|  | Potential Projects Subject to Removal under <br> Ellis Act Ordinance |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \# | Property Address | Permit \# | Comment |
| 1 | 4094 Hamilton | CP15-081 | Permit <br> approved |
| 2 | 373 E. San Fernando St. | CP17-013 | Inquiry |
| 3 | 7201 Bark Ln. | PDC17-035 <br> PRE16-153 | Inquiry |
| 4 | 2050 Southwest Expwy. | PDC17-059 | Inquiry |
| 5 | 439 and 451 S. 4th St. | H17-004 | Inquiry |
| 6 | 1605 Parkmoor Ave | H17-001 | Inquiry |

As of $3 / 15 / 18$
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March 28, 2018

To: Kristen Clements
From: Nora Lake-Brown, David Rosen

Subject: Assessing the Potential Effect of the ARO on New Development
This memo summarizes findings from DRA's analysis of the potential effect of ARO obligations on demolished ARO housing properties that are rebuilt with new market rate housing. DRA focused on the potential difference in cash flows, property valuation and supportable debt under alternative restrictions and the extent to which the financing of new market rate housing construction is affected.

To complete this assignment DRA conducted interviews with representatives of private debt and mezzanine debt/equity sources, using the interviewee list and interview questions outlined in DRA's memo dated February 9, 2018. DRA prepared a financial analysis of prototypical rental developments and calculated supportable first mortgage financing using financing terms and underwriting standards consistent with GSE multifamily loan programs. DRA also compared trends in San Jose apartment rents with the 5\% cap on ARO units.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In its lender and investor interviews and analysis, DRA focused on the following key questions regarding the effect of ARO restrictions on the financing of new multifamily housing development ${ }^{1}$ :

1. How do the ARO restrictions affect the sizing of the senior first mortgage?
2. How do the $A R O$ restrictions affect subordinate mezzanine debt/equity financing?
3. How do historical rent trends in San Jose compare to the $5 \%$ cap under the ARO?
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DRA completed the following lender and investor interviews for this assignment:

- Andrew Ditton at Citibank;
- Stephanie McFadden at CBRE (formerly at Union Bank);
- Kenji Tamaoki at Prudential;
- Bob Simpson and Angela Kelcher at Fannie Mae.


## Effect on First Mortgage Financing

In terms of first mortgage financing, the key underwriting factors affecting first mortgage sizing include the DSCR, mortgage interest rate, loan to value ratio, and escalation rates and cap rates used to determine projected value upon exit. Current term sheets for FreddieMac and FannieMae fixed-rate multifamily loans are attached to this memo.

Due to GSE underwriting standards of $2 \%$ escalation on revenues and $3 \%$ on costs for the purpose of the refinancing test, the $5 \%$ annual cap on rent increases imposed by the ARO does not affect the sizing of the first mortgage. Standard fixedrate mortgage products for conventional multifamily properties from both FannieMae and FreddieMac require a loan-to-value (LTV) ratio of no more than $80 \%$ and a minimum debt service coverage ratio (DSCR) of 1.25 . Based on our cash flow analysis, first mortgage financing on new multifamily construction in San Jose is currently constrained primarily by DSCR, rather than LTV requirements.

Our lender interviews confirmed that ARO rent caps would have no effect on first mortgage financing for new apartment construction. Lenders further confirmed that any effects ARO rent caps might have on subordinate mezzanine debt/equity financing would not affect senior mortgage financing.

DRA also confirmed through its interviews that mezzanine lenders and investors use similar escalators and refinancing tests in assessing the viability of mezzanine debt and equity investments as conventional lenders. Therefore, the sizing of mezzanine debt or equity is not directly affected by ARO rent caps. One lender mentioned that there may be a perception that ARO rent caps subject multifamily property owners to limitations on the "upside" while providing full exposure to
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"downside" risks. This is despite the fact that there is no 10 -year period (the length of time typically used for the refinance test) since 1970 where market rents have increased by more than an average of $5 \%$ per year, as described in the next section. ${ }^{1}$

The perception of a limit on upside potential, however, may lead to ARO projects being viewed slightly less competitively by lenders and investors than projects without ARO restrictions, all other factors being equal. We uncovered no evidence of a lack of liquidity for such projects, however, ARO projects may receive slightly less competitive pricing. Given the number of economy-wide and project-specific factors that affect pricing and investment, it is not possible to isolate or quantify the amount, if any, of this pricing effect.

## Historical Rent Trends in San Jose

Comparing historical trends in apartment rents in San Jose with the $5 \%$ annual cap imposed by the ARO sheds light on the potential effect of ARO restrictions on underwriting of subordinate debt and equity. Table 1 and Charts 1 and 2 on the following pages show the annual percentage increase in the average effective monthly rent per unit and average effective monthly rent per square foot ${ }^{2}$, along with the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers for rent (CPI-U Rent), from 2006 through 2017. Since 2009, the lowest point in the market during this period, the average annual increase in monthly rents has been $3.5 \%$, well below the $5 \%$ ARO cap. Additional data on the $\mathrm{CPI}-\mathrm{U}$ Rent back to 1970 indicates the average annual increase over the past 46 years has averaged $4.9 \%$. With these rent trends, it would be difficult to support underwriting projected rent increases over $5 \%$ per year.
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| Table 1 <br> Annual Percentage Increase in Apartment Rents ${ }^{1}$ and the Consumer Price Index 2006 to 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Effective Monthly Rent Per Unit ${ }^{1}$ |  | Effective Monthly Rent Per Square Foot ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| Year | \$ | Annual Change | \$ | Annual Change | CPI-U Rent) |
| 2006 | \$2,172 | -- | \$1.83 | -- | -- |
| 2007 | \$2,348 | 8.1\% | \$2.00 | 9.3\% | 3.9\% |
| 2008 | \$2,379 | 1.3\% | \$2.06 | 3.0\% | 4.1\% |
| 2009 | \$2,171 | -8.7\% | \$1.86 | -9.7\% | 3.2\% |
| 2010 | \$2,278 | 4.9\% | \$1.95 | 4.8\% | -0.1\% |
| 2011 | \$2,353 | 3.3\% | \$2.03 | 4.1\% | 2.3\% |
| 2012 | \$2,449 | 4.1\% | \$2.15 | 5.9\% | 4.1\% |
| 2013 | \$2,599 | 6.1\% | \$2.28 | 6.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 2014 | \$2,721 | 4.7\% | \$2.45 | 7.5\% | 5.5\% |
| 2015 | \$2,823 | 3.7\% | \$2.66 | 8.6\% | 6.1\% |
| 2016 | \$2,782 | -1.5\% | \$2.68 | 0.8\% | -- |
| 2017 | \$2,869 | 3.1\% | \$2.75 | 2.6\% | -- |
| 2009-2017 | -- | 3.5\% | -- | 3.3\% | 3.7\% |

[^2] Source: CoStar; City of San Jose, DRA.
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Chart 2
San Jose Actual Monthly Rent Per Square Foot Compared to ARO 5\% Rent Cap 2006 to 2017
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## CASH FLOW ANALYSIS

DRA prepared a cash flow analysis estimating the supportable first mortgage financing from prototypical newly constructed multifamily apartment projects using:

- Loan terms (LTV, DSCR), escalation rates ( $2 \%$ on revenues; $3 \%$ on operating costs), and current interest rates ${ }^{1}$ for multifamily fixed rate mortgages used by FannieMae and FreddieMac (estimated at 5\% for 30-year amortization).
- Data from CoStar on average rents by unit bedroom count and subarea within the City of San Jose for apartment properties constructed since 2015, representing rents for newly constructed properties. CoStar data were used to create prototypical housing developments (in terms of total units, unit bedroom count distribution, square footages and rents) for the five geographic market subareas of San Jose defined by CoStar.
- Operating cost data for conventional apartment properties in San Jose from the Institute of Real Estate Management, by housing product type.

Table 2 on the next page summarizes the financing assumptions used in the analysis. Table 3 on the following page summarizes rent and operating costs assumptions.

Since we have concluded that ARO restrictions have no effect on first mortgage sizing or refinance tests used by GSE lenders, the percentage of ARO replacement units ( $100 \%$, or $200 \%$ of demolished AMO units) has no effect on these cash flow projections. The projections assume that the project's Citywide inclusionary housing requirement is met through an alternative compliance method, such as payment in lieu, and does not contain on-site inclusionary units.

Appendix A contains the detailed financial analysis, including Table 4, which describes the rental prototypes in terms of unit sizes and bedroom count distribution, cash flow projections for each prototype, followed by current FannieMae and FreddieMac fixed rate multifamily loan term sheets.
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| Cash Flow and Financing Assumptions <br> San Jose ARO Analysis |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Escalation Rates: Underwriting and Refinance Analysis |  |
| Unregulated Rents | $2.0 \%$ |
| ARO Rents | $2.0 \%$ |
| Inclusionary Rents | $2.0 \%$ |
| Laundry/Misc. Income | $3.0 \%$ |
| Retail Income | $3.0 \%$ |
| Operating Costs | $3.0 \%$ |
| Cap Rates |  |
| Entry Cap Rate | $5.0 \%$ |
| Exit Cap Rate | $7.0 \%$ |
| Financing Assumptions | $6.0 \%$ |
| First Mortgage Interest Rate | 30 years |
| Amortization Period | 1.25 |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR) | $80 \%$ |
| Loan to Value (LTV) Ratio |  |
| Refinance Assumptions | $7.0 \%$ |
| Interest Rate | 30 years |
| Amortization Period | 1.25 |
| DSCR | $80 \%$ |
| LTV |  |
| LTE |  |

Sources: Lender and investor interviews; GSE term sheets; DRA.
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| Table 3 <br> Monthly Rent Per Square Foot and Annual Operating Cost Assumptions <br> San Jose ARO Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Downtown <br> San Jose | West San <br> Jose | Outer North <br> San Jose | South San <br> Jose | East San <br> Jose |
| Studio | -- | -- | $\$ 3.60$ | $\$ 3.60$ | $\$ 3.95$ |
| One BR | $\$ 3.33$ | $\$ 3.33$ | $\$ 3.33$ | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 3.33$ |
| Two BR | $\$ 2.80$ | $\$ 2.80$ | $\$ 2.80$ | $\$ 2.60$ | $\$ 2.30$ |
| Three BR | -- | -- | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 2.45$ |  |
| Average | $\$ 3.07$ | $\$ 3.13$ | $\$ 3.09$ | $\$ 2.80$ | $\$ 2.88$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating <br> Costs/SF | $\$ 14.20$ | $\$ 14.20$ | $\$ 14.20$ | $\$ 9.25$ | $\$ 9.25$ |
| Operating <br> Costs/Unit | $\$ 12,894$ | $\$ 12,141$ | $\$ 13,362$ | $\$ 8,233$ | $\$ 7,770$ |

${ }^{1}$ Rent assumptions from CoStar for properties built 2015 through 2017. Based on average monthly rent by submarket area and unit bedroom count.
${ }^{2}$ Total annual operating expenses per square foot, including property taxes, from Institute of Real Estate Management 2017 Income/Expense Analysis for San Jose.
Sources: CoStar; IREM; City of San Jose; DRA.
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Table 1
City of San Jose
Apartment Rent Trends
4 and 5 Star Properties (1)

|  | Inventory (Units) | Effective Monthly Rent/Unit | Annual Change | Effective <br> Monthly <br> Rent/SF | Annual Change | Annual Change in CPI-U-Rent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 21,887 | \$2,172 |  | \$1.83 |  |  |
| 2007 | 22,774 | \$2,348 | 8.1\% | \$2.00 | 9.3\% | 3.9\% |
| 2008 | 23,606 | \$2,379 | 1.3\% | \$2.06 | 3.0\% | 4.1\% |
| 2009 | 23,849 | \$2,171 | -8.7\% | \$1.86 | -9.7\% | 3.2\% |
| 2010 | 24,119 | \$2,278 | 4.9\% | \$1.95 | 4.8\% | -0.1\% |
| 2011 | 24,656 | \$2,353 | 3.3\% | \$2.03 | 4.1\% | 2.3\% |
| 2012 | 27,410 | \$2,449 | 4.1\% | \$2.15 | 5.9\% | 4.1\% |
| 2013 | 30,524 | \$2,599 | 6.1\% | \$2.28 | 6.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 2014 | 33,820 | \$2,721 | 4.7\% | \$2.45 | 7.5\% | 5.5\% |
| 2015 | 39,178 | \$2,823 | 3.7\% | \$2.66 | 8.6\% | 6.1\% |
| 2016 | 42,147 | \$2,782 | -1.5\% | \$2.68 | 0.8\% | -- |
| 2017 | 43,843 | \$2,869 | 3.1\% | \$2.75 | 2.6\% | -- |
| 2006-2017 (2) |  |  | 2.6\% |  | 3.8\% |  |
| 2007-2017 (2) |  |  | 2.0\% |  |  | 3.7\% |
| 2008-2017 (2) |  |  | 2.1\% |  | 3.2\% | 3.7\% |
| 2009-2017 (2) |  |  | 3.5\% |  | 3.3\% | 3.7\% |
| 2010-2017 (2) |  |  | 3.4\% |  | 5.0\% | 3.7\% |
| 2011-2017 (2) |  |  | 3.4\% |  | 5.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 2011-2017 (2) |  |  | 3.2\% |  | 5.2\% | 5.1\% |

(1) The CoStar Building Rating System is a national rating for commercial buildings.

The highest rating is 5 stars.
(2) For the CPI-U Rent, annual changes are through 2015 rather than 2017.

Sources: CoStar; City of San Jose; DRA.

## Table 2

## Cash Flow and Financing Assumptions

| Escalation Rates: Underwriting/Refinance Analysis | $2.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Unregulated Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| ARO Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Inclusionary Rents | $3.00 \%$ |
| Laundry/Misc. Inc. | $3.00 \%$ |
| Retail Income | $3.00 \%$ |
| Operating Costs |  |
| Cap Rates | $5.00 \%$ |
| Entry Cap Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| Exit Cap Rate |  |
| Financing Assumptions | $5.00 \%$ |
| Interest Rate | 30 |
| Amortization Term (Years) | 1.25 |
| DSCR | $80 \%$ |
| LTV |  |
| Refinance Assumptions | $7.00 \%$ |
| Interest Rate | 30 |
| Amortization Term (Years) | 1.25 |
| DSCR | $80 \%$ |

Source: FannieMae and FreddieMac fixed-rate multifamily mortgage term sheets; lender interviews; DRA.

Table 3
Net Operating Income from Apartments
San Jose ARO Analysis

|  | Prototype 1 | Prototype 2 | Prototype 3 | Prototype 4 | Prototype 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Downtown San Jose | West San Jose | Outer North San Jose | South San Jose | East San Jose |
| Tenure | Rental | Rental | Rental | Rental | Rental |
| Net Rentable SF of Apartment Space | 227,000 | 513,000 | 376,400 | 356,000 | 168,000 |
| Net Rentable SF of Retail Space | 0 | 8,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking Spaces | 0 | 945 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Approximate Building Stories | 0 | 4 \& 5 Stories | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Units | 250 | 600 | 400 | 400 | 200 |
| Unit Size (Square Feet) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Loft | - | - | 660 | 550 | 550 |
| One Bedroom | 780 | 750 | 800 | 750 | 750 |
| Two Bedroom | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,050 |
| Three Bedroom | - | - | 1,300 | 1,300 | - |
| Four Bedroom | - | - | - | - | - |
| Average | 908 | 855 | 941 | 890 | 840 |
| Monthly Rent Per SF (1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Loft |  |  | \$3.60 | \$3.60 | \$3.95 |
| One Bedroom | \$3.33 | \$3.33 | \$3.33 | \$3.00 | \$3.33 |
| Two Bedroom | \$2.80 | \$2.80 | \$2.80 | \$2.60 | \$2.30 |
| Three Bedroom |  |  | \$3.00 | \$2.45 |  |
| Four Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Monthly Rent/Unit | \$3.07 | \$3.13 | \$3.09 | \$2.81 | \$2.88 |
| Monthly Rent Per Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Loft |  |  | \$2,376 | \$1,980 | \$2,173 |
| One Bedroom | \$2,597 | \$2,498 | \$2,664 | \$2,250 | \$2,498 |
| Two Bedroom | \$3,080 | \$3,080 | \$3,080 | \$2,860 | \$2,415 |
| Three Bedroom |  |  | \$3,900 | \$3,185 |  |
| Four Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Monthly Rent/Unit | \$2,790 | \$2,672 | \$2,904 | \$2,500 | \$2,416 |
| Average Monthly Rent Per Square Foot | \$3.07 | \$3.13 | \$3.09 | \$2.81 | \$2.88 |
| Parking Income (\$/Space/Month) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Parking Usage Rate | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Miscellaneous Income (\$/Unit/Year) | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 | \$120 | \$0 |
| Stabilized Rental Vacancy Rate | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% |
| Rental Operating Cost/Unit | \$12,894 | \$12,141 | \$13,362 | \$8,233 | \$7,770 |
| Rental Operating Cost/SF (2) | \$14.20 | \$14.20 | \$14.20 | \$9.25 | \$9.25 |
| Retail Income (\$/NSF/Year) |  | \$65.00 |  |  |  |
| Retail Vacancy Rate (\% Gross Retail Income) |  | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Retail Operating Cost (\$ Per NSF) |  | \$10 |  |  |  |
| Total Monthly Gross Rental Income, Apts. | \$697,610 | \$1,603,350 | \$1,161,760 | \$999,800 | \$483,150 |
| Annual Gross Income | \$8,371,320 | \$19,240,200 | \$13,941,120 | \$11,997,600 | \$5,797,800 |
| Less: Apartment Vacancy | $(\$ 585,992)$ | (\$1,346,814) | $(\$ 975,878)$ | $(\$ 839,832)$ | $(\$ 405,846)$ |
| Plus: Retail Income | \$0 | \$520,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Plus: Parking Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Plus: Misc. Income | \$30,000 | \$72,000 | \$48,000 | \$48,000 | \$0 |
| Adjusted Annual Gross Income | \$7,815,328 | \$18,485,386 | \$13,013,242 | \$11,205,768 | \$5,391,954 |
| Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less: Apartment Operating Costs (2) | (\$3,223,400) | $(\$ 7,284,600)$ | (\$5,344,880) | (\$3,293,000) | (\$1,554,000) |
| Less: Retail Operating Costs | \$0 | (\$80,000) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Net Operating Income | \$4,591,928 | \$11,120,786 | \$7,668,362 | \$7,912,768 | \$3,837,954 |

(1) From CoStar for properties built 2015 through 2017. Average by submarket area and unit bedroom count.
(2) Total expenses from Institute of Real Estate Management 2017 Income/Expense Analysis, including property taxes.

Assumes elevator served buildings for Prototypes 1,2 and 3 and Garden Apartments, High Cost, for Prototypes 4 and 5. Sources: CoStar; IREM; City of San Jose; DRA.

Table 4
Development Prototypes
San Jose ARO Analysis

|  | Prototype 1 | Prototype 2 | Prototype 3 | Prototype 4 | Prototype 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Subarea: | Downtown San Jose | West San Jose | Outer North San Jose | South San Jose | East San Jose |
| Total Housing Unit Count | 250 | 600 | 400 | 400 | 200 |
| Original ARO Units | 100 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 100 |
| Other Regulated Units | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tenure (Renter/Owner) | Rental | Rental | Rental | Rental | Rental |
| New Construction or Conversion | New | New | New | New | New |
| Total Site Area (Acre) |  | 7.68 Acres |  |  |  |
| Total Site Area (SF) |  | 334,541 |  |  |  |
| Density (Units Per Acre) |  | 78 |  |  |  |
| Construction Type |  | Type III-A |  |  |  |
| Parking Type |  | 1.5 Levels |  |  |  |
| Building Stories |  | Partially Subt. 4 \& 5 Stories |  |  |  |
| Net Residential Square Feet (NRSF) | 227,000 SF | 513,000 SF | 376,400 SF | 356,000 SF | 168,000 SF |
| Net SF Retail | 0 SF | 8,000 SF |  |  |  |
| Other Uses (NSF) | 0 SF | 0 SF |  |  |  |
| Net SF Total | 227,000 SF | 521,000 SF | 376,400 SF | 356,000 SF | 168,000 SF |
| Other Uses (NSF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Efficiency Ratio (\%) | 78\% | 78\% | 571\% | 571\% | 80\% |
| Total Gross Building SF (Excl. Pkg.) | 291,026 | 667,949 | 65,864 | 62,294 | 210,000 |
| Unit Bedroom Count Distribution (1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Loft | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 15\% |
| One Bedroom | 60\% | 70\% | 45\% | 50\% | 45\% |
| Two Bedroom | 40\% | 30\% | 35\% | 30\% | 40\% |
| Three Bedroom | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% |
| Four Bedroom | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Units by BR Count |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Loft |  |  | 40 | 40 | 30 |
| One Bedroom | 150 | 420 | 180 | 200 | 90 |
| Two Bedroom | 100 | 180 | 140 | 120 | 80 |
| Three Bedroom |  |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Four Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Residential Units | 250 | 600 | 400 | 400 | 200 |
| Unit Size (Net SF) (1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio/Loft |  |  | 660 SF | 550 SF | 550 SF |
| One Bedroom | 780 SF | 750 SF | 800 SF | 750 SF | 750 SF |
| Two Bedroom | 1,100 SF | 1,100 SF | 1,100 SF | 1,100 SF | 1,050 SF |
| Three Bedroom |  |  | 1,300 SF | 1,300 SF |  |
| Four Bedroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Unit Size | 908 SF | 855 SF | 941 SF | 890 SF | 840 SF |
| Underground Parking Spaces |  | 945 Spaces |  |  |  |
| Structured Parking Spaces |  |  |  |  |  |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  |  |  |  |
| Garage Parking Spaces |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surface/Carport Parking Spaces |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Parking Spaces Provided |  | 945 Spaces |  |  |  |
| Actual Project: |  | The Reserve |  |  |  |

(1) From CoStar. Average by submarket area.
Sources: CoStar; DRA.

# Table 5 <br> Cash Flow Projections <br> Prototype 1 Downtown San Jose <br> $100 \%$ ARO Replacemen <br> <div class="inline-tabular"><table id="tabular" data-type="subtable">
<tbody>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-right: none !important; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">Total Housing Units</td>
<td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">250</td>
</tr>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-right: none !important; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">Unregulated Units</td>
<td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">112</td>
</tr>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-right: none !important; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">ARO Units</td>
<td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">100</td>
</tr>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-right: none !important; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">Inclusionary Units</td>
<td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">38</td>
</tr>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;">
<td style="text-align: left; border-left: none !important; border-right: none !important; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">Other Regulated Units</td>
<td style="text-align: right; border-bottom: none !important; border-top: none !important; width: auto; vertical-align: middle; ">0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<table-markdown style="display: none">| Total Housing Units | 250 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Unregulated Units | 112 |
| ARO Units | 100 |
| Inclusionary Units | 38 |
| Other Regulated Units | 0 |</table-markdown></div> 

## Escalation Rates

Market Rents (non-ARO) ARO Rents
Inclusionary Rents
Other Restricted Rent $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Other Restricted Rents } & 2.00 \% \\ \text { Laundry/Miscella } \\ & 2.00 \%\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { LaundryMiscellaneous Income } & 3.00 \% \\ \text { Retail Income } & 3.00 \%\end{array}$ Operating Costs

Year

Refinance Assumptions

| Refinance Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

## CASH FLOW

Revenues
Gross Potential Rent
Market-Rate Rental Income
Inclusionary Units
ARO Units
Other Restricted Units
Laundry/Miscellaneous
Retail Income
Apartment Vacancy Allowance
Retail Vacancy Allowance
Net Rental Income

## Operating Costs

Net Operating Income
Debt Service--First Trust Deed
Debt Coverage Ratio
Net Cash Flow
$\begin{array}{lllll}\$ 3,750,351 & \$ 3,825,358 & \$ 3,901,866 & \$ 3,979,903 & \$ 4,0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rrrr}\$ 624,118 & \$ 636,600 & \$ 649,332 \\ \$ 3,415,499 & \$ 3,483,809 & \$ 353,485\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rrrr}\$ 3,348,528 & \$ 3,415,499 & \$ 3,483,809 & \$ 3,553,485\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}\$ 4,059,501 & \$ 4,140,691 & \$ 4,223,505 & \$ 4,307,975 & \$ 4,394,134 & \$ 4,482,017 & \$ 4,571,657 & \$ 4,663,091 & \$ 4,756,352 & \$ 4,851,479\end{array} \$ 4,948,509$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\$ 662,319 & \$ 675,565 & \$ 689,076 & \$ 702,858 & \$ 716,915 & \$ 731,253 & \$ 745,878 & \$ 760,796 & \$ 776,012 & \$ 791,532 & \$ 807,363\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\$ 3,624,554 & \$ 3,697,045 & \$ 3,770,986 & \$ 3,846,406 & \$ 3,923,334 & \$ 4,001,801 & \$ 4,081,837 & \$ 4,163,474 & \$ 4,246,743 & \$ 4,331,678\end{array}$ \$4,418,312

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 33,765$ | $\$ 34,778$ | $\$ 35,822$ | $\$ 36,896$ | $\$ 38,00$ | $\$ 39,143$ | $\$ 40,317$ | $\$ 41,527$ | $\$ 42,773$ | $\$ 44,056$ | $\$ 45,378$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |


$\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrr}(\$ 584,246) & (\$ 595,931) & (\$ 607,850) & (\$ 620,007) & (\$ 632,407) & (\$ 645,055) & \$ 657,956) & (\$ 671,115) & (\$ 684,538) & (\$ 698,228) & (\$ 712,193)\end{array}$ | $7.00 \%$ | $(\$ 539,753)$ | $(\$ 550,548)$ | $(\$ 561,559)$ | $(\$ 572,790)$ | $(\$ 584,246)$ | $(\$ 595,931)$ | $(\$ 607,850)$ | $(\$ 620,007)$ | $(\$ 632,407)$ | $(\$ 645,055)$ | $(\$ 657,956)$ | $(\$ 671,115)$ | $(\$ 684,538)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$(\$ 698,228) \quad(\$ 712,193)$ 5.00\% $\begin{array}{llll}\$ 0 & \$ 0 & \$ 0 & \$ 0\end{array}$ $(\$ 3,223,400)(\$ 3,320,102)(\$ 3,419,705)(\$ 3,522,296)(\$ 3,627,965)(\$ 3,736,804)(\$ 3,848,908)(\$ 3,964,375)(\$ 4,083,307)(\$ 4,205,806)(\$ 4,331,980)(\$ 4,461,939)(\$ 4,595,798)(\$ 4,733,672)(\$ 4,875,682)$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\$ 3,977,606 & \$ 4,025,224 & \$ 4,072,837 & \$ 4,120,415 & \$ 4,167,928 & \$ 4,215,344 & \$ 4,262,631 & \$ 4,309,753 & \$ 4,356,673 & \$ 4,403,354 & \$ 4,449,754 & \$ 4,495,832 & \$ 4,541,545\end{array} \quad \$ 4,586,846 \quad \$ 4,631,686$ $(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)(\$ 3,182,085)$



Capitalized Value, Cap Rate of: $\quad 5.00 \%$ \$79,552,124
MAX. 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON DSCR \$49,396,994 MAX 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON LTV $\$ 63,641,699$ PROIECT VALUE LESS FIRST MORTGAGE $\$ 30,155,130$

## REFINANCE TESTS

NOI
Cap Rate
Project Value
Max Loan Based on LTV
Max Loan Based on DSCR
Refinance Proceeds
Less: Outstanding Debt
Cash Out

Refinance in Year 10
\$4,403,354
7.00\%
$\$ 62,905,051$

62,905,051
$\$ 50,324,040$
$\$ 50,324,040$
$\$ 44,123,824$
$\$ 44,123,824$
$\$ 44,123,824$
$\$ 44,123,824$
$\$ 40,180,535$
$\$ 40,180,535$
$\$ 3,943,289$

Refinance in Year 15
\$4,631,686
7.00\%
\$66,166,948
$\$ 66,166,948$
$\$ 52,933,559$
$\$ 52,933,559$
$\$ 46,411,834$
$\$ 46,411,834$
$\$ 46,411,834$
$\$ 46,411,834$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 12,879,224$

Source: DRA

| Financing Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $5.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

Cap Rates Exit Cap Rate
5.00\%

## Table 6

Cash Flow Projections
Prototype 2 West San Jose
100\% ARO Replacement
San Jose ARO Analysis
Total Housing Units
ARO Units
Inclusionary Units
Other Regulated Units

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Escalation Rates |  |
| Market Rents (non-ARO) | $2.00 \%$ |
| ARO Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Inclusionary Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Other Restricted Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Laundry/Miscellaneous Income | $3.00 \%$ |
| Retail Income | $3.00 \%$ |
| Operating Costs | $3.00 \%$ |

Year

| 600 |
| ---: |
| 310 |
| 200 |
| 90 |
| 0 |


|  | Cap Rates |  | Financing Assumptions |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $2.00 \%$ | Entry Cap Rate | $5.00 \%$ | Interest Rate | $5.00 \%$ |
| $2.00 \%$ | Exit Cap Rate | $7.00 \%$ | Amortization | 30 |
| $2.00 \%$ |  |  | DSCR | 1.25 |
| $2.00 \%$ |  |  | LTV | $80 \%$ |
| $3.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  |


| Refinance Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

## CASH FLOW

Revenues
Gross Potential Rent
Market-Rate Rental Income Inclusionary Units
ARO Units
Other Restricted Units
Laundry/Miscellaneous
Retail Income
Apartment Vacancy Allowance
Retail Vacancy Allowance
Net Rental Income

## Operating Costs

Net Operating Income
Debt Service--First Trust Deed
Debt Coverage Ratio
Net Cash Flow
Capitalized Value, Cap Rate of: $\quad 5.00 \% \$ 196,448,902$
MAX. 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON DSCR $\$ 121,982,730$
MAX 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON LTV $\$ \$ 157,159,122$
MAXIST MORTGAGE BASED ONLTV $\quad \$ 157,159,122$

## REFINANCE TESTS

NOI
Cap R
Cap Rate
Project Value
Max Loan Based on LTV
Max Loan Based on DSCR
Refinance Proceeds
Less: Outstanding Debt
Cash Out

Refinance in Year 10
$\$ 11,035,755$
$7.00 \%$
$\$ 157,653,644$
$\$ 126,122,91$
\$110,583,83
\$110,583,83
$\$ 40,180,535$
$\$ 70,403,299$

Refinance in Year 15
\$11,702,400
$7.00 \%$
$\$ 167,177,139$
$\$ 167,177,139$
$\$ 133,741,711$
\$117,263,950
$\$ 117,263,950$
\$33,532,611
\$83,731,339

Source: DRA

## Table 7

Cash Flow Projection
Prototype 3 Outer North San Jose
100\% ARO Replacemen
San Jose ARO Analysis

| Total Housing Units | 40 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Unregulated Units | 140 |
| ARO Units | 200 |
| Inclusionary Units | 60 |
| Other Regulated Units | 0 |

## Other Regulated Unit

## Escalation Rates

Market Rents (non-ARO) ARO Rents
Inclusionary Rents Other Restricted Rents
Laundry/Miscellaneous Income


Retail Income
Operating Costs

## Cap Rates <br> Entry Cap Rate <br> Entry Cap Rate Exit Cap Rate <br> 5.00\% <br> 7.00\%

| Financing Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $5.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |


| Refinance Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

## CASH FLOW

evenues
Gross Potential Rent
Market-Rate Rental Income
nclusionary Units
ARO Units
Other Restricted Units
Retail Income
Apartment Vacancy Allowance
Retail Vacancy Allowance
Net Rental Income

## Operating Costs

Net Operating Income
Debt Service--First Trust Deed
Debt Coverage Ratio
Net Cash Flow
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { MAX. 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON DSCR } & \$ 82,342,178 \\ \text { MAX 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON LTV } & \$ 1060,087,348 \\ \text { PROJECT VALUE LESS FIRST MORTGAGE } & \$ 50,267,007\end{array}$

## REFINANCE TESTS

## NOI

Cap Rate
Project Value
Max Loan Based on LTV
Max Loan Based on DSCR
Refinance Proceeds
Less: Outstanding Debt
Cash Out

## Refinance in Year 10

\$7,343,048

## $7.33,048$ $7.00 \%$

$7.00 \%$
$\$ 104,900,679$
$\$ 104,900,679$
$\$ 83,920,543$ $\$ 83,920,543$
$\$ 73,581,041$ $\$ 73,581,041$
$\$ 73,581,041$ $\$ 73,581,041$
$\$ 40,180,535$ $\$ 40,180,535$
$\$ 33,400,506$

Refinance in Year 15
\$7,725,865

### 7.00\%

\$110,369,495
\$88,295,596
$\$ 88,295,596$
$\$ 77,417,061$
$\$ 77,417,061$
$\$ 77,417,061$
$\$ 77,417,061$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 43,884,451$

Source: DRA

# Table 8 <br> Cash Flow Projections <br> Prototype 4 South San Jose <br> Scenario 1: 100\% ARO Replacement <br> San Jose ARO Analysis 

| Total Housing Units | 400 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Unregulated Units | 140 |
| ARO Units | 200 |
| Inclusionary Units | 60 |
| Other Regulated Units | 0 |


| Other Regulated Units | 0 | Cap Pates |  | Financing Assumptions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Escalation Rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Rents (non-ARO) | 2.00\% | Entry Cap Rate | 5.00\% | Interest Rate | 5.00\% |
| ARO Rents | 2.00\% | Exit Cap Rate | 7.00\% | Amortization | 30 |
| Inclusionary Rents | 2.00\% |  |  | DSCR | 1.25 |
| Other Restricted Rents | 2.00\% |  |  | LTV | 80\% |


| Refinance Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

Laundry/Miscellaneous Income $\quad 3.00 \%$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Retail Income } & 3.00 \% \\ \text { Operating Costs } & 3.00 \%\end{array}$

Operating Costs
$\qquad$

| 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## CASH FLOW

Revenues
Gross Potential Rent
Market-Rate Rental Income
nclusionary
ARO Units
Laundry/Miscellaneous
Retail Income
Apartment Vacancy Allowance
Retail Vacancy Allowance
Net Rental Income

## Operating Costs

Net Operating Income
Debt Service--First Trust Deed
Debt Coverage Ratio
Net Cash Flow

MAX. 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON DSCR \$88,679,120 MAX 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON LTV $\$ 114,251,686$ PROIECT VALUE LESS FIRST MORTGAGE $\$ 54,135,487$

## REFINANCE TESTS

## NOI <br> Cap Rate

Project Value
Max Loan Based on LTV
Max Loan Based on DSCR
Refinance Proceeds
Less: Outstanding Debt
Cash Out

Refinance in Year 10
\$8,177,920

### 7.00\%

\$116,827,431
$\$ 116,827,431$
$\$ 93,461,945$
$\$ 93,461,945$
$\$ 81,946,886$
$\$ 81,946,886$
$\$ 81,946,886$
$\$ 40,180,535$
$\$ 40,180,535$
$\$ 41,766,351$

Refinance in Year 15
\$8,795,397
$7.00 \%$
$\$ 125,648,528$
$\$ 100,518,823$
\$100,518,823
$\$ 88,134,315$
$\$ 88,134,315$
$\$ 88,134,315$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 33,532,611$

Source: DRA

# Table 9 <br> Cash Flow Projections <br> Prototype 5 East San Jose 100\% ARO Replater <br> 100\% ARO Replaceme 

Total Housing Units
Total Housing Units
Unregulated Units
ARO Units
Inclusionary Units
Inclusionary Units
Other Regulated Units

| Escalation Rates |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ Market Rents (non-ARO) | $2.00 \%$ |
| ARO Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Inclusionary Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Other Restricted Rents | $2.00 \%$ |
| Laundry/Miscellaneous Income | $3.00 \%$ |
| Retail Income | $3.00 \%$ |
| Operating Costs | $3.00 \%$ |

Operating Costs

Financing Assumptions

| Interest Rate | $5.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

Refinance Assumptions

| Refinance Assumptions |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Interest Rate | $7.00 \%$ |
| Amortization | 30 |
| DSCR | 1.25 |
| LTV | $80 \%$ |

Amortization
30
1.25

```
Cap Rates
Entry Cap Rate }\begin{array}{ll}{5.00%}\\{\mathrm{ Exit Cap Rate }}&{7.00%}
```

| 200 |
| ---: |
| 70 |
| 100 |
| 30 |
| 0 |


|  | Cap Rates |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2.00 \%$ | Entry Cap Rate | $5.00 \%$ |
| $2.00 \%$ | Exit Cap Rate | $7.00 \%$ |

## CASH FLOW

evenue

Market-Rate Rental Income
Inclusionary Units
ARO Units
Other Restricted Units
Laundry/Miscellaneous
Retail Income
Apartment Vacancy Allowance
Retail Vacancy Allowance
Net Rental Income

## Operating Costs

Net Operating Income
Debt Service--First Trust Deed
Debt Coverage Ratio
Net Cash Flow

|  | \$2,029,230 | \$2,069,815 | \$2,111,211 | \$2,153,435 | \$2,196,504 | \$2,240,434 | \$2,285,243 | \$2,330,947 | \$2,377,566 | \$2,425,118 | \$2,473,620 | \$2,523,092 | \$2,573,554 | \$2,625,025 | \$2,677,526 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$474,132 | \$483,615 | \$493,287 | \$503,153 | \$513,216 | \$523,480 | \$533,950 | \$544,629 | \$555,521 | \$566,632 | \$577,964 | \$589,524 | \$601,314 | \$613,340 | \$625,607 |
|  | \$2,898,900 | \$2,956,878 | \$3,016,016 | \$3,076,336 | \$3,137,863 | \$3,200,620 | \$3,264,632 | \$3,329,925 | \$3,396,523 | \$3,464,454 | \$3,533,743 | \$3,604,418 | \$3,676,506 | \$3,750,036 | \$3,825,037 |
|  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 7.00\% | $(\$ 378,158)$ | (\$385,722) | $(\$ 393,436)$ | (\$401,305) | $(\$ 409,331)$ | (\$417,517) | (\$425,868) | (\$434,385) | (\$443,073) | $(\$ 451,934)$ | $(\$ 460,973)$ | (\$470,192) | (\$479,596) | (\$489,188) | $(\$ 498,972)$ |
| 5.00\% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | \$5,024,104 | \$5,124,586 | \$5,227,077 | \$5,331,619 | \$5,438,251 | \$5,547,016 | \$5,657,957 | \$5,771,116 | \$5,886,538 | \$6,004,269 | \$6,124,354 | \$6,246,841 | \$6,371,778 | \$6,499,214 | \$6,629,198 |
|  | (\$1,554,000) | (\$1,600,620) | (\$1,648,639) | (\$1,698,098) | (\$1,749,041) | (\$1,801,512) | (\$1,855,557) | $(\$ 1,911,224)$ | (\$1,968,561) | (\$2,027,618) | (\$2,088,446) | (\$2,151,099) | (\$2,215,632) | (\$2,282,101) | (\$2,350,564) |
|  | $\$ 3,470,104$ | $\$ 3,523,966$ | $\$ 3,578,439$ | $\$ 3,633,521$ | $\$ 3,689,211$ | $\$ 3,745,504$ | \$3,802,399 | $\$ 3,859,892$ | \$3,917,977 | \$3,976,651 | \$4,035,908 | \$4,095,742 | \$4,156,146 | \$4,217,112 | \$4,278,634 |
|  | 1.25 | 1.27 | 1.29 | 1.31 | 1.33 | 1.35 | 1.37 | 1.39 | 1.41 | 1.43 | 1.45 | 1.48 | 1.50 | 1.52 | 1.54 |
|  | \$694,021 | \$747,883 | \$802,356 | \$857,438 | \$913,128 | \$969,422 | \$1,026,317 | \$1,083,809 | \$1,141,895 | \$1,200,568 | \$1,259,825 | \$1,319,659 | \$1,380,063 | \$1,441,029 | \$1,502,551 |

Capitalized Value, Cap Rate of: $\quad 5.00 \% \quad \$ 69,402,073$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { MAX. } 1 \text { ST MORTGAGE BASED ON DSCR } & \$ 43,094,435 \\ \text { MAX 1ST MORTGAGE BASED ON LTV } & \$ 55,521,659 \\ \text { PROIECT VALE }\end{array}$
PROJECT VALUE LESS FIRST MORTGAGE $\$ 26,307,638$

## REFINANCE TESTS

NOI<br>Cap Rate<br>Project Value<br>Max Loan Based on LTV<br>Max Loan Based on DSCR<br>Refinance Proceeds<br>Less: Outstanding Debt<br>Cash Out

Refinance in Year 10
\$3,976,651
$7.00 \%$
$\$ 56,809,306$
\$56,809,306
$\$ 45,447,445$
$\$ 39844,54$
$\$ 39,848,054$
$\$ 3,848,054$
$\$ 39,848,054$
$\$ 40,180,535$
\$40,180,535

## Refinance in Year 15

\$4,278,634
$7.00 \%$
$\$ 61,123,338$
$\$ 61,123,338$
$\$ 48,898,670$
$\$ 48,898,670$
$\$ 42,874,068$
$\$ 42,874,068$
$\$ 42,874,068$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 33,532,611$
$\$ 9,341,457$

Source: DRA

## Ellis Act Ordinance - Community and Stakeholder Meetings

## Community Meetings

| Meeting | Date | Time | Location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Policy Development <br> Community Meeting - Tenant <br> Meeting | February 22, 2018 | $6: 30-8: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Westminster Presbyterian Church |
| Policy Development <br> Community Meeting | February 12, 2018 | $6: 30-8: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Seven Trees Community Center |
| Housing \& Community <br> Development Commission | February 8, 2018 | $5: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ | San José City Hall - Wing Rooms |
| Policy Development <br> Community Meeting | February 7, 2018 | $9: 00-11: 00$ am | San José City Hall - Wing Rooms |
| ARO \& TPO Educational <br> Outreach | January 25, 2018 | $6: 30-8: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Cypress Community Center |
| ARO \& TPO Educational <br> Outreach | January 19, 2018 | $2: 00-4: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | San José City Hall - Wing Rooms |
| ARO \& TPO Educational <br> Outreach | January 10, 2018 | $9: 00-11: 00$ am | San José City Hall - Wing Rooms |

## Stakeholder Meetings

| Stakeholder Meeting |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stakeholder - Developers | March 16, 2018 | Developer Roundtable |
| Stakeholder - Landlords | March 8, 2018 | Bay Area Housing Network |
| Stakeholder - Developers | March 2, 2018 | Greystar |
| Stakeholder - Developers | February 22, 2018 | Silicon Valley Synergy |
| Stakeholder - Tenants | February 20,2018 | Renters' Coalition |
| Stakeholder - Landlords | February 15, 2018 | California Apartment Association |
| Stakeholder - Landlords | February 12,2018 | California Apartment Association |
| Stakeholder - Tenants | February 6,2018 | Renters' Coalition |
| Stakeholder - Landlords | January 29,2018 | California Apartment Association |
| Stakeholder - Landlords | January 16, 2018 | California Apartment Association |
| Stakeholder - Tenants | January 10,2018 | Renters' Coalition |
| Stakeholder - Landlords | December 15, 2017 | California Apartment Association |
| Stakeholder - Tenants | December 13,2017 | Renters' Coalition |

## Ellis Act Ordinance

City of San José - Department of Housing

Public Comments Received from
February 2, 2018 to April 2, 2018

## Policy Development Meeting Series February 7, 2018 to February 22,2018 Dot Activity for Public Comments

Ellis \#1: How many of the new apartments should be covered by the Apartment Rent Ordinance? Select one.

|  | Tenant | Landlord |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All new apartments | 16 |  |
| All new apartments are re-controlled, with <br> some apartments limited to 5\% and the other <br> apartments limited to 10\% rent increase |  | 1 |
| Two times the number of apartments <br> destroyed are covered |  | 1 |
| The number of apartments destroyed are <br> covered | If the new building includes 20\% affordable <br> units, the entire building would be exempt <br> from rent control | 9 |
| Other | Define what type <br> of affordable <br> Why not more <br> than 20\% <br> Affrodable <br> should be for low <br> income, very low <br> income | None |
| At least 50\% |  |  |
| should be |  |  |
| affordable |  |  |$|$

## 2-7-18 Public Meeting Comments Summary

## Criminal Activity

- The Housing Dept. should take more active of a role to regarding neighborhood issues. Recent shooting in the Cadillac neighborhood. How can Housing assist landlords in these type of situations? TPO makes addressing crime more challenging.
- "Responsible Landlord Engagement Initiative (RLEI)" available for landlords that are fearful of retaliation.
- "Crime Free" is an approach used by many other cities. Why not try crime free in San Jose?
- When did the City Council discuss crime free housing?
- What proof is required by landlord for the 12 Just Cause?


## RUBS

- Master metered electricity and gas - all references to RUBS assume landlords are only using RUBs for water, sewer and garbage. Landlords of older buildings also allocate gas and electric.
- Idea: Certified RUBs provider.
- Idea: Create parameters for monthly fluctuations in RUBs charges.
- Cost of submetering for water is prohibitive. Landlords have called contractors and they are either not willing to bid because they often to not get the work because the cost is so high.
- A landlord stated when the tenants have to pay for the water bill, they are more likely to inform the landlord of a leak so they problem gets resolved much faster, he has had tenants use a vicegrip with a leaky faucet and paid additional water and repair costs from the neglect.


## Ellis Act

- One for one seemed common practice - what do other cities do?


## Source of Income

- A landlord mentioned that he is working with a Section 8 tenant and it has taken 2 to 3 weeks for a deposit and rent, if the program was faster with onboarding he would consider more often.
- Another landlord mentioned he does not have the time to accommodate the additional work required for Section 8 tenants and felt that the word "discriminating" should not be used regarding landlords screening process.
- Participant mentioned if more landlords knew that they could get closer to market rate for their ARO rental units, they might be more willing to take on the programs.


## 2-12-18 Public Comments Summary

## Tenant Protection Ordinance

- If there is 1 issue, having a gun, would landlord and other tenant want that person with the conviction still living in the unit? Would this be a material lease violation?
- Material violation - what is an example or designate an issue that is material? Example, starting a fire in a backyard. Does lease must specify "criminal activity" or "fire" in the lease?
- If someone is arrested for domestic violence, can a landlord serve a notice?
- What is the City of San Jose's position on criminal activity? Tolerant or zero? 3 day notice? not required and go directly to evict?
- The warning is significant, should a 3 day notice still be allowed or evict right after the 1 instance?
- Someone (for example, son or daughter) can be evicted for a conviction and automatically move in with his mom without approval from the landlord, they/tenant are protected. The roommate clause allows for harboring of criminals.
- Landlord should be able to do a review to be aware of a conviction and maximum number of tenants move in? Landlords need some type of help with this issue/check.


## Apartment Rent Ordinance

- Some landlord also do their own RUBs, not only just 3rd parties doing to calculations.
- There should be a RUBS allowed option for consideration by the City Council.
- Will electricity be considered a part of RUBS - all utilities should be considered?
- HUD utility rates, how do they factor or calculate? HUD rates should be removed because nobody can determine their factor.
- What about an alternative for a landlord to charge an additional $1 \%$ in rent if their building is master metered, similar to LA?
- Landlord feels is RUBS is not allowed, an angry tenant will leave the water running so landlord must pay bill and lose money, no conservation.
- If you remove storage and lose rent, will the rent ever be increased or will it be lost income going forward?


## Ellis Act

- Will there be a separate outreach for Ellis Act with developers? This issue is less significant for ARO property owners.
- How is relocation defined or determined? Chart available for calculation per number of bedrooms, how was the cost determined?
- Regarding which units are covered by the Ellis Act, why 1979 when 1985 is when Ellis went into effect?


## Source of Income

- What is the Housing Department's position on Source of Income, is it neutral or direction to create an Ordinance? Housing will be bringing a framework to Council and wait for direction.
- Given a mandate, the Housing Department's position does not appear neutral.
- What is the reason for the source of income policy issue? City Council asked Housing to explore.
- Source of Income issue is not Section 8 voucher holders, instead the deterrence for landlords is the logistics, time, and cost for using Section 8 . Housing is painting the wrong picture about landlords.
- A landlord indicated never used Section 8 because the heard the program was a zoo and has created more problems, does not believe in program.


## 2-12-18 Public Comments Summary

- Had a Section 8 tenant, has lost thousands of dollars, many lawsuits, and they know how to gain the system.


## General questions

- What is the definition of Affordable Housing? Is there special funding for developers if they build Affordable Housing?
- Is there a special property tax relief for Affordable Housing?
- Public Notice is done through ARO; would landlords be notified for specifically for Ellis Outreach?
- Participant feels their input falls on deaf ears, rules appear to be protecting tenants, not landlords.
- Landlords do not want to file a Capital Improvement petition, does not want to ask Housing an allowance to increase rents.


## 2-22-18 Tenant Input Public Comments Meeting

Ellis Act

- Not enough resources available for a tenants to move or relocated while development of property.
- Better option is for lower rents for low income tenants.
- Tenant moved to affordable housing, not able to find affordable housing with good paying job.
- Tenant in affordable housing got an increase of $\$ 250$ this year, should not be considered affordable.
- It should be very expensive to evict tenants living in ARO units.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ These interviews will inform DRA's middle income debt fund analysis as well as the ARO analysis.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Based on analysis of CPI-U Rent data since 1970 and CoStar rent data since 2006.
    ${ }^{2}$ For 4 and 5 star properties as rated by CoStar ( 5 stars is the highest rating).

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Includes 4- and 5 -star properties as rated by CoStar ( 5 stars is the highest rating).

[^3]:    ${ }^{1} 5 \%$ interest rate for 30-year amortization, FannieMae fixed-rate loan, Feb. 16, 2018.

