

Memorandum



CITY OF DALLAS

DATE September 11, 2020

The Honorable Members of the Housing and Homeless Solutions Committee:

TO Chad West, Chair, Casey Thomas, Vice-Chair, Carolyn King Arnold, Lee M. Kleinman, Paula Blackmon, Cara Mendelsohn, Jaime Resendez

SUBJECT **Consideration and Recommendation of City Council Approval of an Award of Funding and Authorization to Enter into a Development Agreement with Good Urban Development, LLC NOFA Project for the Sale of 25 Lots under the Land Transfer Program and the development of up to 50 Single-Family Homes in an Amount not to exceed \$2,000,000.00**

Summary

On March 23, 2020, the Housing and Homeless Solutions Committee was briefed on a proposed project from Good Urban Development, LLC (Developer). On May 27, 2020, City Council requested that the project undergo additional underwriting prior to consideration for approval. The request for additional underwriting was proposed due to changes in the original scope the Developer's proposal. The revised underwriting memo is attached.

Background

On July 5, 2019, Good Urban Development, LLC, serving as the lead developer in a partnership with Urban Specialists, submitted a NOFA proposal for the construction of up to one hundred forty-eight (148) single-family homes on fifty-four (54) Developer-owned lots and the Land Transfer lots identified as Mill City clusters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Of the 148 units, twenty-eight were to be for-sale for household between 80-120% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The remaining one hundred twenty (120) units were to be financed with 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits and offered a lease-purchase option for households between 30-80% of the AMI. Total project costs exceeded \$28 million and the Developer requested \$5 million in General Obligation Bond funds to support the project. The proposal received 106.5 points (minimum fundable score was 100 points) out of a possible 140 points from the evaluation committee—thus making it eligible for underwriting and consideration for funding.

Additional analysis of the project by the Developer—coupled with community input and additional underwriting—necessitated an adjustment in the scope of the project. The resulting proposal includes the construction of fifty (50) single-family homes on twenty-five (25) Mill City lots and twenty-five (25) Developer-owned lots.

DATE September 17, 2020

SUBJECT **Consideration and Recommendation of City Council Approval of an Award of Fund Authorization to Enter into a Development Agreement with Good Urban Development NOFA Project for the Sale of 25 Lots under the Land Transfer Program and the development of up to 50 Single-Family Homes in an Amount not to exceed \$2,000,000.00**

In accordance with the underwriting report, the Developer proposes to build three distinct model types and offer price points accessible to homebuyers between 60-120% of the AMI. Each home will range from 1,200 square feet to 2,000 square feet with an attached garage. Approximately forty (40) of the units are targeted to households in the 60-80% AMI band. The remaining ten (10) homes will be targeted to households at up to 120% of the AMI. Each model offers a minimum of 3 bedrooms and 2 baths with an attached garage. Price points will range from \$140,000 for a 1,200 square foot model to \$220,000 for a home with a 2,000 square foot layout. All units built on Land Transfer lots will remain affordable for a minimum of five years.

Developer seeks \$2,000,000.00 in District 7 General Obligation Bond funds for the construction of the units. This represents an investment of \$40,000.00 per unit and will be used as construction subsidy to bring the homes into congruence with the affordability standards for the targeted homebuyers. Provision of bond funds allows for high-quality housing to be purchased by households between 60-120% of the AMI.

Underwriting & Market Study

As part of the NOFA process, the original submission of the project was underwritten by a 3rd party. The project was subsequently underwritten a second time to analyze the amount of recommended gap financing.

Cash flow modeling for the project assumes the following:

- Home prices will be as follows:

Sq. Ft.	Beds	Baths	Sales Price	No. of Models
1200	3	2	\$ 140,000.00	8
1600	3	2	\$ 168,990.00	18
1600	3	2	\$ 180,000.00	10
2000	4	2	\$ 220,000.00	14

- Total development costs are anticipated to be \$10,290,047.00;
- 5-month construction period per home with a 2-month absorption rate/sell time;

DATE September 17, 2020

SUBJECT **Consideration and Recommendation of City Council Approval of an Award of Fun Authorization to Enter into a Development Agreement with Good Urban Developm NOFA Project for the Sale of 25 Lots under the Land Transfer Program and the de of up to 50 Single-Family Homes in an Amount not to exceed \$2,000,000.00**

- Anticipated 10 housing starts every 4 months starting at month #1 and ending in month #13; 19-20 month build out of project
- 7% sales expense per home;
- \$2,000,000.00 subsidy to be used to pay eligible constructions costs representing approximately 41% of total unit construction

The resulting profit and loss analysis of the project indicates that with \$10,290,047 in total project costs and homes priced as outlined above, there is a total estimated revenue of \$8,301,047. As such, the City's contribution of \$2,000,000.00 allows the developer to **a)** close the gap (which is necessary because development costs outpace revenue based on the price points) and **b)** potentially secure a developer fee of approximately 10% on the project.

Issue

At present, the City controls 94 vacant lots in Mill City. Vacant lots do not provide tax revenue for the City and require regular maintenance. Maintaining a single vacant lot requires the City to spend approximately \$1,404 per year.

Fiscal Impact

As proposed, the Developer seeks \$2,000,000.00 in District 7 General Obligation Bond funding for construction costs. The resulting capital stack is as follows:

Sources			Uses	
Developer Equity	\$ 8,290,047.00	80.6%	Acquisition + construction	\$ 8,290,047.00
City of Dallas D7 GO Bond Funds	\$ 2,000,000.00	19.4%	Unit Construction	\$ 2,000,000.00
	\$ 10,290,047.00			\$ 10,290,047.00

The developer profit for the project is approximately \$983,889 million which represents approximately 10% of the total development costs.

As proposed, the development will generate approximately \$226915.76 in annual property taxes of which \$64,466.77 will be captured as revenue by the City of Dallas. Sale of the Land Transfer lots will result in approximately \$25,000.00 in revenue for the City of Dallas. Lastly, the City of Dallas will save approximately \$35,100.00 in annual maintenance costs for the Land Transfer lots.

DATE September 17, 2020

SUBJECT **Consideration and Recommendation of City Council Approval of an Award of Fun Authorization to Enter into a Development Agreement with Good Urban Developm NOFA Project for the Sale of 25 Lots under the Land Transfer Program and the de of up to 50 Single-Family Homes in an Amount not to exceed \$2,000,000.00**

Staff Recommendation

- Staff recommends Council approval of the item as detailed herein. Passage of the item will help the City achieve its affordable housing production goals.
- As indicated in the underwriting report, Developer has the experience to successfully complete the proposed project. Staff will continue to work with the Developer to address any outstanding due diligence items prior to entering into any agreements.

Please feel free to contact David Noguera, Director of Housing & Neighborhood Revitalization at 214-670-5988, or David.Noguera@dallascityhall.com if you have any questions or need additional information.



Dr. Eric Johnson

Chief of Economic Development & Neighborhood Services

c: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager
Chris Caso, City Attorney
Mark Swann, City Auditor
Biliera Johnson, City Secretary
Preston Robinson, Administrative Judge
Kimberly Bizer Tolbert, Chief of Staff to the City Manager
Majed A. Al-Ghafry, Assistant City Manager
Jon Fortune, Assistant City Manager

Joey Zapata, Assistant City Manager
Nadia Chandler Hardy, Assistant City Manager
M. Elizabeth Reich, Chief Financial Officer
Laila Aleqresh, Chief Innovation Officer
Directors and Assistant Directors



Date: August 3, 2020

To: David Noguera, City of Dallas

Cc: T. Daniel Kalubi, City of Dallas

Re: Good Urban Development- Revised Preliminary Underwriting (all for sale)

From: NDC Underwriter: Corey Leon

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In its review of the application materials, NDC has summarized the salient issues below:

1. NDC recommends the City of Dallas provide a recoverable grant to Good Urban Development (GUD) for the for sale single family home project. As the market study calls into question whether more than 36 units could be absorbed in three (3) years, the developer should pay special attention to strategically cluster units next to or within close proximity of each other to maximize marketability. NDC recommends the sale of twenty-five (25) lots for the project at a combined price of \$25,000 from the Mills City neighborhood clusters to GUD possibly in a phased project.
2. The project developer is developing a 50-unit single-family project. A subsidy of \$2M was requested from GO Bonds for the homeownership project.
3. The project proposes to use twenty-five (25) parcels from the City's Land Transfer Program in the Mills City neighborhood and twenty-five (25) parcels acquired from Habitat from Humanity. Acquisitions costs for these parcels are estimated utilizing the developer's proposal of \$1,000 per lot for the 25 lots, not the LTP guidelines and not per a third-party appraisal per the Comprehensive Housing Policy ("CHP").
4. For Pathway 1, the average development subsidy per unit, excluding any discount for parcels, is \$32,208. For Pathway 2, the average development subsidy per unit excluding any discount for parcels is \$40,000 for all 50 units. Either pathway is below CHP maximum thresholds. Though not explicit in the policy when General Obligation funds are applied to new construction, the City's CHP would require that the homes maintain affordability for a ten (10) year period given the subsidy on a per unit basis and that resale provisions would apply.
5. The Applicant's projected development costs appear reasonable (on a basic per square foot basis), yet they are not the result of a competitive bidding process per CHP requirements. The level of plans and specifications supplied to NDC only included basic elevations. City Housing staff have more detailed information and must ensure that all applicable property standards will be met. These standards of construction quality expectations should be incorporated as part of the funding agreement.
6. The Applicant anticipates selling units to households earning between 80-120% of the Area Median Income (AMI).
7. The project is not taking a construction loan. The financing for the project will be funded through approximately \$3.2 million of developer equity plus the \$1.6M - \$2M of City GO Bonds. Sales of the units will return the developer their equity plus an approximately 10% profit.

8. The applicant's assumptions around construction and completion timelines are reasonable. The applicant projects a construction period of eighteen months including a construction period of five months per unit and estimates a sales period of two months.
9. Pathway 1 projects sales prices between \$150,000 and \$242,000 which are above the market comparables of the Market Study provided by the Developer. Pathway 2 projects sales prices between \$140,000 and \$220,000/unit which appear in line with market comparable sales. As-built appraisals should be obtained on each model to further inform the likely unit prices.
10. The City requested all projects include allowances of \$15,000 for an on/off-site infrastructure (particularly water and sewer taps into old infrastructure) for all of the lots and \$11,000 in additional professional fees for project underwriting costs. Prior to a commitment of funds the City should require firm site construction plans that include a determination of on/off-site infrastructure improvements needed.
11. The applicant has demonstrated adequate management and financial capacity to complete the project.
12. Pathway 1 features a lower City subsidy but may require an updated Market Study due to the prices being higher than the current study. Should the City decide to prioritize deeper affordability, the City of Dallas should consider Pathway 2 which grants the Good Urban Development project \$2M but requires lower, and in line with the Market Study, sales prices for the 50 units.

PURPOSE: The City of Dallas has retained NDC to underwrite applications made as part of a Notice of Funding Availability. This final report is delivered as a final check on underwriting and assumptions to projects that have been designated as potential awardees of assistance. The project under review has been assessed for the following: viability and readiness; management's capacity to start and complete the project; the proposed borrower's experience, financial capacity and creditworthiness. Additionally, a project financial analysis has been conducted to assess ensure the development is not overly enriched.

PROJECT REVIEW:

PROJECT SUMMARY – GOOD URBAN DEVELOPMENT: Good Urban Development is a 50-unit scattered site development comprised of 50 single-family homes for sale. The project is being undertaken by Matthews Southwest (MSW), Urban Specialists, Inc. (US) and Renaissance Neighborhood Development Corporation (RNDC) as a team (Developer Team) and owner via a single-purpose Limited Liability Company – Good Urban Development LLC (GUD). The project is in the Mill City neighborhood in Dallas, Texas. The proposed project will include 50 single-family units all of which will be for-sale. The development will serve multiple income bands – providing 80% to 120% AMI for the for-sale units. The proposed project neighbors Fair Park, MLK, and the Hatcher Dart station and is situated in new and emerging urban core. The units will be designed to conform with other houses in the neighborhood with prominent front porches. The For-sale units will require income restrictions per the City CHP of ten years with resale provisions.

	Pathway 1	Pathway 2
Average Sales Price	\$186,896	\$178,517
Net Revenue From Sales	\$8,690,664	\$8,301,047
Developer Profit	\$983,889	\$983,889
Developer Profit per unit	\$19,678	\$19,678
Non-land Subsidy	\$1,610,383	\$2,000,000

Non-land Subsidy per unit	\$32,208	\$40,000
---------------------------	----------	----------

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

City funds are requested to subsidize the development of 50 units of for-sale housing comprised of scattered site, single family dwellings on lots transferred by the City or acquired from Habitat. The use of funds is appropriate to support affordable for-sale units. All sales should be income restricted for 10 years per the City's CHP. The targeted neighborhood is one identified by the City for development under the NOFA.

II. PROJECT FEASIBILITY AND READINESS

- a. Market Study: Meyers Research and MetroStudy completed an Assessment of Market Opportunity in October of 2019 that shows yearly demand of for sale homes between 18 and 36 units. The market study suggests that units between 1,200 and 1,500 square feet (sf) should be offered. This project does include 8 units that are at 1,200 sf however 32 units are at 1,600 sf and 10 units at 2,000 sf. Input from local stakeholders indicated more demand for larger units. Approximately 26% of the new construction housing built between 2015 and 2019 were 1,600 sf or larger. The average selling price for new construction homes ranges from \$112 per square foot (psf) to \$119 psf. The prices in Pathway 1 are above this average except for fourteen (14) 1,600 sf units priced below average. The prices in Pathway 2 are all within or below the market study price range.

	Pathway 1		Pathway 2	
Average Sales Price	\$186,896	PSF	\$178,517	PSF
1200 SF	150,000	125	140,000	117
1600 SF	193,600	121	180,000	113
1600 SF (Deeper Targeting)	160,000	100	168,990	106
2000 SF	242,000	121	220,000	110

- b. Appraisal: No appraisal was submitted. In order to ensure the City is subsidizing units of fair market value as proposed by the developer, the City must require as-built appraisals.
- c. Entitlements and permits: Zoning information was not reviewed. Single family dwellings on infill lots is likely a conforming use in most residential neighborhoods.
- d. Site Control: GUD has control of 25 lots acquired from Habitat, it is requesting an additional 25 lots from the City at a subsidized sales price of \$1,000/lot. There has not been a recent appraisal to determine the fair market value of the lots.
- e. Dallas Policy Compliance: Increased home ownership are goals of the City's housing policy. This project would provide 50 new single-family homes for sale.

DEVELOPMENT TEAM

- a. Experience and Management Capacity – The owner is comprised of three entities which make up the members of Good Urban Development, LLC. The entities include the following Matthews Southwest (MSW), Urban Specialists, Inc. (US) and Renaissance Neighborhood Development Corporation (RNDC) as a team (Developer Team) and owner via a single-purpose Limited Liability Company – Good Urban Development LLC (GUD).
- b. MSW is a full-service, private, for-profit, real-estate development company headquartered in Lewisville, TX with offices in Dallas and Canada. MSW has acquired, built and managed development of hotel, office, mixed use, retail and residential and industrial developments. MSW will be the lead developer with overall responsibility for concept, financing, approvals and completion. Jack Matthews, President and founding partner of MSW (1982) will be project lead. Kristian Teleki, SVP for MSW, has 28 years of experience in land development and is a registered engineer. His projects include 1,500-acre master-planned residential development in The Colony. MSW most relevant experience to the proposed project is Acres Homes, a 50-unit single family development in Houston which is under construction. MSW has also been involved in larger multi-family projects financed with LIHTC including: The Belleview in Dallas, a 164-unit, mixed use development financed primarily with LIHTC equity and Hutchins Gateway, a 336-unit multifamily development in Hutchins, Texas financed with LIHTC and Tax-exempt bonds.

US is a Texas nonprofit organization working to eliminate violence in South Dallas; US is led by Bishop Omar Jahwar. It is unclear what this organization's role will be in the project.

RNDC, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation formed in 2006, is a partnership between Volunteers of America of Southwest Louisiana and Volunteers of America National Services. It will focus on coordination with local officials, funders, stakeholders and development team members. RNDC is led by Victor Smeltz, its Executive Director. Since 2006, Smeltz has led the development of over 1000 units of mixed-income housing with total financing of more than \$100M. Smeltz is also a registered architect. RNDC's most relevant experience to the proposed project: RNDC developed and manages 25 single family lease-purchase homes in Covington, Louisiana. The units were placed in service in 2017 and financed through the LIHTC program.

MSW and RNDC is experienced with the type of project proposed and should be the controlling entities.

- c. Borrower Financial Capacity

GUD provided an internally prepared financial statement for 2018 with assets of \$288K, and liabilities of \$294K and negative net worth of (\$6K) due primarily to accrued property taxes.

MSW provided internally prepared financial statements for 2018 and 2019 and its 2017 tax return. As of YE 2019, MSW had assets of \$103M (including \$6.9M in cash), liabilities of \$70M and net worth of \$33M. Revenues for 2019 were \$31.3M (\$9.2M from lot sales and \$3.4M from rentals), expenses \$21.3M with net income of \$11M after taxes. The statement indicates assets are understated (likely at cost) and if valued at FMV, MSW's net worth would increase by \$40.4M; however, this increase would only be realized at the sale of the assets.

RNDC provided audited financial statements for the years 2017 and 2018 and Form 990 for both years. RNDC's 2018 financial statement shows assets of \$110M (including cash of \$2.6M), liabilities of \$74M, and net assets of \$36M. Revenues for 2018 were \$8.9M, expenses of \$9.2M with changes in net assets from general and limited partnerships of \$6.2M and net change in net assets of \$5.9M

US provided an audited financial statement for 2018, showing assets of \$134K (including \$50K in cash), liabilities of \$99K, and net assets of \$35K. Revenues and expenses for 2018 were \$2.8M and \$2.8M with a slight increase in net assets of \$42K.

III. PROJECT FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

- a. Financial resources committed (For-sale): The applicant intends to use developer resources (equity) for the project and has the required cash estimated at \$3,235,349 for Pathway 1 or \$3,062,186 for Pathway 2 to undertake the project.
- b. Development Budget (For-sale): total development costs are estimated at \$10,301,047 including a developer fee of \$983,889 (\$19,678/unit, 9.6% of total development cost). As a percentage of total development costs, the fee is 10% and is below the 15% maximum established by City policy. Hard construction costs are estimated at:

	Cost psf	Cost per unit	Infrastructure	Soft Costs
1200 sf	\$90.52	\$108,629	\$15,000	\$50,918
1600 sf	\$85.00	\$136,008	\$15,000	\$50,918
2000 sf	\$81.69	\$163,387	\$15,000	\$50,918

The budget appears reasonable if not conservative given only three floor plans are anticipated, one of which is much smaller units. Higher costs, a lower sales price or lack for affordability could adversely impact the feasibility of the project. However, the applicant is experienced in the industry. The threshold for committing federal funds would require that the project have complete construction drawings and construction bids to inform the development budget. Given that the City is not utilizing federal funds, the City should utilize similar practices to 1) ensure the project costs are firm 2) the construction & design standards are known and met 3) the developer obtains as-built appraisals to determine the fair market value of the units 4) incorporate the construction specifications and standards as contract exhibits.

c. Source and Uses (For-Sale):

SOURCES OF FUNDS	PATHWAY 1		PATHWAY 2	
	AMOUNT	PER UNIT	AMOUNT	PER UNIT
SALES REVENUE	\$9,344,800	\$186,896	\$8,925,857	\$178,517
COST OF SALES	(\$654,136)	(13,083)	(624,810)	(12,496)
NET REVENUE	8,690,664	173,813	8,301,047	166,020
USES OF FUNDS	AMOUNT		AMOUNT	
	AMOUNT	PER UNIT	AMOUNT	PER UNIT
LAND	150,000	3,000	150,000	3,000
SITE PLANNING/ SITE WORK	172,425	3,449	172,425	3,449
INFRASTRUCTURE	750,000	15,000	750,000	15,000
CONSTRUCTION	6,855,148	137,103	6,855,148	137,103
CONSTRUCTION INTEREST	0	0	0	0
DEVELOPER FEE	983,889	19,678	983,889	19,678
OTHER SOFT COSTS	1,389,585	27,792	1,389,585	27,792
TOTAL	10,301,047	206,021	10,301,047	206,021
PROFIT/(LOSS)	(1,610,383)	32,208	(2,000,000)	40,000

- d. No homebuyer analysis was provided by the developer. The developer is targeting families at 80%-120% of AMI for the For-sale units. The underwriter has analyzed the low end of affordability using a 4-person household at 80% AMI with an annual income of \$66,480. At this income a family could qualify for a loan of up to ~\$234,500 with a front-end and back-end ratio maximums of 30% and 43% per the limits prescribed by the City's Homebuyer Assistance Programs as detailed in the CHP. However, loan amounts will be limited by the appraised value of the houses and actual lender requirements. The typical mortgage originator's Loan to Value ("LTV") and ratio thresholds will limit this loan to around \$180,500, which is in the range of all but the largest (2,000 sf) units. A down payment of \$9,500 plus closing costs of ~\$5,400 would be needed from the homebuyer.
- e. Financial resources committed: The developer has committed to finance all of the project costs with equity. As stated above, based on the provided financials the owners of GUD should have access to this amount of cash.

V. RECOMMENDATION AND LIMITING CONDITIONS:

As discussed above, the City needs to obtain complete construction drawings and construction bids to inform the development budget. The City should 1) ensure the project costs are firm through bidding, 2) the construction & design standards are known and met making sure the houses will fit into the character of the neighborhood, 3) obtain as-built appraisals to determine the fair market value of the units, and 4) incorporate the construction specifications and standards as contract exhibits. Rather than funding via an up-front grant, risk can be mitigated by funding actual expenses as evidenced by receipts and inspections. The subsidy is largely consistent with the City's published underwriting standards and structured within market norms. The project is likely to be viable if awarded gap funding by the City. The project could likely commence in the late summer/early fall of 2020.

	Pathway 1	Pathway 2
Average Sales Price	\$186,896	\$178,517
Comment	Slightly above Market Study	Within Market Study averages
Developer Profit	\$983,889	\$983,889
Comment	Within guidelines	Within guidelines
Non-land Subsidy	\$1,610,383	\$2,000,000
Comment	\$32,208 per unit is within guidelines	\$40,000 per unit is within guidelines
Prioritization	Reducing Public Subsidy	Reducing Sales Prices
Comment	Prices are slightly above averages cited in Market Study. Project is targeting more units (50) than Market Study suggests (18-36). Unit sizes (up to 2000 sf) are larger than Market Study suggests (1500 sf or smaller). Pathway 1 may be too aggressive.	Prices are within averages cited in Market Study. Project is targeting more units (50) than Market Study suggests (18-36). Unit sizes (up to 2000 sf) are larger than Market Study suggests (1500 sf or smaller). The lower prices may make Pathway 2 more feasible.

The project will provide 50 units of for-sale housing.

Project risks include the following considerations:

- At the time of this underwriting report, environmental reports were not available for the City parcels. It is possible that an environmental review would uncover some condition that would make one or more lots unavailable for development.
- It is unknown if any on-site improvements are necessary for these infill lots.
- The condition of water and sewer lines and the ability to tap into these lines is unknown requiring an infrastructure allowance.
- Zoning, set-backs, easements, etc. is unknown.
- The construction costs were not based upon a competitive bidding process per City requirements. However, the Applicant provided a third-party estimate of construction costs that generally aligned with the Applicant's cost estimates.

EXHIBITS (FOR EACH PATHWAY):

- Detailed Development and Sales Budget
- Monthly Cash Flow
- Profit & Loss analysis

Pathway 1

(higher prices, less public subsidy)

SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
Development Budget

Project:

GUD Pathway 1

Key

White spaces indicate data entry

DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

ITEM	Cost	% Total	Inflation Factor	
ACQUISITION			0.045	
Building Acquisition	0	0%		
Land Acquisition	150,000	1%		
UNIT CONSTRUCTION (see below)	6,855,148	67%		
OTHER CONSTRUCTION				
Landscaping	0	0%	0	
Permits	104,500	1%		
Clearance and Demolition		0%		
Utility Connections & Tap Fees	261,250	3%		
Contingency	479,860	5%		
INFRASTRUCTURE				
Streets and Sidewalks	0	0%	Cost	Lots
Water and Sewer	750,000	7%	15000	50
Stormwater & Drainage	0	0%		
Impact Fees	0	0%		
PROFESSIONAL FEES				
Site Planning	172,425	2%		
Architecture & Engineering	0	0%		
Inspections	7,838	0%		
Consultant	31,350	0%		
Survey	78,375	1%		
Market Study	0	0%		
Environmental	305,663	3%	6113.25	
Organization Expense	0	0%		
FINANCE COSTS				
Construction Loan Interest	0	0%		
Construction Origination	0	0%		
Appraisal	0	0%		
Construction Insurance	109,750	1%		
Property Taxes	0	0%		
SOFT COSTS				
Marketing	0	0%		
Other	11,000	0%	NDC Fee (charge as Program Delivery Expense?)	
DEVELOPER FEE	983,889	10%		
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST	10,301,047			

Construction/Rehab. Costs

Model Number	Sq. Ft.	Cost/Sq. Ft.	Unit Cost	# Units	Total	Sales Price	40000 After DPA	After DPA Price/SF	After DPA Price/SF
1	1,200	90.523996	108,629	8	869,030	150,000	110000	125	91.66667
2	1,600	85.004872	136,008	18	2,448,140	193,600	153600	121	96
3	2,000	81.693398	163,387	10	1,633,868	242,000	202000	121	101
4	1,600	85.004872	136,008	14	1,904,109	160,000	120000	100	75
5			0	0	0				
6			0	0	0			Avg	112
7			0	0	0			2019 Avg	119
Average			137,103	50	6,855,148	186,896			

Market Study
indicates demand for

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Cash Flow Analysis

% Debt % City Grant %Equity

Key

White spaces indicate data entry

Construction cost	Project #s	Acquisition	0%	0%	100%									
\$137,103		Unit Construction	0%	17%	83%									
Sales price	\$186,896	Other Construction	0%	0%	100%									
Sales expense	7.00%	Infrastructure	0%	100%	0%									
Construction interest rate	0.00%	Professional Fees	0%	0%	100%									
Months to construct	5	Construction Interest	0%	0%	100%									
Months to sell	2	Other Finance Costs	0%	0%	100%									
		Soft Costs	0%	0%	100%									
MONTH			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 # Housing Starts	50		10	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0
2 Project Expenses	Budget	Cumulative Expenditure												
Property Acquisition	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Unit Construction	\$6,855,148	\$6,855,148	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206
Other Construction	\$845,610	\$845,610	\$365,750	\$0	\$95,972	\$0	\$0	\$95,972	\$0	\$0	\$95,972	\$0	\$0	\$95,972
Infrastructure	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Fees	\$595,650	\$595,650	\$595,650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction Interest	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Finance Costs	\$109,750	\$109,750	\$109,750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soft Costs	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Monthly Expenses	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158	\$2,256,356	\$274,206	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178
2a Cumulative Project Expenses			\$2,256,356	\$2,530,562	\$2,900,740	\$3,449,152	\$3,997,563	\$4,367,741	\$4,916,153	\$5,464,565	\$5,834,743	\$6,383,155	\$6,931,567	\$7,301,745
3 Number of New Constr. Sales			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0
4 Project Revenue														
Sales			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,868,960	\$0	\$0	\$1,868,960	\$0	\$0
- Cost of Sale			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,827	\$0	\$0	\$130,827	\$0	\$0
= Net Monthly Revenue			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0
5 Cash Flow														
Net Monthly Revenue (4)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0
- Total Monthly Expenses (2)			\$2,256,356	\$274,206	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178
= Monthly Cash Flow (+ go to 6, - go to 7)			(\$2,256,356)	(\$274,206)	(\$370,178)	(\$548,412)	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)	\$1,189,721	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)	\$1,189,721	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)
6 Uses of Cash Flow (CF)														
6a Debt Repayment			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6b + Equity Repayment			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,189,721	\$0	\$0	\$1,189,721	\$0	\$0
= Total Uses of Monthly CF			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,189,721	\$0	\$0	\$1,189,721	\$0	\$0
7 Sources of Investment														
7a Debt			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7a + Owner Equity	Total		\$1,458,557	\$226,407	\$322,379	\$452,814	\$452,814	\$322,379	\$0	\$452,814	\$322,379	\$0	\$452,814	\$322,379
7a + City Grant	\$ 1,610,383		\$797,799	\$47,799	\$47,799	\$95,598	\$95,598	\$47,799	\$0	\$95,598	\$47,799	\$0	\$95,598	\$47,799
= Total Sources of Monthly Investment			\$2,256,356	\$274,206	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$0	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$0	\$548,412	\$370,178
INVESTMENT SUMMARY														
Outstanding Debt														
Previous Month's Outstanding Debt			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
- CF for Debt Repayment (#6a)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
+ This Month's Debt Invested (#7a)	Highest		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
= OUTSTANDING DEBT	\$ -		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equity Invested														
Previous Month's Outstanding Equity			\$0	\$1,458,557	\$1,684,964	\$2,007,343	\$2,460,156	\$2,912,970	\$3,235,349	\$2,045,628	\$2,498,442	\$2,820,821	\$1,631,100	\$2,083,913
- CF for Equity Repayment (#6b)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$1,189,721)	\$0	\$0	(\$1,189,721)	\$0	\$0
+ This Month's Equity Invested (#7b)	Highest		\$1,458,557	\$226,407	\$322,379	\$452,814	\$452,814	\$322,379	\$0	\$452,814	\$322,379	\$0	\$452,814	\$322,379
= EQUITY INVESTED	\$ 3,235,349		\$1,458,557	\$1,684,964	\$2,007,343	\$2,460,156	\$2,912,970	\$3,235,349	\$2,045,628	\$2,498,442	\$2,820,821	\$1,631,100	\$2,083,913	\$2,406,292
Project Cash Balance														
Cumulative Project Revenue (#4)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$1,738,133	\$1,738,133	\$3,476,266	\$3,476,266	\$3,476,266
- Cumulative Expenses			\$2,256,356	\$2,530,562	\$2,900,740	\$3,449,152	\$3,997,563	\$4,367,741	\$4,916,153	\$5,464,565	\$5,834,743	\$6,383,155	\$6,931,567	\$7,301,745
+ Cumulative Grants Invested			\$797,799	\$845,598	\$893,397	\$988,995	\$1,084,593	\$1,132,393	\$1,132,393	\$1,227,991	\$1,275,790	\$1,275,790	\$1,371,388	\$1,419,187
= CASH BALANCE			(\$1,458,557)	(\$1,684,964)	(\$2,007,343)	(\$2,460,156)	(\$2,912,970)	(\$3,235,349)	(\$2,045,628)	(\$2,498,442)	(\$2,820,821)	(\$1,631,100)	(\$2,083,913)	(\$2,406,292)

13	14	15	16	17	18	19
10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0	\$95,972	\$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
\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$7,850,156	\$8,398,568	\$8,768,746	\$9,042,952	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158
10	0	0	10	0	0	10
\$1,868,960	\$0	\$0	\$1,868,960	\$0	\$0	\$1,868,960
\$130,827	\$0	\$0	\$130,827	\$0	\$0	\$130,827
\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133
\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133	\$0	\$0	\$1,738,133
\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$1,189,721	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)	\$1,463,927	(\$274,206)	\$0	\$1,738,133
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$1,189,721	\$0	\$0	\$1,463,927	\$0	\$0	\$754,244
\$1,189,721	\$0	\$0	\$1,463,927	\$0	\$0	\$754,244
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$452,814	\$322,379	\$0	\$226,407	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$95,598	\$47,799	\$0	\$47,799	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$0	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$2,406,292	\$1,216,571	\$1,669,385	\$1,991,764	\$527,837	\$754,244	\$754,244
(\$1,189,721)	\$0	\$0	(\$1,463,927)	\$0	\$0	(\$754,244)
\$0	\$452,814	\$322,379	\$0	\$226,407	\$0	\$0
\$1,216,571	\$1,669,385	\$1,991,764	\$527,837	\$754,244	\$754,244	\$0
\$5,214,398	\$5,214,398	\$5,214,398	\$6,952,531	\$6,952,531	\$6,952,531	\$8,690,664
\$7,850,156	\$8,398,568	\$8,768,746	\$9,042,952	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158
\$1,419,187	\$1,514,785	\$1,562,584	\$1,562,584	\$1,610,383	\$1,610,383	\$1,610,383
(\$1,216,571)	(\$1,669,385)	(\$1,991,764)	(\$527,837)	(\$754,244)	(\$754,244)	\$983,889

PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT

Project:

GUD Pathway 1

Key

White spaces indicate data entry

REVENUE

	# Units	Price	Total
Sale of Housing Units	8	\$ 150,000	\$ 1,200,000
Sale of Housing Units	18	\$ 193,600	\$ 3,484,800
Sale of Housing Units	10	\$ 242,000	\$ 2,420,000
Sale of Housing Units	14	\$ 160,000	\$ 2,240,000
Sale of Housing Units	0	\$ -	\$ -
Sale of Housing Units	0	\$ -	\$ -
Sale of Housing Units	0	\$ -	\$ -
Total	50	\$ 186,896	\$ 9,344,800
<u>Less Selling Costs</u>	7%	<u>Percent</u>	\$ 654,136
TOTAL REVENUE			\$ 8,690,664

COSTS

Property Acquisition	\$ 150,000
Unit Construction	\$ 6,855,148
Other Construction	\$ 845,610
Infrastructure	\$ 750,000
Professional Fees	\$ 595,650
Finance Costs	\$ 109,750
Soft Costs	\$ 11,000
Developer Fee	\$ 983,889
TOTAL	\$ 10,301,047

TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 8,690,664
+ TOTAL GRANTS	\$ 1,610,383
- TOTAL COSTS	\$ (10,301,047)
= PROFIT (LOSS)	\$ -

PROJECTED PROFIT	0%	Percent	\$ -
- ACTUAL PROFIT			\$ -
= DEVELOPERS SUBSIDY			\$ -

Pathway 2

(lower prices, more public subsidy)

SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
Development Budget

Project:

GUD Pathway 2

Key

White spaces indicate data entry

DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

ITEM	Cost	% Total	Inflation Factor	
ACQUISITION			0.045	
Building Acquisition	0	0%		
Land Acquisition	150,000	1%		
UNIT CONSTRUCTION (see below)	6,855,148	67%		
OTHER CONSTRUCTION				
Landscaping	0	0%	0	
Permits	104,500	1%		
Clearance and Demolition		0%		
Utility Connections & Tap Fees	261,250	3%		
Contingency	479,860	5%		
INFRASTRUCTURE				
Streets and Sidewalks	0	0%	Cost	Lots
Water and Sewer	750,000	7%	15000	50
Stormwater & Drainage	0	0%		
Impact Fees	0	0%		
PROFESSIONAL FEES				
Site Planning	172,425	2%		
Architecture & Engineering	0	0%		
Inspections	7,838	0%		
Consultant	31,350	0%		
Survey	78,375	1%		
Market Study	0	0%		
Environmental	305,663	3%	6113.25	
Organization Expense	0	0%		
FINANCE COSTS				
Construction Loan Interest	0	0%		
Construction Origination	0	0%		
Appraisal	0	0%		
Construction Insurance	109,750	1%		
Property Taxes	0	0%		
SOFT COSTS				
Marketing	0	0%		
Other	11,000	0%	NDC Fee (charge as Program Delivery Expense?)	
DEVELOPER FEE	983,889	10%		
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST	10,301,047			
			2545899	50917.988

Construction/Rehab. Costs

Model Number	Sq. Ft.	Cost/Sq. Ft.	Unit Cost	# Units	Total	Sales Price	40000 After DPA	After DPA Price/SF	After DPA Price/SF
1	1,200	90.523996	108,629	8	869,030	140,000	100000	116.6667	83.33333
2	1,600	85.004872	136,008	18	2,448,140	180,000	140000	112.5	87.5
3	2,000	81.693398	163,387	10	1,633,868	220,000	180000	110	90
4	1,600	85.004872	136,008	14	1,904,109	168,990	128990	105.6186	80.61862
5			0	0	0				
6			0	0	0			Avg	112
7			0	0	0			2019 Avg	119
Average			137,103	50	6,855,148	178,517			

Market Study
indicates demand for
only 36 units per year

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Cash Flow Analysis

% Debt % City Grant %Equity

White s

Construction cost	Project #s	Acquisition	0%	0%	100%						
Sales price	\$137,103	Unit Construction	0%	25%	75%						
Sales expense	\$178,517	Other Construction	0%	0%	100%						
Construction interest rate	7.00%	Infrastructure	0%	100%	0%						
Months to construct	0.00%	Professional Fees	0%	0%	100%						
Months to sell	5	Construction Interest	0%	0%	100%						
	2	Other Finance Costs	0%	0%	100%						
		Soft Costs	0%	0%	100%						
MONTH		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1 # Housing Starts	50	10	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	
2 Project Expenses	Budget	Cumulative Expenditure									
Property Acquisition	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Unit Construction	\$6,855,148	\$6,855,148	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206
Other Construction	\$845,610	\$845,610	\$365,750	\$0	\$95,972	\$0	\$0	\$95,972	\$0	\$0	\$95,972
Infrastructure	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Fees	\$595,650	\$595,650	\$595,650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction Interest	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Finance Costs	\$109,750	\$109,750	\$109,750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soft Costs	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Monthly Expenses	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158	\$2,256,356	\$274,206	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178
2a Cumulative Project Expenses			\$2,256,356	\$2,530,562	\$2,900,740	\$3,449,152	\$3,997,563	\$4,367,741	\$4,916,153	\$5,464,565	\$5,834,743
3 Number of New Constr. Sales			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
4 Project Revenue											
Sales			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,785,171	\$0	\$0
- Cost of Sale			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$124,962	\$0	\$0
= Net Monthly Revenue			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0
5 Cash Flow											
Net Monthly Revenue (4)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0
- Total Monthly Expenses (2)			\$2,256,356	\$274,206	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178
= Monthly Cash Flow (+ go to 6, - go to 7)			(\$2,256,356)	(\$274,206)	(\$370,178)	(\$548,412)	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)	\$1,111,798	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)
6 Uses of Cash Flow (CF)											
6a Debt Repayment			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6b + Equity Repayment			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,111,798	\$0	\$0
= Total Uses of Monthly CF			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,111,798	\$0	\$0
7 Sources of Investment											
7a Debt			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7a + Owner Equity		Total	\$1,436,911	\$204,761	\$300,734	\$409,523	\$409,523	\$300,734	\$0	\$409,523	\$300,734
7a + City Grant		\$ 2,000,000	\$819,444	\$69,444	\$69,444	\$138,889	\$138,889	\$69,444	\$0	\$138,889	\$69,444
= Total Sources of Monthly Investment			\$2,256,356	\$274,206	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$0	\$548,412	\$370,178
INVESTMENT SUMMARY											
Outstanding Debt											
Previous Month's Outstanding Debt			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
- CF for Debt Repayment (#6a)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
+ This Month's Debt Invested (#7a)		Highest	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
= OUTSTANDING DEBT		\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equity Invested											
Previous Month's Outstanding Equity			\$0	\$1,436,911	\$1,641,673	\$1,942,407	\$2,351,929	\$2,761,452	\$3,062,186	\$1,950,388	\$2,359,911
- CF for Equity Repayment (#6b)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$1,111,798)	\$0	\$0
+ This Month's Equity Invested (#7b)		Highest	\$1,436,911	\$204,761	\$300,734	\$409,523	\$409,523	\$300,734	\$0	\$409,523	\$300,734
= EQUITY INVESTED		\$ 3,062,186	\$1,436,911	\$1,641,673	\$1,942,407	\$2,351,929	\$2,761,452	\$3,062,186	\$1,950,388	\$2,359,911	\$2,660,645
Project Cash Balance											
Cumulative Project Revenue (#4)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$1,660,209	\$1,660,209
- Cumulative Expenses			\$2,256,356	\$2,530,562	\$2,900,740	\$3,449,152	\$3,997,563	\$4,367,741	\$4,916,153	\$5,464,565	\$5,834,743
+ Cumulative Grants Invested			\$819,444	\$888,889	\$958,333	\$1,097,222	\$1,236,111	\$1,305,555	\$1,305,555	\$1,444,444	\$1,513,889
= CASH BALANCE			(\$1,436,911)	(\$1,641,673)	(\$1,942,407)	(\$2,351,929)	(\$2,761,452)	(\$3,062,186)	(\$1,950,388)	(\$2,359,911)	(\$2,660,645)

Key
paces indicate data entry

10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
10	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0	\$95,972	\$0	\$0	\$95,972	\$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
\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$6,383,155	\$6,931,567	\$7,301,745	\$7,850,156	\$8,398,568	\$8,768,746	\$9,042,952	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158
10	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	10
\$1,785,171	\$0	\$0	\$1,785,171	\$0	\$0	\$1,785,171	\$0	\$0	\$1,785,171
\$124,962	\$0	\$0	\$124,962	\$0	\$0	\$124,962	\$0	\$0	\$124,962
\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209
\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209	\$0	\$0	\$1,660,209
\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$548,412	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$274,206	\$274,206	\$0	\$0
\$1,111,798	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)	\$1,111,798	(\$548,412)	(\$370,178)	\$1,386,004	(\$274,206)	\$0	\$1,660,209
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$1,111,798	\$0	\$0	\$1,111,798	\$0	\$0	\$1,386,004	\$0	\$0	\$676,321
\$1,111,798	\$0	\$0	\$1,111,798	\$0	\$0	\$1,386,004	\$0	\$0	\$676,321
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$409,523	\$300,734	\$0	\$409,523	\$300,734	\$0	\$204,761	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$138,889	\$69,444	\$0	\$138,889	\$69,444	\$0	\$69,444	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$0	\$548,412	\$370,178	\$0	\$274,206	\$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
\$2,660,645	\$1,548,847	\$1,958,370	\$2,259,104	\$1,147,306	\$1,556,829	\$1,857,563	\$471,559	\$676,321	\$676,321
(\$1,111,798)	\$0	\$0	(\$1,111,798)	\$0	\$0	(\$1,386,004)	\$0	\$0	(\$676,321)
\$0	\$409,523	\$300,734	\$0	\$409,523	\$300,734	\$0	\$204,761	\$0	\$0
\$1,548,847	\$1,958,370	\$2,259,104	\$1,147,306	\$1,556,829	\$1,857,563	\$471,559	\$676,321	\$676,321	\$0
\$3,320,419	\$3,320,419	\$3,320,419	\$4,980,628	\$4,980,628	\$4,980,628	\$6,640,838	\$6,640,838	\$6,640,838	\$8,301,047
\$6,383,155	\$6,931,567	\$7,301,745	\$7,850,156	\$8,398,568	\$8,768,746	\$9,042,952	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158	\$9,317,158
\$1,513,889	\$1,652,778	\$1,722,222	\$1,722,222	\$1,861,111	\$1,930,555	\$1,930,555	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
(\$1,548,847)	(\$1,958,370)	(\$2,259,104)	(\$1,147,306)	(\$1,556,829)	(\$1,857,563)	(\$471,559)	(\$676,321)	(\$676,321)	\$983,889

PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT

Project: GUD Pathway 2

Key

White spaces indicate data entry

REVENUE

	# Units	Price	Total
Sale of Housing Units	8	\$ 140,000	\$ 1,120,000
Sale of Housing Units	18	\$ 180,000	\$ 3,240,000
Sale of Housing Units	10	\$ 220,000	\$ 2,200,000
Sale of Housing Units	14	\$ 168,990	\$ 2,365,857
Sale of Housing Units	0	\$ -	\$ -
Sale of Housing Units	0	\$ -	\$ -
Sale of Housing Units	0	\$ -	\$ -
Total	50	\$ 178,517	\$ 8,925,857
<u>Less Selling Costs</u>	7%	<u>Percent</u>	\$ 624,810
TOTAL REVENUE			\$ 8,301,047

COSTS

Property Acquisition	\$ 150,000
Unit Construction	\$ 6,855,148
Other Construction	\$ 845,610
Infrastructure	\$ 750,000
Professional Fees	\$ 595,650
Finance Costs	\$ 109,750
Soft Costs	\$ 11,000
Developer Fee	\$ 983,889
TOTAL	\$ 10,301,047

TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 8,301,047
+ TOTAL GRANTS	\$ 2,000,000
- TOTAL COSTS	\$ (10,301,047)
= PROFIT (LOSS)	\$ (0)

PROJECTED PROFIT	0% Percent	\$ -
- ACTUAL PROFIT		\$ (0)
= DEVELOPERS SUBSIDY		\$ 0