/Mining | 6 | 50 | 120 | 151 | 585 | 929 | 25 | 12 | 8 |
| Construction | 67 | 372 | 812 | 823 | 2,797 | 5,766 | 12 | 8 | 7 |
| Manufacturing | 47 | 112 | 243 | 1,007 | 2,758 | 5,261 | 21 | 25 | 22 |
| Transp/Commun/Pub Util | 31 | 139 | 361 | 158 | 1,292 | 2,646 | 5 | 9 | 7 |
| Wholesale Trade | 82 | 201 | 395 | 1,385 | 2,741 | 4,507 | 17 | 14 | 11 |
| Government | 9 | 28 | 63 | 85 | 478 | 1,495 | 9 | 17 | 24 |


| Annual Consumer Spending | 2010 |  |  | 2015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radius | 1 Mile | 3 Mile | 5 Mile | 1 Mile | 3 Mile | 5 Mile |
| Total Specified Consumer Spending | 111,935 | 1,198,224 | 3,566,501 | 125,615 | 1,327,028 | 3,971,895 |
| Apparel: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Apparel | 3,951 | 41,906 | 125,275 | 4,434 | 46,411 | 139,514 |
| Women's Apparel | 1,589 | 17,040 | 50,915 | 1,783 | 18,871 | 56,703 |
| Men's Apparel | 929 | 9,851 | 29,441 | 1,042 | 10,910 | 32,788 |
| Girl's Apparel | 340 | 3,657 | 10,957 | 382 | 4,050 | 12,203 |
| Boy's Apparel | 275 | 2,933 | 8,747 | 308 | 3,248 | 9,741 |
| Infant Apparel | 300 | 3,066 | 9,115 | 336 | 3,396 | 10,151 |
| Footwear (excl. Infants) | 635 | 6,655 | 19,878 | 713 | 7,370 | 22,137 |
| Other Apparel Prod/Services | 519 | 5,360 | 16,099 | 582 | 5,936 | 17,929 |
| Entertainment: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Entertainment | 10,393 | 112,471 | 335,894 | 11,663 | 124,561 | 374,074 |
| Sports and Recreation | 419 | 4,466 | 13,274 | 470 | 4,947 | 14,783 |
| TV, Radio, and Sound Equipment | 3,782 | 40,466 | 120,368 | 4,244 | 44,816 | 134,050 |
| Reading Materials | 464 | 5,181 | 15,403 | 521 | 5,738 | 17,154 |
| Travel | 5,594 | 60,948 | 182,665 | 6,277 | 67,500 | 203,428 |
| Photographic Equipment | 134 | 1,409 | 4,184 | 151 | 1,561 | 4,659 |
| Food at Home: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Food At Home | 9,345 | 100,447 | 299,298 | 10,488 | 111,244 | 333,318 |
| Cereal Products | 572 | 6,130 | 18,258 | 642 | 6,789 | 20,334 |
| Bread \& Bakery Products | 1,226 | 13,383 | 39,778 | 1,376 | 14,822 | 44,299 |
| Seafood | 499 | 5,321 | 15,980 | 560 | 5,893 | 17,797 |
| Meat/Poultry/Fish/Eggs | 3,162 | 33,837 | 100,890 | 3,548 | 37,474 | 112,358 |
| Dairy Products | 1,496 | 16,153 | 48,001 | 1,679 | 17,889 | 53,457 |
| Fruits and Vegetables | 2,390 | 25,623 | 76,391 | 2,682 | 28,377 | 85,074 |
| Food Away from Home: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Food Away From Home | 9,425 | 99,991 | 298,083 | 10,577 | 110,739 | 331,966 |
| Breakfast and Brunch | 914 | 9,786 | 29,229 | 1,026 | 10,838 | 32,551 |
| Dinner | 4,398 | 46,763 | 139,455 | 4,935 | 51,790 | 155,307 |
| Lunch | 3,101 | 32,664 | 97,184 | 3,480 | 36,176 | 108,230 |
| Snacks and Non Alcoholic Bev | 714 | 7,447 | 22,191 | 801 | 8,247 | 24,714 |
| Catered Affairs | 298 | 3,330 | 10,024 | 335 | 3,688 | 11,163 |


| Alcoholic Beverages: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Alcoholic Beverages | 1,853 | 19,439 | 57,882 | 2,079 | 21,529 | 64,461 |
| Total Alcoholic Bev. at Home | 1,047 | 10,958 | 32,680 | 1,175 | 12,136 | 36,395 |
| Total Alcoholic Bev. away from Home | 805 | 8,481 | 25,202 | 904 | 9,392 | 28,067 |
| Furniture and Appliance: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Furniture and Appliances | 10,129 | 109,038 | 325,259 | 11,367 | 120,759 | 362,230 |
| Bedroom Furniture | 565 | 5,820 | 17,340 | 635 | 6,446 | 19,311 |
| Living Room Furniture | 888 | 9,642 | 28,908 | 997 | 10,678 | 32,194 |
| Other Living \& Family Room Furniture | 232 | 2,493 | 7,436 | 261 | 2,761 | 8,281 |
| Other Furniture | 110 | 1,251 | 3,743 | 123 | 1,385 | 4,169 |
| Major Appliances | 852 | 9,501 | 28,261 | 956 | 10,522 | 31,473 |
| Small Appliances | 2,110 | 22,408 | 66,766 | 2,368 | 24,817 | 74,355 |
| Misc Household Equipment | 5,372 | 57,923 | 172,805 | 6,028 | 64,150 | 192,447 |
| Transportation and Maintenance: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Transportation and Maintenance | 24,859 | 264,250 | 784,698 | 27,897 | 292,656 | 873,892 |
| New Autos/Trucks/Vans | 6,507 | 69,990 | 208,625 | 7,302 | 77,513 | 232,339 |
| Used Vehicles | 6,278 | 65,199 | 192,674 | 7,045 | 72,207 | 214,575 |
| RVs and Boats | 684 | 7,384 | 21,997 | 767 | 8,178 | 24,498 |
| Gasoline | 8,424 | 89,934 | 266,841 | 9,453 | 99,602 | 297,172 |
| Diesel Fuel | 125 | 1,366 | 4,014 | 140 | 1,512 | 4,470 |
| Autornotive Maintenance/Repair | 2,841 | 30,378 | 90,547 | 3,189 | 33,643 | 100,839 |
| Health Care: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Health Care | 4,596 | 51,238 | 151,519 | 5,158 | 56,745 | 168,742 |
| Medical Services | 2,724 | 29,893 | 88,584 | 3,057 | 33,107 | 98,654 |
| Prescription Drugs | 1,415 | 16,234 | 47,780 | 1,588 | 17,979 | 53,210 |
| Medical Supplies | 457 | 5,110 | 15,155 | 513 | 5,659 | 16,877 |
| Education and Day Care: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Education and Day Care | 8,614 | 93,129 | 278,329 | 9,667 | 103,140 | 309,966 |
| Education | 3,803 | 41,264 | 123,344 | 4,267 | 45,700 | 137,364 |
| Room and Board | 351 | 3,868 | 11,592 | 394 | 4,284 | 12,909 |
| Tuition/School Supplies | 3,338 | 36,391 | 108,819 | 3,746 | 40,303 | 121,188 |
| Day Care | 1,123 | 11,606 | 34,574 | 1,260 | 12,853 | 38,504 |

## DEFINITIONS \& TERMS USED IN THIS REPORT

Class B Buildings - A classification used to describe an office building with asking gross rents based on a specified range between the asking gross rents for Class $A$ and Class $C$ space. Class $B$ buildings are in average locations relative to the needs of major tenant sectors in the marketplace. Building systems (mechanical, HVAC, elevator and utility) have adequate capacities to deliver services currently required by tenants. The building finishes engineers have average to good quality design and materials. Tenant fit outs are characterized by fair to good quality trim and interior finish. Building services are characterized by average to good maintenance, management and upkeep. Buildings must exhibit more than one of the characteristics to be considered Class B. Because property characteristics in different markets vary dramatically, property class definitions will remain somewhat subjective.

Flex Facility - As its name suggests, an industrial building designed to allow its occupants Flexibility of alternative uses of the space, usually in an industrial park setting. Specialized Flex buildings include service center/showroom properties. Typical characteristics are shown in the matrix. Service Center/Showroom a type of Flex facility characterized by a substantial showroom area, usually fronting a freeway or major road. Typical characteristics are shown in the matrix.

Triple Net Lease - NNN -A lease in which the tenant pays all property operating expenses in addition to the stipulated rent. Disclosure of the specific expenses to be paid directly by the tenant is required.
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