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## Stablized-Year Rental Apartment Income Statement Development Value

| Gross Square Footage |  | 750 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rental Units |  | 1 |
| Revenue from Rental Units |  |  |
| Average Monthly Rent Per Unit ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 1,255 |
| Potential Cash Flow | \$ | 15,064 |
| Less Vacancy Allowance (5\% of Revenue) | \$ | (753) |
| Less Unpaid Rent (3\% of Revenue) | \$ | (452) |
| Less Operating Expenses Incl. Tax, Insurance, Etc. (20\% of Revenue) | \$ | $(3,013)$ |
| Net Cash Flow |  | \$10,846 |
| Stabilized Year Net Operating Income | \$ | 10,846 |
| Capitalized Value at 7.00\% | \$ | 154,941 |
| Less Sales Costs at 4.00\% | \$ | $(6,198)$ |
| Residual Value Per Residential Unit | \$ | 148,744 |
| Residual Value Per Gross Square Foot | \$ | 198 |

Source: Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Affordable rent based on HUD guidelines for very low income ( $50 \% \mathrm{AMI}$ ) and low income ( $80 \% \mathrm{AMI}$ ) households.

## Stablized-Year Retail Income Statement Development Value

| Gross Square Feet |  | 1,000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Loss Factor | $10 \%$ |  |
| Rentable Building Area (90\% of Gross) |  | 900 |
| Retail Lease Revenue | $\$$ | 40 |
| Average Lease Rate (Gross PSF) | $\$$ | 36,000 |
| Potential Cash Flow | $\$$ | $(2,880)$ |
| Less Vacancy Allowance (8\% of Lease Revenue) | $\$, 200)$ |  |
| Less Operating Costs Incl. Tax, Insurance, Etc. (20\% of Lease Revenue) | $\$$ | 25,920 |
| Net Cash Flow | $\$$ | 25,920 |
| Stabilized Year Net Operating Income | $\$$ | 370,286 |
| Capitalized Value at 7.00\% | $\$$ | $(14,811)$ |
| Less Sales Costs at 4.00\% | $\$$ | 355,474 |
| Residual Value Per 1,000 SF | $\$$ | 355 |
| Residual Value Per Gross Square Foot | $\$$ |  |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Stablized-Year Office Income Statement Development Value

| Gross Square Feet |  | 1,000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Loss Factor <br> Rentable Building Area (90\% of Gross) <br> Office Lease Revenue |  | 900 |
| Average Lease Rate (Gross PSF) |  |  |
| Potential Cash Flow <br> Less Vacancy Allowance (8\% of Lease Revenue) <br> Less Operating Costs Incl. Tax, Insurance, Etc. (30\% of Lease Revenue) | $\$$ | 40,500 |
| Net Cash Flow | $\$$ | $(3,240)$ |
| Stabilized Year Net Operating Income | $\$$ | 25,110 |
| Capitalized Value at 7.00\% | $\$$ | 25,110 |
| Less Sales Costs at 4.00\% | $\$$ | 358,714 |
| Residual Value Per 1,000 SF | $\$$ | $(14,349)$ |
| Residual Value Per Gross Square Foot | $\$$ | 344,366 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Stablized-Year Rental Apartment Income Statement <br> Assessed Value

| Gross Square Footage |  | 750 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Number of Rental Units |  |  |
| Revenue from Rental Units | $\$$ | 1,255 |
| Average Monthly Rent Per Unit ${ }^{1}$ | $\$$ | 15,064 |
| Potential Cash Flow <br> Less Vacancy Allowance (10\% of Revenue) <br> Less Unpaid Rent (3\% of Revenue) <br> Less Operating Expenses Incl. Tax, Insurance, Etc. (20\% of Revenue) <br> Net Cash Flow | $\$$ | $(452)$ |
| Stabilized Year Net Operating Income | $\$$ | $\$ 10,093$ |
| Capitalized Value at 10.00\% | $\$$ | 10,093 |
| Less Sales Costs at 4.00\% | $\$$ | 100,927 |
| Residual Value Per Residential Unit | $\$$ | $(4,037)$ |
| Residual Value Per Gross Square Foot | $\$$ | 96,890 |

Source: Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Affordable rent based on HUD guidelines for very low income ( $50 \% \mathrm{AMI}$ ) and low income ( $80 \% \mathrm{AMI}$ ) households.

## Stablized-Year Retail Income Statement <br> Assessed Value

| Gross Square Feet |  | 1,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss Factor |  | 10\% |
| Rentable Building Area (90\% of Gross) |  | 900 |
| Retail Lease Revenue |  |  |
| Average Lease Rate (Gross PSF) | \$ | 40 |
| Potential Cash Flow | \$ | 36,000 |
| Less Vacancy Allowance (10\% of Lease Revenue) | \$ | $(3,600)$ |
| Less Operating Costs Incl. Tax, Insurance, Etc. (20\% of Lease Revenue) | \$ | $(7,200)$ |
| Net Cash Flow | \$ | 25,200 |
| Stabilized Year Net Operating Income | \$ | 25,200 |
| Capitalized Value at 10.00\% | \$ | 252,000 |
| Less Sales Costs at 4.00\% | \$ | $(10,080)$ |
| Residual Value Per 1,000 SF | \$ | 241,920 |
| Residual Value Per Gross Square Foot | \$ | 242 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Stablized-Year Office Income Statement <br> Assessed Value

| Gross Square Feet |  | 1,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss Factor |  | 10\% |
| Rentable Building Area (90\% of Gross) |  | 900 |
| Office Lease Revenue |  |  |
| Average Lease Rate (Gross PSF) |  | \$45 |
| Potential Cash Flow | \$ | 40,500 |
| Less Vacancy Allowance (10\% of Lease Revenue) | \$ | $(4,050)$ |
| Less Operating Costs Incl. Tax, Insurance, Etc. (30\% of Lease Revenue) | \$ | $(12,150)$ |
| Net Cash Flow | \$ | 24,300 |
| Stabilized Year Net Operating Income | \$ | 24,300 |
| Capitalized Value at 10.00\% | \$ | 243,000 |
| Less Sales Costs at 4.00\% | \$ | $(9,720)$ |
| Residual Value Per 1,000 SF | \$ | 233,280 |
| Residual Value Per Gross Square Foot | \$ | 233 |
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## Municipal School Cost (Per RU)

|  | Pupils <br> Per RU |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element | 0.35 | Municipal School <br> Cost Per Pupil ${ }^{2}$ | Municipal School <br> Cost Per RU |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | 0.00 | $\$ 13,200$ | $\$ 4,620$ |
| Age-Restricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | 0.35 | $\$ 13,200$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Affordable Rental Units (Per RU) | 0.200 | $\$ 4,620$ |  |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Assumes 0.35 students per residential unit (Katz).
${ }^{2}$ Assumes a total municipal cost per pupil of $\$ 13,200$ (\$15,000 total per pupil, less State/County/Other funding of 12 percent).

## Municipal Service Cost (Per DU/1,000 SF)

|  | Total Cost | Local Tax- <br> Funded Cost ${ }^{1}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Municipal Service Costs |  |  |
| Current Municipal Costs | $\$ 31,405,200$ |  |
| Municipal Budget $^{2}$ | $\$ 22,496,510$ | $\$ 17,272,860$ |
| Costs Impacted by Redevelopment $^{3}$ | $\$ 12,373,080$ |  |
| Municipal Costs By Land Use Category |  |  |

Source: ESRI; US Census Bureau; West Windsor Township; Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
1 Approximately 55 percent of the municipal budget is funded by local taxes.
2 The analysis relies on data from the 2006 Township budget.
${ }^{3}$ Variable budget items include public safety, statutory expenses, sewerage, refuse collection, public works,
community development, administration, fire hydrant services, utility expenses, health/human services, law,
municipal court, capital improvement
${ }^{4}$ Municipal Costs are allocated to land uses based on their respective shares of total Township assessed value.

## Municipal Tax Revenue (Per RU/1,000 SF)

|  | Assessed <br> Value | Property <br> Tax Rate | Annual Tax <br> Revenue | Remittance to <br> County (5\%) | Municipal <br> Tax Revenue |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  | $\$ 334$ | $\$ 6,351$ |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | $\$ 350,000$ | $1.91 \%$ | $\$ 6,685$ | $\$ 334$ | $\$ 6,351$ |
| Age-Restricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | $\$ 350,000$ | $1.91 \%$ | $\$ 6,685$ | $\$ 93$ | $\$ 1,758$ |
| Affordable Rental Units (Per RU) | $\$ 96,890$ | $1.91 \%$ | $\$ 1,851$ | $\$ 231$ | $\$ 4,390$ |
| Retail (Per 1,000 SF) | $\$ 241,920$ | $1.91 \%$ | $\$ 4,621$ | $\$ 223$ | $\$ 4,233$ |
| Office (Per 1,000 SF) | $\$ 233,280$ | $1.91 \%$ | $\$ 4,456$ |  |  |

Source: West Windsor Township; Economics Research Associates

## Fiscal Impact (Per RU/1,000 SF)

|  | Municipal <br> Tax <br> Revenue | Municipal <br> School <br> Costs | Municipal <br> Service <br> Costs | Net <br> Municipal <br> Revenue |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | $\$ 6,351$ | $\$ 4,620$ | $\$ 1,071$ | $\$ 659$ |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,071$ | $\$ 5,279$ |  |
| Age-Restricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | $\$ 6,351$ | $\$ 1,758$ | $\$ 4,620$ | $\$ 1,071$ |$(\$ 3,933)$

Source: West Windsor Township; Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Development Value (Per RU/1,000 SF)

|  |  | Vertical <br> Development <br> Value | Construction <br> Cost |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | $\$ 350,000$ | $\$ 178,200$ | $\$ 171,800$ |
| Age-Restricted For-Sale Units (Per RU) | $\$ 350,000$ | $\$ 178,200$ | $\$ 171,800$ |
| Affordable Rental Units (Per RU) | $\$ 148,744$ | $\$ 99,000$ | $\$ 49,744$ |
| Retail (Per 1,000 SF) | $\$ 355,474$ | $\$ 198,000$ | $\$ 157,474$ |
| Office (Per 1,000 SF) | $\$ 344,366$ | $\$ 198,000$ | $\$ 146,366$ |
|  |  |  | Less Land Cost |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Development Program: As-of-Right Scenario

|  | Units | Total <br> Square Feet |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Unrestricted For-Sale Units | 0 | 0 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | $\frac{193}{193}$ | $\frac{144,750}{144,750}$ |
| Affordable Rental Units |  | 68,274 |
| Residential Total |  | $1,657,746$ |
| Retail | 193 | $1,870,770$ |
| Office |  |  |
| Total |  |  |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Municipal Tax Revenue and Costs: As-of-Right Scenario

| Program Element | Municipal Revenue | Municipal School Cost | Municipal Service Cost | Net Municipal Tax Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$339,000 | \$892,000 | \$207,000 | -\$759,000 |
| Residential Total | \$339,000 | \$892,000 | \$207,000 | -\$759,000 |
| Retail | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$21,000 | \$278,000 |
| Office | \$7,017,000 | \$0 | \$828,000 | \$6,190,000 |
| Total | \$7,656,000 | \$892,000 | \$1,056,000 | \$5,709,000 |
|  |  |  | Low (5.0\%) | High (4.5\%) |
|  | Value of Potential RAB: |  | \$87,758,000 | \$92,990,000 |
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## Amenity Funding Analysis: As-of-Right Scenario

| Program Element | Total <br> Market Value <br> [1] | Vertical Construction Cost [2] | Residual Development Value $[3]=[1]-[2]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$28,708,000 | \$19,107,000 | \$9,601,000 |
| Residential Total | \$28,708,000 | \$19,107,000 | \$9,601,000 |
| Retail | \$24,270,000 | \$13,518,000 | \$10,751,000 |
| Office | \$570,871,000 | \$328,234,000 | \$242,637,000 |
| Total 1 | \$623,848,000 | \$360,859,000 | \$262,989,000 |
|  |  | Land Cost | -\$128,596,000 |
|  |  | structure Cost ${ }^{1}$ | -\$49,000,000 |
|  |  | eveloper Profit ${ }^{2}$ | -\$73,418,000 |
|  | Low Income H | using Subsidy ${ }^{3}$ | \$4,825,000 |
|  | Potential Am | enity Funding | \$16,800,000 |
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## Sources of Funding for Amenities:

As-of-Right Scenario

| Funding Source | Low | High |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue Area Bond | $\$ 87,758,000$ | $\$ 92,990,000$ |
| Development Value | $\underline{\$ 16,800,000}$ | $\underline{\$ 16,800,000}$ |
| Total | $\$ 104,558,000$ | $\$ 109,790,000$ |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Development Program: 1,000 RU Scenario

|  |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |
| Residential | 548 | 548,000 |
| $\quad$ Unrestricted For-Sale Units | 274 | 274,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | 178 | $\underline{133,500}$ |
| Affordable Rental Units | 1,000 | 955,500 |
| Residential Total |  | 151,336 |
| Retail |  | 802,771 |
| Office | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 0 9 , 6 0 7}$ |
| Total |  |  |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Municipal Tax Revenue and Costs: 1,000 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Municipal Revenue | Municipal School Cost | Municipal Service Cost | Net Municipal Tax Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$3,480,000 | \$2,532,000 | \$587,000 | \$361,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$1,740,000 | \$0 | \$294,000 | \$1,447,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$313,000 | \$822,000 | \$191,000 | -\$700,000 |
| Residential Total | \$5,533,000 | \$3,354,000 | \$1,071,000 | \$1,108,000 |
| Retail | \$664,000 | \$0 | \$47,000 | \$617,000 |
| Office | \$3,398,000 | \$0 | \$401,000 | \$2,997,000 |
| Total | \$9,596,000 | \$3,354,000 | \$1,519,000 | \$4,722,000 |
|  |  |  | Low (5.0\%) | High (4.5\%) |
|  | Value of Potential RAB: |  | \$72,592,000 | \$76,920,000 |
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## Amenity Funding Analysis: 1,000 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Total Market Value [1] | Vertical Construction Cost [2] | Residual Development Value $[3]=[1]-[2]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$191,800,000 | \$97,654,000 | \$94,146,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$95,900,000 | \$48,827,000 | \$47,073,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$26,476,000 | \$17,622,000 | \$8,854,000 |
| Residential Total | \$314,176,000 | \$164,102,000 | \$150,074,000 |
| Retail | \$53,796,000 | \$29,965,000 | \$23,832,000 |
| Office | \$276,447,000 | \$158,949,000 | \$117,498,000 |
| Total | \$644,419,000 | \$353,016,000 | \$291,404,000 |
|  |  | Land Cost | -\$132,837,000 |
|  |  | astructure Cost | -\$49,000,000 |
|  |  | eveloper Profit ${ }^{1}$ | -\$72,878,000 |
|  | I Low Income H | using Subsidy ${ }^{2}$ | \$4,450,000 |
|  | Potential Am | enity Funding | \$41,139,000 |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Developer profit is assumed to be 15 percent of development cost, including land and vertical construction costs.
${ }^{2}$ Federal and State funds, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, are assumed to be $\$ 25,000$ per affordable unit.

## Sources of Funding for Amenities:

1,000 RU Scenario

| Funding Source | Low | High |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue Area Bond | $\$ 72,592,000$ | $\$ 76,920,000$ |
| Development Value | $\underline{\$ 41,139,000}$ | $\$ 41,139,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 113,731,000$ | $\$ 118,059,000$ |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Development Program: 750 RU Scenario

|  | Units | Total <br> Square Feet |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |
| Residential | 409 | 409,000 |
| $\quad$ Unrestricted For-Sale Units | 204 | 204,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | $\frac{137}{750}$ | $\frac{102,750}{715,750}$ |
| Affordable Rental Units |  | 113,502 |
| Residential Total |  | 602,078 |
| Retail | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 3 1 , 3 3 0}$ |
| Office |  |  |
| Total |  |  |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Municipal Tax Revenue and Costs: 750 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Municipal Revenue | Municipal School Cost | Municipal Service Cost | Net Municipal Tax Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$2,597,000 | \$1,890,000 | \$438,000 | \$270,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$1,296,000 | \$0 | \$219,000 | \$1,077,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$241,000 | \$633,000 | \$147,000 | -\$539,000 |
| Residential Total | \$4,134,000 | \$2,523,000 | \$803,000 | \$808,000 |
| Retail | \$498,000 | \$0 | \$35,000 | \$463,000 |
| Office | \$2,549,000 | \$0 | \$301,000 | \$2,248,000 |
| Total | \$7,181,000 | \$2,523,000 | \$1,139,000 | \$3,519,000 |
|  |  |  | Low (5.0\%) | High (4.5\%) |
|  | Value of Potential RAB: |  | \$54,090,000 | \$57,315,000 |
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## Amenity Funding Analysis: 750 RU Scenario

|  |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element | Vertical <br> Construction <br> Cost | Residual <br> Development <br> Value |
| [2] |  |  |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Developer profit is assumed to be 15 percent of development cost, including land and vertical construction costs.
${ }^{2}$ Federal and State funds, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, are assumed to be $\$ 25,000$ per affordable unit.

## Sources of Funding for Amenities:

750 RU Scenario

| Funding Source | Low | High |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue Area Bond | $\$ 54,090,000$ | $\$ 57,315,000$ |
| Development Value | $\$ 30,723,000$ | $\$ 30,723,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 84,813,000$ | $\$ 88,038,000$ |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Development Program: 500 RU Scenario

|  |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |
| $\quad$ Unrestricted For-Sale Units | 270 | 270,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | 135 | 135,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | $\underline{95}$ | $\underline{71,250}$ |
| Residential Total | 500 | 476,250 |
| Retail |  | 75,668 |
| Office |  | 401,386 |
| Total | 500 | 953,304 |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Municipal Tax Revenue and Costs: 500 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Municipal Revenue | Municipal School Cost | Municipal Service Cost | Net Municipal Tax Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$1,715,000 | \$1,247,000 | \$289,000 | \$178,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$857,000 | \$0 | \$145,000 | \$713,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$167,000 | \$439,000 | \$102,000 | -\$374,000 |
| Residential Total | \$2,739,000 | \$1,686,000 | \$536,000 | \$517,000 |
| Retail | \$332,000 | \$0 | \$24,000 | \$309,000 |
| Office | \$1,699,000 | \$0 | \$200,000 | \$1,499,000 |
| Total | \$4,770,000 | \$1,686,000 | \$760,000 | \$2,324,000 |
|  |  |  | Low (5.0\%) | High (4.5\%) |
|  | Value of Potential RAB: |  | \$35,730,000 | \$37,860,000 |
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## Amenity Funding Analysis: 500 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Total Market Value [1] | Vertical Construction Cost [2] | Residual Development Value [3] = [1] - [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$94,500,000 | \$48,114,000 | \$46,386,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$47,250,000 | \$24,057,000 | \$23,193,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$14,131,000 | \$9,405,000 | \$4,726,000 |
| Residential Total | \$155,881,000 | \$81,576,000 | \$74,305,000 |
| Retail | \$26,898,000 | \$14,982,000 | \$11,916,000 |
| Office | \$138,223,000 | \$79,474,000 | \$58,749,000 |
| Total | \$321,002,000 | \$176,033,000 | \$144,969,000 |
|  |  | Land Cost | -\$66,169,000 |
|  |  | astructure Cost | -\$24,500,000 |
|  |  | eveloper Profit ${ }^{1}$ | -\$36,330,000 |
|  | I Low Income H | using Subsidy ${ }^{2}$ | \$2,375,000 |
|  | Potential Am | enity Funding | \$20,345,000 |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Developer profit is assumed to be 15 percent of development cost, including land and vertical construction costs.
${ }^{2}$ Federal and State funds, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, are assumed to be $\$ 25,000$ per affordable unit.

## Sources of Funding for Amenities: 500 RU Scenario

| Funding Source | Low | High |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue Area Bond | $\$ 35,730,000$ | $\$ 37,860,000$ |
| Development Value | $\underline{\$ 20,345,000}$ | $\$ \underline{20,345,000}$ |
| Total | $\$ 56,075,000$ | $\$ 58,205,000$ |

Source: Economics Research Associates

## Development Program: 250 RU Scenario

|  |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Program Element | Units | Square Feet |
| Residential |  |  |
| $\quad$ Unrestricted For-Sale Units | 131 | 131,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | 66 | 66,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | 53 | 39,750 |
| Residential Total | 250 | 236,750 |
| Retail |  | 37,834 |
| Office |  | 200,693 |
| Total |  | 475,277 |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

## Municipal Tax Revenue and Costs: 250 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Municipal Revenue | Municipal School Cost | Municipal Service Cost | Net Municipal Tax Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$832,000 | \$605,000 | \$140,000 | \$86,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$419,000 | \$0 | \$71,000 | \$348,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$93,000 | \$245,000 | \$57,000 | -\$208,000 |
| Residential Total | \$1,344,000 | \$850,000 | \$268,000 | \$226,000 |
| Retail | \$166,000 | \$0 | \$12,000 | \$154,000 |
| Office | \$850,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$749,000 |
| Total | \$2,360,000 | \$850,000 | \$380,000 | \$1,130,000 |
|  |  |  | Low (5.0\%) | High (4.5\%) |
|  | Value of Potential RAB: |  | \$17,370,000 | \$18,406,000 |
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## Amenity Funding Analysis: 250 RU Scenario

| Program Element | Total Market Value [1] | Vertical Construction Cost [2] | Residual Development Value $[3]=[1]-[2]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| Unrestricted For-Sale Units | \$45,850,000 | \$23,344,000 | \$22,506,000 |
| Age-restricted For-Sale Units | \$23,100,000 | \$11,761,000 | \$11,339,000 |
| Affordable Rental Units | \$7,883,000 | \$5,247,000 | \$2,636,000 |
| Residential Total | \$76,833,000 | \$40,352,000 | \$36,481,000 |
| Retail | \$13,449,000 | \$7,491,000 | \$5,958,000 |
| Office | \$69,112,000 | \$39,737,000 | \$29,375,000 |
| Total | \$159,394,000 | \$87,581,000 | \$71,813,000 |
|  |  | Land Cost | -\$32,857,000 |
|  |  | structure Cost | -\$12,250,000 |
|  |  | veloper Profit ${ }^{1}$ | -\$18,066,000 |
|  | I Low Income H | using Subsidy ${ }^{2}$ | \$1,325,000 |
|  | Potential Am | enity Funding | \$9,966,000 |

Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
${ }^{1}$ Developer profit is assumed to be 15 percent of development cost, including land and vertical construction costs.
${ }^{2}$ Federal and State funds, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, are assumed to be $\$ 25,000$ per affordable unit.

## Sources of Funding for Amenities:

250 RU Scenario

| Funding Source | Low | High |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue Area Bond | $\$ 17,370,000$ | $\$ 18,406,000$ |
| Development Value | $\$ 9,966,000$ | $\$ 9,966,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 27,336,000$ | $\$ 28,372,000$ |

Source: Economics Research Associates
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[^1]:    Source: Economics Research Associates

[^2]:    Source: West Windsor Township; Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

[^3]:    Source: Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
    ${ }^{1}$ Infrastructure cost is assumed to be $\$ 49$ million under the as-of-right and 1,000 RU scenarios. Infrastructure costs are reduced in proportion to density under other scenarios.
    ${ }^{2}$ Developer profit is assumed to be 15 percent of development cost, including land and vertical construction costs.
    ${ }^{3}$ Federal and State funds, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, are assumed to be \$25,000 per affordable unit.

[^4]:    Source: West Windsor Township; Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

[^5]:    Source: West Windsor Township; Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates

[^6]:    Source: West Windsor Township; Hillier Architecture; Economics Research Associates
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