



"Providing solutions & exceeding expectations through vision, integrity & excellence"

***SELF-CONTAINED APPRAISAL OF:***



**Raintree Apartments**

A 200-Unit Income-Restricted Rental Community  
Located at 601 Saunders Avenue  
Hinesville, Liberty County, Georgia 31313

***PREPARED FOR:***

Mr. Thompson Gooding  
Dewar Properties  
JT Development  
2409 Bemiss Road  
Valdosta, GA 31602

***PREPARED BY:***

Value Tech Realty Services, Inc.  
240 Crystal Grove Boulevard  
Lutz, Florida 33548

***VALUATION DATE:***

July 18, 2013

***DATE OF REPORT:***

February 12, 2014

***VALUE TECH REALTY SERVICES, INC.***

***FILE NUMBER: 2013-121***

***240 Crystal Grove Blvd.***

***Lutz, FL 33548***

***(813) 948-0545***

***[www.gotovalue.com](http://www.gotovalue.com)***



"Providing solutions & exceeding expectations through vision, integrity & excellence"

February 12, 2014

Mr. Thompson Gooding  
Dewar Properties, Inc.  
JT Development  
2409 Bemiss Road  
Valdosta, GA 31602

RE: Revised Appraisal of Raintree Apartments, a 200-unit income restricted rental community located at 601 Saunders Avenue, Hinesville, Georgia 31313.

Dear Mr. Gooding:

At your request, we prepared an appraisal of the property referenced above. This appraisal has been amended to incorporate review comments issued by HUD received January 16, 2014. In addition, information contained within the A/E Review & Cost Estimate Report dated November 13, 2013 prepared by Dominion Due Diligence Group has been incorporated into this revised appraisal.

Accompanying this letter is an Appraisal that contains detailed income and expense estimates. The income and expense information is provided for the subject operating as a restricted and as a market-rate property. Rental rate and expense conclusions are based on market parameters and historical operations.

This Appraisal is supportive and consistent with the attached forms: Form-HUD-92273, Estimates of Market Rents by Comparison, Form-HUD-92274 and Operating Expense Analysis Worksheet and the Form-HUD-92264.

Our analyses and forecasts resulted in the value conclusions which are based upon assumptions, limiting conditions, and definitions presented in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

**VALUE TECH REALTY SERVICES, INC.**

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kay Kauchick".

Kay Kauchick, MAI  
State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser 251355 (GA)

KK:ggw  
2013-121

## *Table of Contents*

Table of Contents .....	1
Certificate of Appraisal.....	2
Executive Summary .....	5
Definitions .....	7
Background Information.....	10
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions.....	13
Subject Site Description.....	15
Improvement Description .....	21
Ad Valorem Tax Analysis .....	27
Liberty County Area Analysis .....	29
Neighborhood Analysis .....	39
Highest and Best (Intended) Use .....	42
Marketing Time and Financing .....	44
Appraisal Process .....	45
Cost Approach.....	46
Land Valuation.....	47
Sales Comparison Approach - Retrospective As Is .....	54
Income Approach.....	61
Direct Capitalization .....	100
Final Value Estimate .....	102

### **ADDENDA**

SUBJECT INFORMATION .....	ADDENDUM A
COMPARABLES .....	ADDENDUM B
HUD FORMS .....	ADDENDUM C
QUALIFICATION/LICENSE .....	ADDENDUM D

## *Certificate of Appraisal*

- The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- The reported analyses, opinions and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions and is our personal, unbiased professional analyses, opinions and conclusions.
- We have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report, and we have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.
- Our compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value estimate, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event.
- Our analyses, opinions and conclusions were developed and this report prepared in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Foundation.
- The racial/ethnic composition of the neighborhood surrounding the property is no way affected the appraisal determination.
- This report has been prepared in compliance with the Office of Thrift Supervision of the Department of Treasury's Regulation 12 CFR Part 564, the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice and the Office of the Comptroller of Currency (OCC) Regulation Pas 12 CFR, 34.44, written appraisal guidelines.
- This Appraisal conforms to the Standards required by 12 U.S.C. Part 34.4 etc. issued pursuant to Title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA).
- Kay Kauchick, MAI, conducted a physical inspection of the subject, market and the comparables indicated. No one provided significant real property appraisal assistance to the person signing this certification.
- We certify that, to the best of our knowledge and beliefs, the reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed and this report prepared in conformity with the requirements of the Code of Professional Ethics and the Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.
- Kay Kauchick, MAI received her HUD MAP training in October 2000.
- I (we) have performed a prior service concerning the subject property within the 3 year period immediately preceding acceptance of this appraisal assignment.

This Appraisal is not based on a requested minimum valuation, a specific valuation, or the approval of a loan.

As a result of our investigation into those matters affecting market value, and by virtue of our experience and training, we estimated that the hypothetical retrospective “As-Is Market” value of the fee simple interest in the subject assuming market rents effective July 18, 2013 was:

**“HYPOTHETICAL RETROSPECTIVE AS-IS” MARKET VALUE – WITH MARKET RENTS  
(Hypothetical Assumption)  
FIVE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS  
(\$5,500,000)**

As a result of our investigation into those matters affecting revenue and expense projections, and by virtue of our experience and training, we estimated that the **Net Operating Income Under the “As-Renovated” Scenario** of the fee simple interest in the subject effective July 18, 2013 was:

<b>NET OPERATING INCOME SUMMARY</b>	
	As Renovated
Potential Rental Income	\$1,773,312
Other Income	\$11,160
Potential Gross Income	\$1,784,472
Less: Vacancy and Collection	(\$89,224)
Effective Gross Income	\$1,695,248
Less: Total Expenses	(\$976,606)
Net Operating Income	\$718,643

Respectfully submitted,

**VALUE TECH REALTY SERVICES, INC.**



Kay C. Kauchick, MAI  
President  
State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser 251355 (GA)

**APPRAISER CERTIFICATION FOR HUD**

I understand that my Appraisal will be used by Walker & Dunlop to document to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and that the MAP Lender's application for FHA multifamily mortgage insurance was prepared and reviewed in accordance with HUD requirements. I certify that my review was in accordance with the HUD requirements applicable on the date of my review and that I have no financial interest or family relationship with the officers, directors, stockholders, or partners of the Borrower, the general contractor, any subcontractors, the buyer or seller of the proposed property, or engage in any business that might present a conflict of interest.

I am employed under contract for this specific assignment and I have no other side arrangements, agreements, or financial considerations with MAP Lender or others in connection with this transaction.



---

Signature

**Warning:** Title 18 U.S.C. 1001 provides in part that whoever knowingly and willfully makes or uses a document containing any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, in any manner in the jurisdiction of any department of agency of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

## ***Executive Summary***

Property Name:	Raintree Apartments
Property Identification -	
Street Number	601
Street Name	Saunders Avenue
Municipality:	Hinesville
County:	Liberty
State:	Georgia
Zip:	31313
Congressional District	G1
Census Tract -	
State Code:	13
MSA Code:	25980
County Code:	179
Tract/BNA Code:	101.00
Purpose of the Appraisal:	To estimate the hypothetical retrospective "as is" market value of the fee simple estate and the revenues and expenses for the subject "as if renovated" operating under the HAP contract.
Pertinent Dates -	
Valuation Date:	July 18, 2013
Report Date:	February 12, 2014
Certification -	
Certified Appraiser:	Kay Kauchick, MAI
Certification Number:	251355 (GA)
Certification Type:	State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
Site Summary -	
Site Size (Acres):	24.68
Site Size (SF):	1,075,061
Zoning	R-A-1: Multi-Family Dwelling
Zoning Compliance:	Legally Conforming Use
Utilities:	All Available
Flood Hazard Zone -	
Zone:	X
Panel Number:	13179C0226D
Panel Date:	September 26, 2008
Flood Insurance Required:	No

**Improvement Summary -**

Property Type:	Garden Style, Section 8
Year of Construction:	1984
Construction Type:	Class D, Wood Frame
Rentable SF:	189,640
Number of Stories:	2
Number of Units:	200
Parking Spaces	309

**Operation Summary -**

Units Occupied at inspection	99%
Projected Occupancy	93% Retrospective As Is-95.0%-As If Renovated

**Unit Mix:**

<b>Raintree Apartments</b>				
<b>SUBJECT UNIT SIZE ANALYSIS</b>				
Apartment Unit Type	Units	Percent	Sq. Ft.	Living Area
1x1	32	16.0%	669	21,392
2x1	112	56.0%	944	105,672
3x1	48	24.0%	1,097	52,632
4x1.5	8	4.0%	1,243	9,944
Total/Weight Average	200	100.0%	948	189,640

**Conclusion:**

**As-Is Value-Market Rent:**

<b>VALUE ESTIMATE –RETROSPECTIVE AS-IS MARKET RENT</b>	
Approach to Value: Income Approach	"Retrospective As-Is" \$5,500,000

**NOI-As If Renovated-Market Rent:**

<b>NOI ESTIMATED AS IF RENOVATED</b>	
NOI-As If Renovated-Market	\$718,643

**Conditions:**

This Appraisal is subject to the General Assumptions, General Limiting Conditions, Special Conditions, and Certificate of Appraisal contained within this report. We reserve the right to modify the conclusions contained herein in the event of changes in the proposed renovation plans.

## ***Definitions***

The definitions included in this section have been extracted, solely or in combination, from definitions and descriptions printed in:

The Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP);

*The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal*, Appraisal Institute, Chicago, Illinois, (*Dictionary*);

*The Appraisal of Real Estate*, Appraisal Institute, Chicago, Illinois; and/or

*Marshall Valuation Service*, Marshall & Swift, L. P., Los Angeles, California, (*MVS*).

### **Accrued Depreciation**

The difference between the reproduction or replacement cost of the improvements on the effective date of the appraisal and the market value of the improvements on the same date. (*Dictionary*)

### **Appraisal**

The act or process of developing an opinion of value. (*USPAP*)

### **Business Value**

A value enhancement that results from items of intangible personal property such as marketing and management skill, an assembled work force, working capital, trade names, franchises, patents, trademarks, contracts, leases, and operating agreements (*Dictionary*).

### **Deferred Maintenance**

Curable, physical deterioration that should be corrected immediately, although work has not commenced; denotes the need for immediate expenditures, but does not necessarily suggest inadequate maintenance in the past. (*Dictionary*)

### **Direct Capitalization**

A method used to convert an estimate of a single year's income expectancy into an indication of value in one direct step, either by dividing the income estimate by an appropriate rate or by multiplying the income estimate by an appropriate factor.

### **Effective Date of the Appraisal**

The date at which the value opinion is an appraisal applies, which may or may not be the date of inspection; the date of the market conditions that provide the context for the value opinion. Current appraisals occur when the effective date of the appraisal is contemporaneous with the date of the report. Prospective value opinions (effective date of the appraisal subsequent to the date of the report) are intended to reflect the current expectations and perceptions along with available factual data. Retrospective value opinions are likely to apply as of a specific historic date; the opinions are intended to reflect the expectations and perceptions of market participants at the specified date, along with available factual data. Data subsequent to the effective date may be considered in estimating a retrospective value as a confirmation of trends. (*Dictionary and USPAP*)

**Entrepreneurial Profit**

Entrepreneurial profit is a “market-derived figure that represents the amount an entrepreneur **expects** to receive for his or her contribution to a project”; may be measured by the difference between the total cost of a property (cost of development) and its market value (property value after completion), which represents the entrepreneur's compensation for the risk and expertise associated with development. The term “entrepreneurial incentive” has the same definition as profit, but the perspective of the use of the word “incentive” is forward-looking (expected reward), whereas the use of the word “profit” indicates a retrospective perspective of a quantifiable amount earned. Unless otherwise noted, as used in this report, the terms are synonymous. (*Definition*)

**Exposure Time**

Exposure time is the estimated length of time the property interest being appraised would have been offered on the market prior to the hypothetical consummation of a sale at market value on the effective date of the appraisal. Exposure time differs from the marketing period in that exposure time is assumed to precede the effective date of the appraisal. (*USPAP and Dictionary*)

**Fee Simple Estate**

Absolute ownership unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the limitations imposed by the governmental powers of taxation, eminent domain, police power, and escheat. (*Dictionary*)

**Family household (Family)**

A family includes a householder and one or more people living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. All people in a household who are related to the householder are regarded as members of his or her family. A family household may contain people not related to the householder, but those people are not included as part of the householder's family in census tabulations. Thus, the number of family households is equal to the number of families, but family households may include more members than do families. A household can contain only one family for purposes of census tabulations. Not all households contain families since a household may comprise a group of unrelated people or one person living alone.

Local items that are subject to loss from hazards. It is that portion of an asset or asset group that is acknowledged or recognized under the provisions of an applicable loss insurance policy. *Marshall & Swift* defines insurable value as the “replacement or reproduction cost less deterioration and non-insurable items.” (*MVS and Dictionary*)

**Investment Value**

The specific value of an investment to a particular investor or class of investors based on individual investment requirements; distinguished from market value, which is impersonal and detached. (*Dictionary*)

**Leased Fee Estate**

An ownership interest held by a landlord with the rights of use and occupancy conveyed by lease to others. The rights of the lessor (the leased fee owner) and the leased fee are specified by contract terms contained within the lease. (*Dictionary*)

**Leasehold Estate**

The interest held by the lessee (the tenant or renter) through a lease conveying the rights of use and occupancy for a stated term under certain conditions. (*Dictionary*)

**Market Value**

The most probable price which a property should bring in a competitive and open market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeably, and assuming the price is not affected by undue stimulus. Implicit in this definition are the consummation of a sale as of a specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions whereby:

- buyer and seller are typically motivated;
- both parties are well informed or well advised, and acting in what they consider their best interests;
- a reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market;
- payment is made in terms of cash in United States dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and
- the price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale. (*USPAP, according to the Federal Register, CFR 34.43(F)*)

**Marketing Period**

A reasonable marketing period is the period of time it might take to sell a property interest in real estate at or near the concluded market value during the period immediately following the effective date of the appraisal. A marketing period is a function of price, time, use, and anticipated market conditions.

**Replacement Cost**

The estimated cost to construct, at current prices as of the effective date of the Appraisal, a building with utility equivalent to the building being appraised, using modern materials and current standards, design and layout. (*Dictionary and USPAP*)

**Reproduction Cost**

The estimated cost to construct, at current prices as of the effective date of the Appraisal, an exact duplicate or replica of the building being appraised, using the same materials, construction standards, design, layout, and quality of workmanship and embodying all the deficiencies, superadequacies, and obsolescence of the subject building. (*Dictionary*)

**Use Value**

The value a specific property has for a specific use. (*Dictionary*)

## ***Background Information***

### **Identification of the Subject**

The subject is an existing 200-unit apartment building located at 601 Saunders Avenue. The property is located within the City of Hinesville, Liberty County, Georgia. The complex primarily consists of 25 two-story apartment buildings, a main office, community room, coin-operated laundry facility, and maintenance building located on a 24.68-acre site. A legal description for the subject is presented in the Addendum. The project is currently operating under the restrictions of a HAP contract.

### **Intended Use of the Appraisal**

The purpose of the appraisal is to determine the hypothetical retrospective "As-Is" market value for the subject property and to project net operating income assuming the HAP contract remain in place and the subject is substantially renovated.

### **Intended User of the Appraisal**

This Appraisal is to be used by Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA), Dewar Properties, Inc., JT Development, Inc., JT Hinesville, LP, Georgia Fund 2013 VI LLC, R4 Capital LLC and R4 HGA Acquisition LLC in underwriting a mortgage loan to be secured by the subject.

### **Pertinent Dates**

The Appraisal is dated on the last date market information was secured, July 18, 2013. Preparation of the written report was completed on February 12, 2014.

### **Scope of Work, Market Research and Appraisal Procedures**

Standards Rule 2-2(a;viii) of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice requires that all appraisals "describe the information analyzed, the appraisal techniques employed, and the reasoning that supports the analyses, opinions, and conclusions. The scope of work includes the following steps:

- Identification of Subject;
- Identification of Property Rights to be Valued;
- Define Use of Appraisal
- Define User of Appraisal
- Definition of Value;
- Date of Value;
- 3-Year History of arm's length transactions involving the subject, if any;
- Special Assumptions and Limiting Conditions;
- Data Selection and Collection-General and Specific;
- Examination of Economic Influences;
- Housing Market Area Analysis;
- Highest and Best Use Analysis;
- Approaches to Value as appropriate (Cost, Sales Comparison and/or Income);
- Reconciliation;
- Self-Contained Report.

Kay Kauchick, MAI conducted a physical inspection of the subject's interior and exterior and conducted interviews with the market-rent and restricted-rent comparables. An exterior inspection was completed at

all of the rent comparables with a review of a model unit at properties where authorization to view a unit was granted. The occupancy and rental rates of market properties were reviewed and a rent analysis conducted on the HUD 92273 forms. The restricted rents were also reviewed to determine the strength of the affordable housing market. Revenues and expenses were projected based on two scenarios; the hypothetical scenario that the subject operated as a market-rent property and a restricted-rent scenario based on the HAP rents in place. Overall capitalization rates were secured from the market and applied to the market-rent scenario to estimate a value. Revenues and expenses were projected for the restricted-rent scenario. The results of the research and analyses are presented in this appraisal report.

### **Special Instructions**

HUD MAP has special guidance and requirements for valuation and loan processing. These are included in the Addenda under Subject Information:

### **Inspection**

Kay Kauchick, MAI conducted a detailed physical inspection of the comparables and market area. The last day of inspection was on July 18, 2013.

### **Data Collection**

Three types of data are normally gathered while completing an appraisal: general, specific, and competitive supply and demand.

*General Data*—General data concerns the social, economic, governmental, and environmental forces that impact property values. General data presented in this market study/appraisal is found in the Area Description and Analysis and the Neighborhood Description and Analysis Sections. We gathered general data from a variety of sources and publications as noted in the analyses. General data concerning the neighborhood is also based upon observations made during our inspection of the neighborhood.

*Specific Data*—Data relating to the property being analyzed and/or appraised, and to comparable properties, is referred to as specific data. Documents we relied upon for specific data pertaining to the subject are listed in the General Assumptions. Additional data pertaining to the subject was gathered from subject contacts, local city and county offices and chambers of commerce, various State offices, and other resources maintained in our library.

Specific comparable data was gathered from market participants. The extent of the comparable market data collection process varies for each type of comparable data. Refer to discussions preceding the presentation of data in the approaches to value for descriptions of the data sources consulted and the search criteria.

*Competitive Supply and Demand Data*—An analysis of the operating performance levels of apartment communities within the primary market was conducted by Value Tech Realty Services, Inc. Projected operating results have been prepared by Value Tech Realty Services, Inc. as presented within this document.

### **Compliance**

We developed this report in compliance with the requirements of the Code of Ethics and the Standards of Professional Practice of the Appraisal Institute, the *Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice* promulgated by the Appraisal Foundation. Further, the appraisal was prepared in conformance with the

requirements of Housing and Urban Development under the 221 (d)(4) substantial rehab and project net operating income as substantially rehabilitated program.

**Competency**

Kay Kauchick, MAI has analyzed multifamily assignments that include HUD subsidies, market-rate rents, LIHTC, Bond Financing, as well as projects that contain both market and income-restricted rents.

**Ownership and History of the Subject**

According to public records, the site size is 24.68 acres or 1,075,061 square feet. The property is owned by Raintree Associate LTD. Management services are provided by Dewar Properties, Inc. Dewar Properties also provides similar services to several other properties across the Eastern United States, mostly in Georgia. The subject is under contract for purchase between Northgate Associates, LTD and JT Hinesville, LP dated January 25, 2013. The purchase price is \$3,725,070. This appears to be generally near market.

Substantial renovations are planned. The appearance of the unit interiors will be upgraded along with various changes to the property's common areas and mechanical features of the building.

There is currently a land use restriction in place.

Prior to this sale/contract no other transactions have occurred involving the subject property within the past three years.

## ***Assumptions and Limiting Conditions***

The use of this report is subject to the following assumptions and limiting conditions:

### ***General Assumptions***

- No responsibility is assumed for the legal description or for matters including legal or title considerations. Title to the property is assumed to be good and marketable unless otherwise stated.
- The property was analyzed “free and clear” of any and all liens or encumbrances unless otherwise stated.
- Responsible ownership and competent property management are assumed.
- The information furnished by others is believed to be reliable. However, no warranty is given for its accuracy.
- All engineering is assumed to be correct. The plot plans and illustrative material in this report are included only to assist the reader in visualizing the property.
- It is assumed that there are no hidden or unapparent conditions of the property, subsoil, or structures that render it more or less valuable. No responsibility is assumed for such conditions or for arranging for engineering studies that may be required to discover them.
- It is assumed that there is full compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental regulations and laws unless noncompliance is stated, defined, and considered in this report.
- It is assumed that all applicable zoning and land use regulations and restrictions have been complied with unless a non-conformity has been stated, defined, and considered in this report.
- It is assumed that all required licenses, certificates of occupancy, consents or other legislative or administrative authority from any local, state, or national government or private entity or organization have been or can be obtained or renewed for any use on which the market support and/or value estimate contained in this report is based.
- It is assumed that the utilization of the land and improvements is within the boundaries or property lines of the property described and that there is no encroachment or trespass unless noted in this report.
- The appraiser has not made an environmental inspection of the subject and is not qualified to detect the existence of hazardous materials. The appraiser assumes no responsibility for any existing conditions or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them. The client is urged to retain an expert in this field, if so desired.
- The presence of hazardous materials such as asbestos, urea-formaldehyde foam insulation, or other potentially hazardous materials may affect the value and/ or marketability of the property. The appraiser assumes no responsibility for any existing conditions or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them. The client is urged to retain an expert in this field, if so desired.

- The Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective January 26, 1992. Noncompliance with the ADA could cause a loss in value. Unless otherwise stated in this report, Value Tech Realty Services, Inc. has not been provided with a compliance survey; therefore, our value estimate is predicated upon the assumption that the subject is not negatively or positively impacted by issues relating to Fair Housing and ADA.

### ***General Limiting Conditions***

- Possession of this report, or a copy thereof, does not carry with it the right of publication.
- The appraiser herein by reason of this report is not required to give further consultation, testimony, or be in attendance in court with reference to the property in question unless arrangements have been previously made.
- Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report (especially any conclusions as to market support and/or value estimates, the identity of the appraiser or that with which the appraiser is connected) shall be disseminated to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or other media without the prior written consent and approval of the appraiser.

### ***Specific Assumptions and Limiting Conditions***

This report has also been made subject to the following specific assumptions and limiting conditions:

- We assume that the project will be renovated and maintained in a quality condition.
- We assume that the subject will be aggressively marketed and professionally managed.
- We provided a value that adheres to the guidelines and limitations outlined under the HUD MAP program and have incorporated the review comments received January 2014.


### ***Hypothetical Condition & Extraordinary Assumptions***

Hypothetical conditions are contrary to known facts about the physical, legal, or economic characteristics of the subject property; or about conditions external to the property such as market conditions or trends; or about the integrity of data used in an analysis.


Extraordinary Assumptions presume as fact otherwise uncertain information about physical, legal, or economic characteristics of the subject property; or about conditions external to the property, such as market conditions or trends; or about the integrity of data used in an analysis.

- For the “retrospective as is” scenario, the hypothetical condition is based on the property operating at market and not operating under a restriction program.
- For the “as renovated” net operating income projection, the subject is valued under the HAP contract. The assumption is made that the physical plant is totally rehabilitated and stabilized.

### Subject Site Description



MAP VIEW



AERIAL VIEW

The first portion of this section provides information regarding the site including location, access, topography, zoning, utilities, flood plain, hazardous materials, and related. The latter portion of this section provides detailed information on the improvements.

The subject is located within a “workforce” neighborhood. The households are on the low to moderate spectrum of income levels. The households tend to be residing within the area due to affordability and proximity to jobs. The subject is located near residential and commercial services and provides convenient access to employment opportunities.

SITE DESCRIPTION					
<b>Location</b>	601 Saunders Avenue, Hinesville, Georgia 31313				
<b>Frontage</b>	Weymouth Court	<b>Shape</b>	Irregular		
<b>Depth</b>	Varies	<b>Excess Land</b>	None		
<b>Site Size (Acres)</b>	24.68	<b>Topography</b>	Generally Level		
<b>Usable Area (Acres)</b>	24.68	<b>Zoning Code</b>	R-A-1: Multi-Family Dwelling		
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Access</b>		X			
<b>Drainage</b>		X			
<b>Function/Utility</b>		X			
<b>Landscaping</b>		X			
<b>Shape</b>		X			
<b>Street Frontage</b>			X		
<b>Traffic Pattern</b>		X			
<b>Traffic Volume</b>			X		
<b>Utilities</b>		X			
<b>Comment</b>	The subject property is located in an area primarily developed with commercial and residential uses.				
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Alley</b>		X	<b>Corner Lot</b>		X
<b>Curbs and Gutters</b>	X		<b>Underground Utilities</b>	X	
<b>Electric</b>	X		<b>Assume Adequate Soils</b>	X	
<b>Gas</b>	X		<b>Environmental Issues</b>		X
<b>Lighting</b>	X		<b>Development Limitations</b>		X
<b>Public Sewer</b>	X		<b>Easements/Restrictions</b>	X	
<b>Sidewalks</b>	X		<b>Flood Plain Information</b>		
<b>Storm/Drainage</b>	X		<b>Map No.</b>	13179C0227D	
<b>Paved, Public Streets</b>	X		<b>Zone Code:</b>	X	
<b>Public Water</b>	X		<b>Date:</b>	September 26, 2008	
<b>Comments:</b> None					

**Location and Access**

The subject property is located on the north side of the west end of Saunders Avenue. Saunders Avenue is a residential road that traverses west/east to and from the subject area and acts as the most common access route to the subject. Saunders Avenue intersects with General Screven Way at the easternmost end of the street. The subject is located 1.2 miles north of Highway 84.

The subject contains 309 parking spaces. Of those spaces, eleven are designated for handicap use. Visitors tend to park near unit building parking spaces.


The subject is easily accessible via an entrance on Saunders Avenue. A photograph of the entrance is shown on the following page:



MAIN ENTRANCE AND SIGNAGE

**Site Plan/General Layout**

A site plan of the subject property is shown below:



**Area and Dimensions**

According to public records, the total site area is 24.68 acres. All land is usable. The site is irregular in shape and is sufficient in size to accommodate a multifamily development.

**Soil and Subsoil**


During our inspection, no soil or subsoil problems were apparent. This opinion is based solely on a visual inspection of the surface of the property. We assume that the hidden or unapparent conditions beyond the area of our expertise (see Item 6 of General Assumptions).

**Topography & Drainage**

The subject site is near road grade. Overall, the site is level and is considered typical of other recently developed residential complexes in the area.

**Flood Hazard Statement**

According to the survey, the subject site lies within Flood Zone X. This area is described as being within the 100-year flood plain.



<b>FEMA FLOOD ZONE INFORMATION</b>	
Flood Hazard Zone:	
Zone	X
Panel Number	13179C0226D
Panel Date	September 26, 2008
Flood Insurance Required	No

**Utilities and Services**

<b>UTILITIES AND RELATED SERVICES INFORMATION</b>	
Water:	City of Hinesville
Sewer:	City of Hinesville
Electricity:	Georgia Power
Gas:	SCANA Natural Gas
Telephone:	Coastal Communications
Police:	City of Hinesville
Fire:	City of Hinesville

According to the City of Hinesville, water and sewer is available to service the subject site.

**Zoning**

The subject site is zoned R-A-1 (Multi-family Residential). The zoning restrictions are as follows:

<b>ZONING INFORMATION</b>	
Zoning:	R-A-1: Multi-Family Dwelling
Maximum Lot Coverage	0.35
Maximum Height (Ft.)	35'
Front Setback	20'
Side Setback	10'
Rear Setback	15'
Corner Setback	25'
Conformity	Legal, conforming use
Source: City of Hinesville Zoning and Planning Department	

The subject has zoning referred to as R-A-1 (Multi-Family Residential). The subject is a conforming and legally permissible use under the current zoning designation.

**Land Uses**

The subject is located along a north/south road, West General Screven Way. The land uses within the immediate site area are as follows:

<b>LAND USES IN IMMEDIATE AREA</b>	
Location	Land use
Northwest	Wooded land/Fort Stewart
Northeast	Fort Stewart railroad tracks/wooded land/West General Screven Way
Southwest	Single-family detached homes/commercial business
Southeast	Wooded land/Fort Stewart

**Easements**

We have assumed no easements will negatively affect the marketability or use of the subject.

**Noise Hazard**

A railroad track is located on the eastern side of the market. According the property's management, a train would pass two times per day only when troops were stationed on base for deployment purposes. This has the effect of potentially increasing the average noise level only if deployment is required. The railroad has not adversely impacted the marketability of the subject.

**Hazardous or Toxic Materials**

During our visual inspection of the subject, we did not observe any hazardous substances. We are not experts, however, in determining the presence of hazardous substances, defined as all hazardous or toxic wastes, pollutants, or contaminants (including asbestos, PCB's, or raw materials) either used in construction or stored on the property. The appraiser has not been provided with certification from the client or current property owner that no hazardous substances are present, which would adversely affect the rent potential of the subject property. We are not expert in determining the presence of hazardous substances, and the value estimated included in this report reflects the assumption that the subject property is not so affected.

**Conclusion/Comments**

The site is of sufficient size and shape to support development of a residential multifamily complex. The site is serviced by all the public utilities necessary for development of such a complex, which is allowed under its approved zoning and land uses. No adverse conditions were noted at the time of inspection. Entrance to and from the subject property is easily accessible, and has good visibility from the major roads. The subject is in a neighborhood that supports multi-family residential properties. The subject site's regional location, access, topography, and availability of utilities, are considered suitable for development of a property such as the subject.

## ***Improvement Description***

### **Overview**

The subject consists of 25, two-story apartment buildings containing 200 residential units. The site also contains a detached, single-story building consisting of the maintenance room, office, and community room.

The northern and western boundaries of Raintree Apartments borders Ft. Stewart, a 280,000-acre military base and home of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Infantry Division. The subject has southerly access to the north side of Saunders Avenue, which connects to General Screven Way. The main gate of Ft. Stewart is located one block north of Saunders Avenue on General Screven Way. Highway 84 and Highway 196 are located about 1.2 miles south of Saunders Avenue via General Screven Way.



SUBJECT SIGNAGE



SUBJECT EXTERIOR

The subject's wood-frame and stucco buildings were constructed on poured-in-place concrete slabs. The roof of the building is pitched and shingled.

An administrative office with a tiled reception area and lobby is located near the main entrance of the subject. The lobby branches off into public bathrooms, administrative offices and two community rooms. A maintenance building is also located north of the main office building.



MAIN OFFICE



MAINTENANCE BUILDING

The subject contains 309 parking spaces. Of those spaces, eleven are designated for handicap use.

**Resident Units**

The subject includes one, two, three, and four bedroom units. The unit mix is appropriate for the current use of the complex. The rental unit mix is depicted on the following table:

<b>Raintree Apartments</b>				
<b>SUBJECT UNIT SIZE ANALYSIS</b>				
Apartment Unit Type	Units	Percent	Sq. Ft.	Living Area
1x1	32	16.0%	669	21,392
2x1	112	56.0%	944	105,672
3x1	48	24.0%	1,097	52,632
4x1.5	8	4.0%	1,243	9,944
Total/Weight Average	200	100.0%	948	189,640

All units contain a kitchen, dining area and living room nearest the door. A hallway connects the living room to the bedrooms and bathrooms. In all units, there is a separate bathroom. In three and four bedroom units, there is an additional bathroom in the master bedroom.



ONE-BEDROOM HALLWAY



FOUR-BEDROOM HALLWAY

Flooring is provided by vinyl tiles in all areas. All units also provide central heat and air, a smoke detector, and vertical slide windows.



FOUR-BEDROOM UNIT KITCHEN



ONE-BEDROOM UNIT KITCHEN

Each kitchen contains a four-burner electric range/oven unit and refrigerator. A single-basin stainless steel sink is included in one-bedroom units with double-compartment stainless steel sinks in all other apartments.



TYPICAL TOILET AND VANITY



TYPICAL TUB AND SHOWER

Full bathrooms contain a toilet, sink, vanity, tub, and shower.

**Other Community Features**

As introduced earlier, residents of the subject have use of a community building. The building is located in the main office building in the center of the complex. Pictures of the community room are shown on the following page:



COMMUNITY ROOM



COMMUNITY ROOM

### **General Layout and Efficiency**

The design of the buildings and the individual floor plans are considered functional and are comparable with other properties of the same age. The layout of the site is open, with landscaped shrubs and trees located throughout the grounds.

### **Construction Quality**

Construction Quality of the building and units appears to be good. We assume no responsibility for hidden or unapparent conditions beyond our expertise as appraisers. We are not proficient in construction techniques, and it is assumed that the improvements are structurally adequate and in conformance with applicable building codes.

### **Age and Condition**

The subject was constructed in 1984. Despite its age, the complex is still fully functioning and can be generically described as being in fair to poor condition. There is an amount of wear and tear that requires correction.

### **Renovation Program**

Renovation plans will enhance the physical product. All rents include the cost of water/sewer and trash removal. Tenants will bear the cost of all other utilities. As part of the rehabilitation, the heat source for all units will be converted from gas to electric.

The following unit features are planned:

- Kitchens with Energy Star appliances including a refrigerator (including an icemaker), stove/oven, dishwasher, and range hood
- Central heat and air-conditioning
- Wall-to-wall carpeting in living room and bedrooms and vinyl floors in kitchens and bathrooms
- Wiring for high-speed internet access and cable television
- Washer/dryer connections

The following community amenities are planned:

- Community room
- Playground (tot-lot)
- Basketball court and recreation field (5,000 SF)
- Gazebo
- Central laundry area
- Management office

**Remaining Economic Life**

According to the *Marshall Valuation Service*, the average life expectancy for a Class D (wood frame) multiple residence building is 55 to 60 years.

**Construction Details and Conditions**

<b>IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY</b>	
<b>Construction Type:</b>	Class D
<b>Number of Units</b>	200
<b>Residential Buildings</b>	25
<b>Other Buildings</b>	2
<b>Number of Stories:</b>	2
<b>Year Built:</b>	1984
<b>Construction Quality:</b>	Average
<b>Construction Condition:</b>	Fair
<b>Deferred Maintenance:</b>	Yes
<b>Improvement Description:</b>	
<b>Ceiling:</b>	Painted / Textured
<b>Electrical:</b>	Meets Code
<b>Elevators:</b>	N/A
<b>Exterior Walls:</b>	Wood / Stucco / Brick
<b>Floor System</b>	Slab on grade
<b>Floor Cover:</b>	Vinyl
<b>Floor-to-Ceiling Height:</b>	9'
<b>Foundation:</b>	Pured-in-place concrete
<b>Frame:</b>	Gable & Hip
<b>Interior Partitions:</b>	Dry wall
<b>HVAC:</b>	Central/Electric
<b>Plumbing:</b>	Meets Code
<b>Roof Cover:</b>	Asphalt Shingle
<b>Sprinklers:</b>	No
<b>Security:</b>	No
<b>Windows:</b>	Aluminum / Wood Frame
<b>Other Project Descriptions:</b>	
<b>Landscaping:</b>	Assumes Adequate once renovated
<b>External Lighting</b>	Adequate
<b>Clubhouse</b>	Community Rooms
<b>Restrooms:</b>	Individual Units & Main office
<b>Parking Summary:</b>	
<b>Parking:</b>	Surface
<b>Garages</b>	None
<b>Adequate</b>	Yes
<b>Conforms to Zoning</b>	Yes
<b>Number of Spaces</b>	309
<b>Spaces/Unit</b>	1.5

**Conclusions/Comments**

The subject' site plan appears to be good in terms of the quality and design of the buildings and units. The units feature functional floor plans. The overall condition of the physical plant is fair to poor. The property provides housing to the affordable income resident. Some of the physical components have reached the end of their useful life. Upgrades to apartment communities will typically occur every 10 to 15 years. The subject will require this in the near term. Without this community, there would be an under-supply of affordable apartments servicing the low income household in the market.

## Ad Valorem Tax Analysis

In Georgia, property is required to be assessed at 40% of the fair market value and is levied to all private real property. The property appraiser must report the just value of all real property in the county as of January 1. Factors that are considered in determining just value are present cash value, use, location, quantity or size, cost, replacement value of improvements, condition, income from property and net proceeds if the property is sold. The amount of tax that is due is calculated by multiplying the assessed value by 40% and dividing by 1,000 then multiplying the taxable value by the tax rate (millage) levied by the taxing authority within that county or city. The current millage rate for the City of Hinesville is .0013.

The terms land, real estate, realty and real property may be used interchangeably. Real property includes all other permanent improvements on the land and is broadly classified based on land use.

Property tax returns must be filed with the Liberty County Board of Tax Assessors between January 1 and April 1 of each year. The taxpayer may elect not to file a property tax return if there have been no changes that would affect the value of their property from the previous year. Failure to file a new return when there have been improvements made to the property will subject the taxpayer to a 10% penalty on the value of the property not returned plus interest and possibly penalties from the date the tax would have been due.

Shown below are the tax comparables for the “As-Renovated” tax analysis:

<b>TAX COMPARABLE ANALYSIS</b>				
<b>Raintree Apartments</b>				
	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comparable 1</b>	<b>Comparable 2</b>	<b>Comparable 3</b>
<b>Property</b>	Raintree Apartments	Mission Ridge	The Columns at Independence	Colonial Village at Huntington
City	Hinesville	Hinesville	Hinesville	Savannah
Map ID	043D 001	045B 107	P125027 003	2-0493 -01-006
Project Type	Income Restricted (Section 8)	Market Rate	Market Rate	Market Rate
Year Built	1984	1983	2010	1985
# Units	200	54	222	147
<b>Current Assessment</b>				
Tax Year	2012	2012	2012	2012
Land Value	\$740,400	\$183,600	\$602,500	
Improvement Value	\$4,905,448	\$1,226,556	\$13,455,329	\$7,800,900
Total Value	\$5,645,848	\$1,410,156	\$14,057,829	\$7,800,900
Total Assessment	\$2,258,339	\$564,061	\$5,623,132	\$3,120,360
Per Unit	\$11,292	\$10,446	\$25,329	\$21,227
Total Taxes	\$97,402	\$24,328	\$242,526	\$83,623
Per Unit	\$487	\$451	\$1,092	\$569

Shown below are the tax comparables for the “Retrospective As-Is-Market” tax analysis:

<b>TAX COMPARABLE ANALYSIS-RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>			
<b>Raintree Apartments</b>			
	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comparable 1</b>	<b>Comparable 2</b>
<b>Property</b>	Raintree Apartments	Northgate Apartments	Baytree Apartments
City	Hinesville	Hinesville	Hinesville
Map ID	043D 001	045B 106	056B 024
Project Type	Income Restricted (Section 8)	Income Restricted (Section 8)	Income Restricted (Section 8)
Year Built	1984	1982	1983
# Units	200	80	60
<b>Current Assessment</b>			
Tax Year	2012	2012	2012
Land Value	\$740,400	\$240,000	\$153,900
Improvement Value	\$4,905,448	\$1,965,658	\$1,803,713
Total Value	\$5,645,848	\$2,205,658	\$1,957,613
Total Assessment	\$2,258,339	\$882,263	\$783,045
Per Unit	\$11,292	\$11,028	\$13,051
Total Taxes	\$97,402	\$38,052	\$33,773
Per Unit	\$487	\$476	\$563

The assessment for the subject currently in place generally aligns with Mission Ridge; a property that has been renovated. This suggests the “retrospective as is” assessment may be overstated.

The renovations anticipated will provide a property that is physically able to continue to operate into the future. The renovations will not materially change the property’s functionality. Reliance was placed on the actual assessment in place for the renovated scenario. Reliance was also placed on the current taxes incurred for the “retrospective as is” valuation.

The methodology for the real estate tax estimate for the subject property at both the ‘Retrospective As-Is’ and ‘As-Renovated’ are provided in the tables below:

<b>REAL ESTATE TAX ESTIMATE</b>	
	Raintree Apartments
Number of Units	200
Taxes per Unit	\$490
Total	\$98,000

## Liberty County Area Analysis



### Introduction

Liberty County is located on the eastern border of Georgia. Liberty County is bordered by five counties. To the south is McIntosh County; southwest is Long County, to the northwest lies Evans County and Tattnall County. And to the northeast is Bryan County. Liberty County consists of 602.5 square miles and 519 of those square miles are land.

Liberty County consists of the following municipalities: Allenhurst, Flemington, Fort Stewart, Gumbranch, Hinesville (county seat), Midway, Sunbury, Riceboro and Walthourville.

The land that would form Liberty County was ceded to the English by the Creeks in the Treaty of Savannah on May 21, 1733, confirmed and expanded by agreements of 1735 and 1736. On February 5, 1777, Georgia adopted the state's first constitution and transformed the existing colonial parishes into seven counties. Liberty County was sixth on the list and therefore considered Georgia's sixth county. The county was named to recognize the American colonies' declaration of independence from British rule.

Liberty County neighbors the Savannah, Georgia metropolitan survey area. Savannah is Georgia's fourth largest city and the third largest metropolitan area. Savannah is a major industrial center and an important Atlantic seaport.

**Population and Demographics**

The following provides population and household growth information for Liberty County from 2010 to 2012:

<b>POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS: LIBERTY COUNTY</b>				
	2010	2012	Change	% Change
Total Population	63,453	65,993	2,540	4.0%
Total Households	22,155	22,776	621	2.8%
Source: Demographic and Income Profile, ESRI Site Analysis				

As indicated previously, the total population and total households increased from 2010 to 2012 by 4.0% and 2.8%, respectively. The information in this section was obtained through the US Census Bureau and ESRI. The population distribution by age is shown in the table below:

<b>2012 POPULATION BY AGE LIBERTY COUNTY</b>		
Age	Total	% of Total
0-19	21,883	33.2%
20-24	7,041	10.7%
25-44	18,924	28.7%
45-54	7,998	12.1%
55-64	5,802	8.8%
65-74	2,959	4.5%
75-84	1,059	1.6%
85+	327	0.5%
Total	65,993	100.0%
Source: Demographic and Income Profile, ESRI Site Analysis		

Shown above, the 2012 population in Liberty County is dominated by residents below the age of 45 at 72.5%. The following chart provides population projections by age for Liberty County:

<b>LIBERTY COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTION BY AGE</b>					
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTS</b>					
Age	2010	2012	2017	Change 2012 - 2017	% Change
0-4	6,552	6,816	7,588	772	11.3%
5-9	5,244	5,439	6,024	585	10.8%
10-14	4,540	4,659	5,221	562	12.1%
15-19	4,997	4,969	5,246	277	5.6%
20-24	6,695	7,041	7,186	145	2.1%
25-34	10,472	11,064	12,349	1,285	11.6%
35-44	7,748	7,860	8,533	673	8.6%
45-54	7,909	7,998	8,218	220	2.8%
55-64	5,325	5,802	6,732	930	16.0%
65-74	2,654	2,959	3,943	984	33.3%
75-84	1,019	1,059	1,236	177	16.7%
85+	298	327	383	56	17.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>63,453</b>	<b>65,993</b>	<b>72,659</b>	<b>6,666</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>% Change</b>		<b>4.0%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>		
<b>Compounded annual growth rate (2010 to 2017)</b>			<b>2.0%</b>		
<b>Compounded annual growth rate (2012 to 2017)</b>			<b>1.9%</b>		
Source: Demographic and Income Profile, ESRI Site Analysis					

The table above illustrates that the population grew by 4.0% from 2010 to 2012 and is projected to grow by 10.1% through 2017. The largest growth is projected for the age group of 65 to 74 at 33.3%.

The following table illustrates the working age cohort in the area:

<b>LIBERTY COUNTY-WORKING AGE RESIDENTS</b>					
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTS</b>					
<b>Age</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>Change 2012 - 2017</b>	<b>% Change</b>
20-24	6,695	7,041	7,186	145	2.1%
25-34	10,472	11,064	12,349	1,285	11.6%
35-44	7,748	7,860	8,533	673	8.6%
45-54	7,909	7,998	8,218	220	2.8%
55-64	5,325	5,802	6,732	930	16.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>38,149</b>	<b>39,765</b>	<b>43,018</b>	<b>3,253</b>	<b>8.2%</b>
<b>% Change</b>		<b>4.24%</b>	<b>8.18%</b>		
<b>Compounded annual growth rate (2010 to 2017)</b>			<b>1.7%</b>		
<b>Compounded annual growth rate (2012 to 2017)</b>			<b>1.6%</b>		
Source: Demographic and Income Profile, STDB, Inc., ESRI Site Analysis.					

The table above illustrates that the working age cohort increased by 4.24% from 2010 to 2012 and will increase by 8.2% by 2017.

The following table exhibits household growth within Liberty County:

<b>HOUSEHOLD PROJECTION FOR 2012 to 2017</b>					
<b>LIBERTY COUNTY</b>					
				<b>% Household Change</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2010-2012</b>	<b>2012-2017</b>
<b>Total</b>	22,155	22,776	25,619	2.8%	12.5%
<b>Compounded annual growth rate</b>				<b>1.4%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
<b>Average Size</b>	2.75	2.78	2.74		
Source: Site To Do Business					

The household projections shown above are evidence of stable growth. The number of households increased 1.4% from 2010 to 2012. They are projected to increase 2.4% through 2017.

### **Socio-Economic Characteristics**

According to ESRI Inc., the median household income in Liberty County for 2012 is \$40,173, shown in the table below:

<b>MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>	
<b>Median household income in 2012</b>	<b>Liberty County</b>
<b>Total</b>	\$40,173
Source: Age by Income Profile, ESRI Site Analysis	

**Employment**

Employment in Liberty County is dominated by the Health Care and Social Assistance sector, followed by Retail Trade and Educational Services. The following chart and table provide employment by industry statistics for Liberty County:

<b>LIBERTY COUNTY EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY</b>		
Industry	Number	Percent
Health Care/Social Assistance	3,316	14.0%
Retail Trade	3,103	13.1%
Public Administration	2,866	12.1%
Educational Services	2,842	12.0%
Accommodation/Food Services	2,084	8.8%
Other Services	1,563	6.6%
Construction	1,421	6.0%
Manufacturing	1,350	5.7%
Transportation/Warehousing	1,018	4.3%
Admin., Support, and Waste Mgmt. Services	924	3.9%
Finance/Insurance	687	2.9%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	663	2.8%
Real Estate/Rental/Leasing	568	2.4%
Wholesale Trade	308	1.3%
Information	308	1.3%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting	284	1.2%
Arts/Entertainment/Recreation	284	1.2%
Utilities	95	0.4%
Mining	24	0.1%
Management of Companies/Enterprises	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,710</b>	<b>100%</b>
Source: STDB 2010 Employed Civilian Population by Industry Chart		

Occupational projections were not directly available for Liberty County from the Georgia Labor Market Explorer. The Coastal Georgia WIA was utilized for the purposes of this report. Bulloch, Effingham, Bryan, Chatham, Long, McIntosh, Glynn, and Camden counties are also included in the Coastal Georgia WIA. The following chart illustrates total projected growth in the Coastal Georgia WIA:

<b>COASTAL GEORGIA WIA OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS</b>						
<b>Total Employment All Occupations</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>Growth Rate</b>	<b>Growth</b>	<b>Replacement</b>	<b>Total</b>
	271,070	301,830	1.08%	3,380	6,180	9,560
Source: Georgia Labor Market Explorer, <a href="http://explorer.dol.state.ga.us">http://explorer.dol.state.ga.us</a>						

As indicated above, jobs are projected to grow at an annual rate of 1.08% between 2008 and 2018. This amounts to an increase of 30,760 total job openings during this time period.

The following chart illustrates the largest occupation category and projected growth within the Coastal Georgia WIA:

## COASTAL GEORGIA WIA OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS

Occupation Category	Employment		Growth Rate	Average Annual Job Openings		
	2008	2018		Growth	Replacement	Total
Office and Administrative Support Occupations	43,370	46,380	0.7%	390	920	1,310
Sales and Related Occupations	29,970	31,930	0.6%	190	930	1,120
Food Preparation and Serving Related Occupations	28,180	33,470	1.7%	510	900	1,410
Management Occupations	14,180	15,020	0.6%	60	290	350
Production Occupations	13,880	14,410	0.4%	50	210	260
Construction and Extraction Occupations	13,750	13,140	-0.4%	0	200	200
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations	13,010	14,170	0.9%	110	170	280
Retail Salespersons	11,940	12,940	0.8%	100	370	470
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations	11,910	13,740	1.4%	180	200	380
Personal Care and Service Occupations	9,390	11,340	1.9%	180	210	390

Source: Georgia Labor Market Explorer, <http://explorer.dol.state.ga.us>

As indicated above, Office and Administration, Sales and Related, and Food Preparation and Serving are the largest occupation categories in 2008 and are expected to be through 2018.

The following table illustrates the top employers in the area:

MAJOR EMPLOYERS IN LIBERTY COUNTY	
Company	No. of Employees
Fort Stewart	2,696
Liberty County Board of Education	1,493
SNF	936
Liberty Regional Medical Center	525
Wal-Mart Super Center	475
Target	470
Liberty County Board of Commissioners	333
Interstate Paper LLC	230
The Heritage Bank	220
City of Hinesville	211
International Greetings	196
Hugo Boss	180
Woodlands Health & Rehab Center	117
Kroger	103
Century Link	62

Source: Liberty County Chamber of Commerce

A summary of some selected employers in the area is given below:



SNF, Inc. is one of the world’s leading manufacturers of water-soluble polymers. Water-soluble polymers that are produced by SNF, Inc. are included in municipal waste, industrial waste, wastewater treatment, mining, and oil field applications around the world. SNF has been located in Riceboro, Georgia since 1990.



Target is an upscale discounter that provides high-quality, on-trend merchandise at attractive prices in clean, spacious and guest-friendly stores. In addition, Target operates an online business, Target.com. In 2011, Target Corporation produced over \$69 million in revenues and has 355,000 employees worldwide with about 470 of which in Liberty County.



Wal-Mart began in 1962, when Sam Walton opened the company’s first discount store in Rogers, Ark. Five years later, there were 24 Wal-Mart stores in Arkansas making \$12.6 million in sales. 1968 saw the opening of the first stores outside of Arkansas, in Sikeston, Missouri and Claremore, Oklahoma. The company officially incorporated as Wal-Mart Stores Inc. on October 31, 1969. In total, the company employs about 475 Liberty County residents.

**Housing Market**

The building permit trend in Liberty County is presented below:

LIBERTY COUNTY BUILDING PERMITS			
Year	SF*	MF*	Total
2013 (P)	54	0	54
2012	164	0	164
2011	142	0	142
2010	59	0	59
2009	71	252	323
2008	66	0	66
2007	57	264	321
2006	96	0	96
2005	114	0	114
2004	321	0	321
2003	264	72	336
2002	230	176	406

\*SF= under 5 units MF=5+ units; Source: SOCDs Building Permits, (P)=Preliminary data

Construction activity in the county has remained well below historical levels over the last few years, reflecting the negative impact caused by the financial industry collapse in 2008 and the continual lack of readily available mortgages for homebuyers. Building permits peaked in 2002 with 406 issuances; however, subsequent years have experienced a drop in permits. Despite population expansion, the construction activity has been low due to the inability to secure financing. The 2012 data shows an upward trend in building permit activity.

**Unemployment Trends**

Civilian labor force is defined as individuals who are civilians (not members of the Armed Services) who are age 16 years or older, and are not in institutions such as prisons, mental hospitals, or nursing homes. Unemployment as a percentage of total civilian labor force increased significantly from 2008 to 2010. The total number of employed persons increased as indicated on the following table:

LABOR FORCE, EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT DATA IN LIBERTY COUNTY				
Year	Civilian Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	Unemployment Rate (%)
2013 YTD	25,721	23,142	2,579	10.0%
2012	25,745	23,247	2,498	9.7%
2011	25,987	23,433	2,554	9.8%
2010	25,562	23,115	2,447	9.6%
2009	25,833	23,674	2,159	8.4%
2008	25,304	23,786	1,518	6.0%
2007	24,251	22,957	1,294	5.3%
2006	24,036	22,641	1,395	5.8%
2005	23,060	21,731	1,329	5.8%
2004	22,203	21,003	1,200	5.4%
2003	20,848	19,777	1,071	5.1%
Source: BLS.gov				
YTD 2013 consists of data through May 2013; the data is not seasonally adjusted.				

**Vacancy in Housing**

The majority of housing units in the county are owner occupied. Rental housing includes all types of units such as apartments, duplexes, triplexes, manufactured housing, single-family homes, etc. The number of owner and renter occupied units for the area is provided below:


HOUSING UNITS IN LIBERTY COUNTY		
	% of Total	Total
Total:	100.0%	22,776
Owner occupied	53.0%	12,071
Renter occupied	47.0%	10,705
Source: ESRI, 2012 Housing Profile		

**OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS**

■ Owner occupied    ■ Renter occupied

Source: Census 2010

The county has 47% of the households utilizing rental housing units. As shown below, the housing market in the county reports a vacancy factor of 16.6%.



The vacancy rate of 16.6% includes all vacant homes regardless if they are available for rent or not. A large portion of vacancy is within seasonal and vacation homes and other vacant.

**Military**



Liberty County is home to Fort Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield. Fort Stewart houses the 3<sup>rd</sup> Infantry Division which is the Army’s premier power projection platform on the Atlantic Coast. Fort Stewart is the largest armor training base east of the Mississippi river, covering 280,000 acres of land. Hunter Airfield is the Army’s longest runway on the east coast spanning 11,375feet.

With over 25,000 military personnel stationed on Fort Stewart, Fort Stewart plays a very significant part in Liberty County’s economy. It employs 2,696 local civilians and is the largest employer in the county.

**Schools**

Liberty County School Board is the second largest employer in Liberty County with 1,493 employees. Liberty County has eight elementary schools, three middle schools and two high schools all totally to13 publicly funded schools. There are a total of five higher learning facilities located in Liberty County including: Columbia College, University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Service located, Savannah Technical College, Brewton Parker College and Savannah Technical College all of which are located in the city of Hinesville.

**Medical**

There are two hospitals in the Liberty County area. The major hospitals in the market are listed in the following table:

<b>MAJOR HOSPITALS IN LIBERTY COUNTY</b>		
<b>Hospital</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Beds</b>
Liberty Regional Medical Center	Hinesville	131
Winn Army Community Hospital	Fort Stewart	0
Source: American Hospital Directory.		

A summary of the selected hospital from above follows below:



Liberty Regional opened in 1961 as a community hospital. Since 1961, the hospital has made technological and educational advancements to become a modern medical center. Based in Hinesville, the Liberty Regional Medical Hospital is a government run critical access hospital. This is an accredited hospital and provides emergency services to the community. The medical center occupies a 20 acre parcel of land that has a newly constructed 70,000 square foot facility at the heart of the complex.

### **Government**

Liberty County's Board of Commissioners consists of six County Commissioners elected from six different districts and a Chairman. The Board of Commissioners meet twice a month to discuss issues concerning the county.

### **Transportation**

Interstate 95 travels north and south and is the only interstate highway in the Liberty County. U.S. Highway 38 runs northwest to southeast and is used to access Fort Stewart, the MidCoast Regional Airport and I-95.

### **Airports**

There is currently only one airport in Liberty County that is operational. Wright Aaf (Fort Stewart)/ Midcoast Regional Airport is jointly owned by the U.S. Army and Liberty County government and is located in Fort Stewart.

### **Port of Savannah**

The Port of Savannah located 20 miles to the northeast of Liberty County and is one of the major economic drivers of the region. The port contains two terminals, the Garden City Terminal and the Ocean Terminal.

The Garden City Terminal is the fourth-largest container port in the United States and the largest single-terminal operation in North America. Two Class I rail providers serve the Garden City Terminal. The terminal also offers immediate interstate access to over 100 trucking companies operating in the Savannah area.

The Georgia Port Authority is planning on investing \$1.2 billion in expansion projects over the next 10 years. The Garden City Terminal is scheduled to add on average two high-speed super post-Panamax container cranes every 18 months for a total of 25 cranes. The terminal will also add 86 Rubber-Tired Gantry (RTG) over the next decade, in preparation for a full RTG conversion at the facility.


In anticipation for the widening of the Panama Canal, the Georgia Port Authority is in the process of increasing the depth of the Savannah River Navigation Channel from 42 to 48 feet. When all the expansions are completed, it is expected to increase the throughput capacity of the terminal from the current 2.62 million TEUs to 6 million TEUs in 2018.

The Ocean Terminal is a dedicated break-bulk and RoRo facility that has 5,768 feet of deep water berthing, 1.4 million square feet of covered storage, and 73 acres of open storage. The Ocean Terminal's range of shipments include forest and solid wood products, steel, industrial and farm equipment, automobiles, project shipments and heavy-lift cargoes. The terminal is served by two Class I rail providers.

**Conclusion**

Liberty County has experienced population growth in the past several years and is supported by a relatively diverse economy. Liberty County features opportunities in numerous job sectors, including educational services at all levels, medical services, retail, business, hospitality, and more. The port of Savannah, located 20 miles northeast, has a large positive economic impact on the entire region. Though the area was affected by the financial collapse, Liberty County remains an attractive location for households and now businesses are starting to expand and add jobs. The long-term economic forecast is for continued economic growth.

## Neighborhood Analysis



A neighborhood is an area of similar or complementary land uses, inhabitants, buildings, and business enterprises that are relatively uniform; that is, a neighborhood exhibits a greater degree of commonality than the larger area surrounding it. The subject is located in the City of Hinesville.

### The City of Hinesville

The defined neighborhood is the city of Hinesville. Hinesville is the county seat and largest city in Liberty County. Liberty County was established in 1777, and over the next fifty years the county seat would be moved twice. Finally, in 1836, a state senator named Charlton Hines suggested the site for the county seat, so the city was named after him.

Hinesville was destroyed during the Civil War and many of the inhabitants either left or were left destitute. Hinesville slowly recovered over the next 50 years, but was hit with two hurricanes and then the great depression. This sequence of events left the city with only 315 citizens, but in 1940 a large tract of land (280,000 acres) adjacent to Hinesville was selected to be what is today Fort Stewart.

Hinesville withstood some of the greatest hardships in the country, and after Fort Stewart was established Hinesville became known as “Boomtown.” Hinesville has been growing in population and economic influence ever since.

**Introduction**

The following table illustrates some of the general characteristics of the subject’s neighborhood:

13c. Neighborhood Description									
Location	<input type="checkbox"/> Urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suburban	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural	Present Land Use	40% 1 Family	<input type="checkbox"/> % 2 to 4 Family			
Built Up	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully Developed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Over 75%	<input type="checkbox"/> 25% to 75%	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 25%	5% Multifamily	<input type="checkbox"/> % Condo/Coop			
Growth Rate	<input type="checkbox"/> Rapid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steady	<input type="checkbox"/> Slow	40% Commer.	10% Industrial				
Property Values	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/> Stable	<input type="checkbox"/> Declining	5% Vacant					
Demand/Supply	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shortage	<input type="checkbox"/> In Balance	<input type="checkbox"/> Oversupply	Change in Use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Taking Place		
Rent Controls	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Likely	From		to			
				Predominant Occupancy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owner	<input type="checkbox"/> Tenant	<15% Vacant		

**Schools**

The subject is located in a good school district. The following chart summarizes the schools located in the subject’s district:

SUBJECT’S DISTRICT SCHOOLS			
Name	Rating	Grades	Enrollment
Button Gwinnett Elementary	6	PK-5	967
Snelson-Golden Middle School	3	6-8	795
Bradwell Institute High	6	9-12	1,784
Joseph Martin Elementary School	7	K-5	590
Jordye Bacon Elementary School	4	K-5	503
Lyman Hall Elementary School	5	K-5	513
Waldo Pafford Elementary School	7	K-5	623
Taylor’s Creek Elementary School	8	K-5	650
Source: Greatschools.org			

Great Schools is an organization that rates thousands of schools across the country against their state averages. The scale goes from 1 to 10, ten being the best.


**Access**

Highway 84 and State Road 96 are the primary commercial and traffic corridors in Hinesville. Access to the Hinesville is achieved via U.S. Highway 84 from the south and the northeast. State Road 196 is used to travel west of the city and to access Fort Stewart.

**Community Support Services**

The immediate area surrounding the subject property provides a variety of support services and is dominated by residential and commercial land uses that support the subject. There are no anticipated changes to the land uses or economic environment that would suggest the location would diminish in its desirability in the future. There is no decay with the existing housing or commercial establishments in the market and neighborhood characteristics continue to trend upward in income scale. As a result, the subject’s location is good.

The subject site is proximate to the civic, social and commercial centers providing support to rental households. The following map depicts the location of community support services in relation to the subject:



### Conclusion

The subject is located within the City of Hinesville. There are a variety of major employers within close proximity to the subject including Fort Stewart, various medical centers, the Board of Education, as well as Elementary, Middle, and High schools. The subject has convenient access to the major road networks including public transportation. The neighborhood has the entire infrastructure necessary to support rental apartments.

## ***Highest and Best (Intended) Use***

### **Introduction**

According to *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, the highest and best use of a property is defined as follows:

The reasonably probable and legal use of vacant land or an improved property, which is physically possible, appropriately supported, financially feasible, and that results in the highest value.

Fundamental in the above definition are separate estimates of the highest and best use of the subject property as if vacant and as improved. Although the highest and best use of the site may be determined to be different from the existing improvements, the improvements will continue as the highest and best use until land value exceeds the properties total value plus demolition costs.

In this section of the appraisal, we address the highest and best use relative to the HUD requirement that the property be examined based on its intended use.

### **As-If Vacant**

#### **Physically Possible**

The subject site is rectangular in shape and contains 24.68 acres. The property could accommodate a residential or residential-support use.

#### **Legally Permissible**

The subject site is zoned Residential R-A-1(Multi-family Residential). This zoning permits multifamily structures. The subject is a legally permissible use of the site under the current zoning designation.

#### **Financially Feasible**

Because residential development was the intended use and the project is financially viable, it is considered a feasible use of the property.

#### **Conclusion of Highest and Best Use — As Vacant**

The subject's intended use is considered to be the likely highest and best use as a residential / multifamily development.

#### **Highest and Best Use — As Improved**

The subject operates in a market area in which occupancy is high and income characteristics outline demand for affordable housing. The subject's unit-mix and improvements are physically well suited for the market. As such, a substantially renovated property is considered the highest and best use of the improvements.

#### **Demographic Trends**

The subject accommodates the family market with residents typically in the 20-54 age brackets. Demographic trends for the as follows:

POPULATION PROJECTION BY AGE					
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTS					
Age	2010	2012	2017	Change 2012 - 2017	% Change
0-4	6,552	6,816	7,588	772	11.3%
5-9	5,244	5,439	6,024	585	10.8%
10-14	4,540	4,659	5,221	562	12.1%
15-19	4,997	4,969	5,246	277	5.6%
20-24	6,695	7,041	7,186	145	2.1%
25-34	10,472	11,064	12,349	1,285	11.6%
35-44	7,748	7,860	8,533	673	8.6%
45-54	7,909	7,998	8,218	220	2.8%
55-64	5,325	5,802	6,732	930	16.0%
65-74	2,654	2,959	3,943	984	33.3%
75-84	1,019	1,059	1,236	177	16.7%
85+	298	327	383	56	17.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>63,453</b>	<b>65,993</b>	<b>72,659</b>	<b>6,666</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>% Change</b>		<b>4.0%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>		
<b>Compounded annual growth rate (2010 to 2017)</b>			<b>2.0%</b>		
<b>Compounded annual growth rate (2012 to 2017)</b>			<b>1.9%</b>		

Source: Demographic and Income Profile, ESRI Site Analysis

As shown above, some of the particular age cohorts are expected to decrease significantly while others are projected to increase significantly. The 25-54 cohorts are projected to increase. These are the typical age groups accommodated at the subject. A summary of market trends for rental apartments in the area is provided below:

HINESVILLE AREA RENTAL PROPERTIES				
Property Name	Year Built	# Units	Occupancy	Occupied Units
Northgate Apartments	1982	80	98%	80
Raintree Apartments	1984	200	99%	200
Baytree Apartments	1983	60	95%	60
The Columns at Independence	2010	222	92%	211
The Pines at Willowbrook	2003	80	100%	80
Wyngrove Apartments	2000	140	95%	133
<b>Total</b>		<b>782</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>728</b>
SAVANNAH AREA RENTAL PROPERTIES				
Colonial Village at Huntington	1985	147	85%	125
Georgetown Crossings	1994	168	91%	153
Georgetown Grove	1997	220	94%	207
Links at Georgetown	1998/2000	360	92%	332
<b>Total</b>		<b>895</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>817</b>

Anticipated growth within the targeted rental tenant profile of the subject that is low income in nature, the subject will have continued support as an affordable rental community.

## ***Marketing Time and Financing***

### **Typical Buyers**

Typical buyers for apartment complexes similar to the subject include limited partnerships, REIT's, insurance companies and pension funds.

### **Marketing Time**

According to the verifying sources for each of the sales within the Sales Comparison Approach, the typical marketing time for their respective complexes was 6± months.

We also considered average marketing periods reported in investor surveys and from brokers in the area. Respondents in the *Korpacz Real Estate Investor Survey* indicated a marketing time of 6-12 months, while a recent *CB Richard Ellis Commercial Survey* indicated an average marketing period of 6-12 months. Also, we surveyed real estate brokers of similar apartment projects, most of which indicated typical marketing periods of 6-12 months.

Based on the actual marketing periods for several of the sales that will be discussed in detail in the Sales Comparison Approach, as well as the recent investor surveys, we estimated a typical marketing time for the subject of 6± months.

### **Exposure Time**

Exposure time may be defined as follows:

The estimated length of time the property being appraised would have been offered on the market prior to the hypothetical consummation of a sale at market value on the effective date of the appraisal; a retrospective estimate based upon an analysis of past events, assuming a competitive and open market. (source: "USPAP 1994 Edition," Statement on Appraisal Standards No. 6 {SMT-6})

The market value estimates derived herein assume an exposure time for the subject of 6± months.

### **Financing**

Financing for the subject property would most likely be obtained from an agency such as HUD, Freddie Mac or Fannie Mae as well as a regional bank or life insurance company. Permanent lenders in the area are presently underwriting loans based on a 1.10x to 1.25x DSCR, with 25 to 30-year amortization period, and a rate based on a spread of 175 to 250 basis points over the 10-year U.S. Treasury rate. Agency rates are between 4.50 and 5.0 depending on the property and various underwriting standards.

## *Appraisal Process*

Three traditional approaches are normally used by appraisers in the estimation of market value of a property, providing data from three market perspectives. These three techniques are the cost approach, the income approach, and the sales comparison approach (market approach).

The **cost approach** is the sum of the land value and the cost new of the improvements less accrued depreciation. The cost approach is based on the premise that an informed, rational investor/purchaser would pay no more for an existing property than it would cost him to reproduce a substitute property with the same utility without undue delay. The Cost Approach provides an excellent valuation method for recently constructed or proposed improvements as well as unique or special purpose property types in which improved sales or comparable leases are not readily available.

The **sales comparison approach** (market approach) is the process of comparing prices paid for properties having a satisfactory degree of similarity to the subject property adjusted for differences in time, location, and physical characteristics. This approach is based upon the principle of substitution, which implies that a prudent purchaser will not pay more to buy a property than it would cost him to buy a comparable substitute property in a similar location.

The **income approach** is based on the premise that a prudent investor would pay no more for the subject property than they would for another investment with similar risk and return characteristics. Since the value of an investment can be considered equal to the present worth of anticipated future benefits in the form of dollar income or amenities, this approach estimates the present value of the net income that the property is capable of producing. This amount is capitalized at a rate that should reflect risk to the investor and the amount of income necessary to support debt service or the mortgage requirement.

Each technique or approach to value has its strengths and weaknesses, depending largely on the type of property being appraised and the quality of available data. In most instances, one or more of these approaches will produce a more reliable value indication than the other approach or approaches.

The final step in the appraisal process is the reconciliation and correlation of all of the value indications into a final value estimate. This step usually begins with a discussion of the merits and demerits of each approach and an analysis of the reliability of the data used in each approach. It concludes with the statement of final value estimate. In this instance, the income approach was the only one utilized in forming reliable market value indications for the subject property.

## *Cost Approach*

The cost approach is based on the principle of substitution, which states that a prudent purchaser would not pay more for a property than the amount required to purchase a similar site and construct similar improvements, without undue delay, to produce a property of equal desirability and utility. The procedure begins by estimating the value of the subject site at its highest and best use, based upon a market analysis of recent comparable sales of vacant land similar to the subject site. The next step involves estimating the current reproduction cost of the improvements including entrepreneurial profit, less accrued depreciation, if any. The final step involves adding the land value to the contributory value of the improvements to result in a value indication.

The subject is over 10 years old and a cost approach is not a reliable approach for older assets. Therefore, a cost approach is not provided.

## ***Land Valuation***


The cost approach is based on the principle of substitution, which states that a prudent purchaser would not pay more for a property than the amount required to purchase a similar site and construct similar improvements, without undue delay, to produce a property of equal desirability and utility. The procedure begins by estimating the value of the subject site at its highest and best use, based upon a market analysis of recent comparable sales of vacant land similar to the subject site. The next step involves estimating the current reproduction cost of the improvements including entrepreneurial profit, less accrued depreciation, if any. The final step involves adding the land value to the contributory value of the improvements to result in a value indication.

The subject is greater than 10 years old. Therefore, the cost approach does not provide a reasonable estimate of value. However, according to the HUD Map Guide, an estimate of the land value must still be provided.

In estimating the value of the subject site, we utilized the sales comparison approach, which involves direct market comparison of the subject site with recent sales of vacant land with similar utility and physical characteristics. Of the sales reviewed, those considered most comparable to the subject site have been included in the following Land Sales Analysis table. The land sales were analyzed and compared to the subject considering property rights conveyed, financing, conditions of sale, market conditions, location, and physical characteristics. No adjustments were required for cash equivalency, as all of the sales were for cash via third-party acquisitions.

Sales used to value the subject site were analyzed on a per-acre basis, per unit and on per-square foot basis. Discussions with the local real estate agents indicated that per-unit is the typical methodology used in the market. A summary of our adjustments and conclusions regarding the land sales can be found in the Land Sales Analysis table. The locations of the land sales are referenced in the Land Sales Map, and detailed description the comparable land sales are in the addenda. These complete discussions may facilitate further understanding of the adjustment discussion that follows the Land Sales Analysis table.

## Land Sales Map



**Land Sale 1** was purchased for the development of a rental property (Independence) located south of the activity center of Hinesville near a secondary entrance gate to the Post. The property has a somewhat isolated environment and is a distance to retail or support services. The property is garden style in design. There are a total of 264 apartments. This sale provides the best guidance for the subject.

**Land Sale 2** was purchased for the development of Savannah Highlands Apartments. The property was purchased in November 2009 for a price of \$1,489,600. The site is located at 2170 Benton Boulevard, Savannah, Georgia. The property was developed with 222 market-rate units.

Land Sale One was purchased at a time where lending became constricted due to the economic downturn. The land is located within the Pooler submarket is upper income in nature and is serviced by major highways and community support services. The property was purchased with a phased concept. The buyer was able to purchase the land for a reduced price due to a higher cost associated with a phased project. This sale was superior to the subject due to location.

**Land Sale 3** was purchased for the development of Villas a Park Avenue in October 2011. This project has 238 approved units. The property is located along Pooler Parkway in the Savannah area. The site has good access and exposure.

Land Sale Three represents a sale that was somewhat affected by the economic downturn when lending was beginning to tighten. The land is located to the north of the subject and is considered to be superior regarding location.

## **Land Sales Analysis**

Many times adjustments are made to offset differences for various factors affecting value such as date of sale, location/access, zoning/density, physical characteristics, and condition/other. Explanations of the adjustment categories utilized to reflect the similarities between these sales and the subject property are discussed below.

### **Adjustments**

Adjustments to the sales are as follows.

**Property rights conveyed**—A transaction price is always predicated on the real property interest conveyed. All land transactions reviewed herein were transfers of fee simple title.

No adjustments were deemed necessary for real property rights conveyed.

**Financing terms**—The transaction price of one property may differ from that of an identical property due to different financing arrangements. Each of the sales was a cash transaction or financed through a third party at a market rate or term.

All of the sales were considered cash equivalent and no adjustments were necessary.

**Conditions of sale**—Adjustments for conditions of sale usually reflect the motivation of buyer and seller. Although conditions of sale are often perceived as applying only to sales that were not arm's-length transactions, an arm's-length sale may reflect atypical motivations or sale conditions due to seller motivation, unusual tax considerations, sale at legal auction, lack of exposure to the open market, or eminent domain proceedings. No conditions of sale adjustments were required.

**Market conditions (time)**—Adjustments for time or changes in market conditions are measured from the date of sale of each comparable or from the listing date to the date of the appraisal. Market conditions requiring adjustments include change in price levels due to inflation, tax law changes, population and demographic changes, changing supply and demand factors for similar property, changes in land uses, and changes in the general economic outlook in the subject's locale. Changing market conditions are not dependent upon the passage of time but are dependent upon the change in the supply and demand equation.

Land Sale One occurred near the peak of the real estate boom and was adjusted downward. Sales Two and Three were after the boom and not adjusted.

**Location**—Adjustments for location are based upon site visibility from roadways, proximity to shopping, employment, ease of access to the property, existence of complementary land uses, and any impact of surrounding properties.

Comparable One has a slightly more remote location but is proximate a secondary access gate to the Post. This sale was considered generally similar to the subject and not adjusted. Sales Two and Three are located in more upscale neighborhoods and were adjusted downward after pairing with Sale One.

**Size**—Adjustments for size are consistent with the theory that buyers will pay more per unit for smaller parcels when all other factors are equal. This principle is especially true with large tracts of vacant land since a developer will typically develop large tracts of land in phases.

The subject site is considered typical for multifamily. All of the sales are considered similar to the subject and were not adjusted.

**Zoning/Density**—This adjustment category considers the allowable density for residential units provided by zoning. Adjustments are made with regard to how density reflects prices per residential multifamily unit. Prices paid for land with a relatively high density usually tend to be lower on a price per unit basis than prices paid for land with a lower density.

All sales have typical density levels for multifamily product and not adjusted.

**Utilities**—All of the comparable sales used had utilities available at the site at the time of sale. Therefore, no adjustments for utilities were necessary.

**Other**— Sale Two was originally negotiated as one parcel of land with 26.69 acres and a project concept of 328 apartments. The site was placed under contract as raw land without the entitlements necessary for development. A phased project was developed with Phase I’s sale price derived as an allocation from the original negotiations. Phase I was constructed with 222 units and some of the site work and infrastructure installed was required to support Phase II. The benefits associated with the entitlements and the additional costs to support Phase II required an upward adjustment. A 15% upward adjustment was considered reasonable.

**Conclusion/Land Value Estimate**

After analyzing all available land sales data and making the necessary adjustments, the indicated range of values for the subject was as follows:

<b>INDICATED VALUE PER UNIT</b>	
Minimum	\$3,946
Maximum	\$5,368
Average	\$4,719
Standard Deviation	\$719
<b>Reconciled Value</b>	<b>\$4,800</b>

The subject’s projection is within the range of the land comparables and is considered reasonable. The land analysis is presented on the following table.

8. Value Fully Improved	Location of Project			Size of Subject Property	
	601 Saunders Avenue		Hinesville	Georgia	24.68 Acres
	Comparable Sale 1	Comparable Sale 2	Comparable Sale 3		Subject
	Independence Place Apartments	Savannah Highlands	Villas at Park Ave		601 Saunders Avenue
		2-1016-025-048	5-0017A-01-095		
Date of Sale	April-07	November-09	October-11		
Sales Price	\$1,420,120	\$1,489,600	\$1,445,000		
Size (Acres)	27.44	21.28	17.00		24.68
Size (SF)	1,195,286	926,957	740,520		1,075,061
Number of Units	264	222	238		200
Density	9.62	10.43	14.00		8.10
Price per Unit	\$5,379	\$6,710	\$6,071		
Price Per Acre	\$51,754	\$70,000	\$85,000		
Price Per SF	\$1.19	\$1.61	\$1.95		
Unit of Comparison	\$5,379	\$6,710	\$6,071		
Adjustments (%)					
Time	-10%	0%	0%		
Location	0%	-35%	-35%		
Zoning/Density	0%	0%	0%		
Plottage	0%	0%	0%		
Demolition	0%	0%	0%		
Unusal Site conditions	0%	0%	0%		
Other	0%	15%	0%		
Total Adjustment Factor	-10.0%	-20.0%	-35.0%		
Adjusted Price	\$4,841	\$5,368	\$3,946		
Indicated Value by Comparison	\$968,264	\$1,073,586	\$789,286		
<b>Conclusion :</b>		<b>\$4,800</b>		<b>9. Value of Site Fully Improved</b>	<b>\$960,000</b>

**Remaining Economic Life Analysis (REL)**

REMAINING ECONOMIC LIFE ANALYSIS AS IF RENOVATED					
Subject Year Built	1984				
Subject Last Renovation	N/A				
Construction Type:	Type A-Steel	Type B-Steel/Masonry	Type C-Masonry	Type D-Wood	Type S-Other
Subject Type:				X	
Item Considered:	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Not Applicable
<b>Livability:</b>			X		
Physical Condition			X		
Unit Design			X		
Unit Configuration			X		
Room Sizes			X		
Interior Flow			X		
Adequacy of Closets			X		
Lighting			X		
Laundry Facilities in Units					X
Laundry Facilities in Project			X		
Project Amenities				X	
Project Density			X		
Availability of Parking			X		
<b>Externalities:</b>	Positive Influences	Negative Influences			
Neighborhood Characteristics	X				
Growth Trends	X				
Sustainability of Demand	X				
Sustainability of Rent Levels	X				
	Long Term Sustainability	Moderate Term Sustainability	Short Term Sustainability		
<b>Overall Rating of Subject</b>	X				
Note: Assumes all critical and non-critical repairs are completed as outlined in the PCNA					

Per Chapter 7 Section 6I of the MAP Guide, there are factors that are evaluated when estimating the remaining economic life of an asset. Each of the factors was examined as follows:

1-Economic make-up of the community or region and the ongoing demand for accommodations of the type represented.

The subject has a good location proximate residential support services and the economic center for Hinesville. The tenant profile is dependent on social services and support that are located near the complex.

2-The relationship between the property and the immediate environment.

Rental apartments are located along the primary and secondary traffic arterials. This medium density land use is compatible with the immediate environment. Single family residential land uses are located along secondary roadways with high commercial and retail concentrations at the intersection of primary traffic routes. No changes are anticipated to the land uses within the immediate environment thus, the subject is compatible with no future conflicts to impact the REL.

3-Architectural design, style and utility from a functional point of view and the likelihood of obsolescence attributable to new inventions, new materials, changes in building codes and changes in tastes.

The apartments have floor plans that reflect the 1980's lifestyle with double loaded interior corridors as opposed to new styles that feature more open design. There is some functional obsolescence noted with the flow of the apartments.

4. The trend and rate of change in the characteristics of the neighborhood that affect property values and their effect on those values.

The subject's HMA has experienced growth due in part to the expansion of the military. Fort Stewart has deployable missions and this impacts the stability of the population in general. However, the lower income population has expanded and has an upward trajectory. Demand levels for rental assisted housing is anticipated to remain strong into the future.

5. Workmanship and Durability of construction and the rapidity with which natural and man-made forces may cause physical deterioration.

The subject's original construction materials were good as evidenced by the continued functionality of the physical plant. The property required substantial upgrades to remain functional into the future.

6. Physical condition and the practice of owners and occupants with respect to maintenance, the use or abuse to which the improvements are subjected, the physical deterioration and the functional obsolescence within the subject property.

Management is strict with respect to rules and ensures no tenant disregard to the apartments is tolerated. Air conditioning filters are changed under a regular maintenance program, apartments are continually inspected for pests, housekeeping standards and related. Corrective measures are taken as apartment's turnover. Once renovated, the subject will continue to provide quality housing for the low income resident.

Considering the extensive renovation plan anticipated, a 50 year remaining economic life is estimated for the subject "as if renovated".

## ***Sales Comparison Approach-Retrospective As Is***


The sales comparison approach is a method of estimating the market value of a property by the comparison of actual sales or offerings of properties considered similar to the subject site. This approach reflects the market value of a property, based on actions of typical buyers and sellers in the marketplace, and simplifies the principles of substitution. The principle of substitution affirms that the maximum value of a property tends to be set by the cost of acquiring an equally desirable and valuable substitute property, assuming that no costly delays are encountered in making the substitution.

The methodology in the sales comparison approach was to locate similar properties that sold recently. We obtained a number of sales that are considered in the analysis. Of the total sales, two were selected from the general region near the subject in similar markets while the third sale was from the subject's area but was older.

Once the sales comparison approach was completed, we were able to compare other sales from elsewhere in Georgia to the subject in order to test how reasonable the value indications were. The value indications were considered reasonable.

One of the primary measurements of comparison used by buyers and sellers of improved multifamily projects is the price per unit. Adjustments were made, as necessary, to these sales on this basis to recognize differences in various factors affecting value, such as location/access, age/condition, quality/amenities, property size, occupancy, and unit mix/average unit size. No adjustments were required for cash equivalency, as all the sales were cash transactions or involved conventional third party financing at market interest rates and terms. The following map outlines the improved sales while written descriptions of the properties can be found subsequently and in addenda.

### ***Improved Sales Map***



A brief description of the sales is provided:

**Pinnacle Place** is a garden style apartment complex and is located in Hephzibah, GA. The property was built in 1987 and renovated in 2005 and has 120 units. The property includes typical amenities for an apartment. The property sold in April 2011 for \$4,382,500 or \$36,521 per unit. Occupancy at the time of sale was 95%. The actual cash flow and the buyer's anticipated operating performance were provided. The cap rate of 8.05% is based on actual financials and includes a management fee and replacement reserves of \$250/unit.

**Ponderosa and Glynn Pines I & II** operate under a Section 8 contract. The buyer specializes in affordable communities. These three communities were in average condition at the time of sale and were repaired and upgraded after the acquisition. The property provides the best indication of general overall capitalization rates for Section 8 communities that are in need of repair.

**Southland Heights Apartments** is a garden style apartment complex located in Americus, GA. The property was built in 1973 and has 89 units. The roofs were replaced in 2010 and the property is in average condition. No major capital expenditures were made after sale. The property includes typical amenities for an apartment including a pool. The property sold in July 2012 for \$2,250,000 or \$25,281 per unit. Occupancy at the time of sale was 99% which is typical. The cap rate of 7.50% is based on actual financials and includes a management fee and replacement reserves of \$250/unit. Americus is a very rural market and the sale required an adjustment for location.

## **Valuation Analysis**

### **Adjustments**

The table at the end of this section entitled "Improved Sales Analysis" summarizes the adjustments made to each comparable. The adjustments were made on the following considerations.

### **Property Rights Conveyed**

Each of the sales used transferred typical property rights via a Warranty Deed and/or the purchase of a partnership/corporation where the real estate was the only asset. As a result, no adjustments were necessary for various property rights.

### **Financing**

All of the sales were all cash or purchased via third party loans. There were no adjustments for financing.

### **Conditions of Sale**

All of the sales represented an arm's length transaction that reflected a fair market value. As a result, no adjustments for conditions of sale were made for conditions of sale.

### **Market Conditions (Time)**

An adjustment for market conditions may be appropriate for an active market in which buyers are optimistic and prices increase. Sale Three occurred during a period of limited multifamily transaction activity when compared to the activity currently taking place. This sale was adjusted upward to reflect the depressed market in which this asset sold. Sales One and Two did not require adjustment.

**Location**

All the sales have access to local highways, major highways, community services, and job employment. Sale One has the most similar location in a market with military influence. Sale Two is located in the same general region as the subject. Sale Three is located in a tertiary, rural market and was adjusted upward after comparing to the other two sales.

**Year Built**

The sales were adjusted for their age. To quantify the rate of depreciation, two sales from the same market were obtained with different ages. The properties have been maintained but no renovations or upgrades have occurred. The rate of depreciation was calculated as follows:

<b>Age/Depreciation</b>		
<b>Property</b>	<b>Year Built</b>	<b>\$/Unit</b>
Jasmine at Winters Chapel	1989	\$55,743
Oaks at Holcomb Bridge	1979	\$51,316
Compound Annual Depreciation, Rounded	10	0.80%

The depreciation was applied to the three sales. Sale One was estimated at a blended age of four younger and adjusted downward by 4%, rounded. Sale Two was a blend of about four years older and adjusted upward by 4%, rounded. Sale Three was 10 years and adjusted upward by 8%, rounded.

**Quality/Condition**

The subject has average quality construction and is in fair condition. All of the sales were somewhat superior and adjusted downward.

**Project Size**

A larger community has the ability to spread fix costs over more units than a smaller community. Sales One and Two are similar sized complexes and not adjusted. Sale Three is smaller and adjusted upward.

**Average Unit Size**

The subject and the comparables provide basic housing and were considered similar. No adjustment was made.

**Project Amenities**

The subject has limited recreational facilities and common areas. The sales are generally similar with basic amenities and not adjusted.

**Value Indication – Retrospective As Is Scenario**

After adjustments, the sales indicated a range of per unit values as follows:

<b>INDICATED VALUE PER UNIT</b>	
Minimum	\$26,438
Maximum	\$31,408
Average	\$29,647
Standard Deviation	\$2,784
Reconciled Value	\$27,000

We have placed on all of the sales. The analysis is provided on the following table:

Item		Subject Property				Comparable Sale No. 1				Comparable Sale No. 2				Comparable Sale No. 3																											
Address	601 Saunders	Hinesville				Pinnacle Place				Ponderosa, Glynn Pines I & II				Southland																											
Proximity to subject						500 Caldwell Drive, Hephzibah, GA				4920 Laroche Ave, Savannah				113 Highway 27 E., Americus GA																											
Sales price						\$4,382,500				\$4,050,000				\$2,250,000																											
Sales price per GBA						\$37.08				\$39.06				\$26.92																											
Effective Gross Income						\$886,785				\$989,881				\$478,289																											
Effective Gross Rent Multiplier (1)*						4.94				4.09				4.70																											
Sales price per unit						\$36,521				\$28,125				\$25,281																											
Sales price per room						\$6,087				\$6,099				\$5,220																											
Data source						Broker																																			
Adjustments		Description				Description				+ (-) \$ Adjust.				Description				+ (-) \$ Adjust.																							
Sales or financing Concessions						Cash to seller								Cash to Seller																											
Date of sale/time						April-11								March-12				July-12																							
Location		Good				Similar								Similar				Inferior				15.00%																			
Site/view		Good				Similar								Similar																											
Design and appeal		Average				Average								Similar				Similar																							
Quality of construction		Average				Average								Similar				Similar																							
Year built		1984								-4.00%				1979, 1978, 1980				4.00%				1973				8.00%															
Condition		Fair				Average				-10.00%				Average				-10.00%				Average				-10.00%															
Gross Building Area		193,608		Sq. ft.		118,200		Sq. ft.				103,680		Sq. ft.				83,571		Sq. ft.		10.00%																			
Average Unit Size		948		Sq. ft.		985		Sq. ft.				720		Sq. ft.				939		Sq. ft.																					
Unit Breakdown	No. of Units	Room count				No. of Units	Room count				No. of Units	Room count				No. of Units	Room count																								
		Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.																				
		32	4	1	1	16	4	1	1	88	4	1	1	1	3	0	1																								
		112	6	2	2	72	6	2	2	40	5	2	1	32	4	1	1																								
		48	6	3	1	32	7	3	2	16	7	3	2	48	5	2	1																								
		8	7.5	4	1.5	2				2				8	7.5	3	2.5																								
		0	2			2				2																															
	200	1148			120	720			144	664			89	431																											
Basement description		N/A																																							
Functional utility		Average				Similar								Similar																											
Heating/cooling		Electric				Similar								Similar																											
Parking on/off site		On Site				Similar								Similar																											
Project amenities and fee		Typical				Similar								Similar																											
Other																																									
Net Adjustment (Total)						+				-				-14.0%				+				-				-6.0%				+				-				23.0%			
Adjusted sales price of comparables										\$31,408								\$26,438								\$31,096															
8. Value by Sales Comparison via Per Unit										\$27,000								200								\$5,400,000															

**Effective Gross Income Multiplier (EGIM) – Retrospective As Is – Market Rent**

In addition to adjusting the improved sales for price paid per unit, we have examined the indicated EGIMs and expense ratios of each property. This method compares the subject’s income characteristics with those of the comparable properties and develops a multiplier, which is appropriate for the subject. The sales provided a reasonable range for analysis.

<i>EGIM</i>		
PROPERTY	OPERATION	EGIM
Pinnacle Place	Not Stabilized	4.94
Ponderosa, Glynn Pines I & II	Stabilized	4.09
Southland	Stabilized	4.70
<b>Subject</b>	Stabilized	<b>3.50</b>

**EGIM ANALYSIS**

<b>EFFECTIVE GROSS REVENUE MULTIPLIER ANALYSIS</b>		
Effective Gross Income		\$1,612,955
Effective Gross Income Multiplier		3.50
Retrospective As Is Market		\$5,645,342
<b>Rounded</b>		<b>\$5,600,000</b>
<b>Per Operating Unit</b>		<b>\$28,000</b>

The subject has significant repairs that will be required. As such, an EGIM at below the low end of the range was selected.

**Value Conclusion**

The sales comparison approach is not evaluated or applied to the restricted rent scenario per the HUD MAP Guide. Only the value under the market rent scenario was estimated. The value conclusion under the sales comparison approach for the market rate scenario is below:

<b>SALES COMPARISON APPROACH</b>	
	Retrospective As-Is Market
Estimated Sale Value	\$5,400,000
EGIM	\$5,600,000
Average	\$5,500,000

<b>Conclusion, rounded</b>	<b>\$5,500,000</b>
----------------------------	--------------------

## ***Income Approach***

### **Introduction**

The Income Approach is based on the premise that a prudent investor would not pay more for a property than he would for an alternative investment that offers similar financial return characteristics. This method is usually the most appropriate technique for valuation of income producing properties similar to the subject.

The Income Approach is an appraisal technique that translates anticipated or future benefits from a property into an indication of value. The basic steps involved in the Income Approach include the following:

1. Research the subject market area for rental and expense information on similar properties to the subject.
2. Estimate potential gross income for the subject through analyzing appropriate market derived data and the subject's actual income.
3. Estimate appropriate vacancy and operating expenses for the subject to arrive at a net operating income.
4. The capitalization rate was determined through an analysis of sales within the region, discussions with real estate brokers active in the multifamily arena as well as the debt structure for the project.

We estimated the subject property value via the Income Approach using the direct capitalization method. The direct capitalization method converts a single year's net income into a value estimate. We estimated the subject "retrospective as is" market value via this direct capitalization approach. This is explained in the following market rent analysis section.


**Market Rent Analysis**

To evaluate appropriate market rental rates for the subject, we conducted a rental survey of all of the apartment communities in Hinesville. There are very few quality market-rent apartment communities in Hinesville. The newest non-military rental complex is The Columns at Independence that built in 2010. This is a quality complex reporting strong operating results. The next highest quality rental apartment complex is the Pines at Willowbrook that has both LIHTC restricted units and market-rent units. The market rents have a slight downward pull on their rental rates due to their association with a restricted product. Hinesville has a number of old “Cardinal Industry” rental apartment communities. In essence, these are single-story, pre-manufactured apartment buildings with very small units and very limited amenities. The quality is poor to fair and not comparable to a typical garden-style community. The balance of the communities is generally older with a mix of low quality. A summary of the apartment communities considered for the rent analysis is provided below:

MARKET AREA RENTAL PROPERTIES								
Property Name	Year Built	# Units	Occupancy	Occupied Units	Unit Types with low end range.			
					One Bedroom	Two Bedroom	Three Bedroom	Four Bedroom
Northgate Apartments	1982	80	100.0%	80		\$680	\$838	\$913
Raintree Apartments	1984	200	100.0%	200	\$769	\$866	\$983	\$1,122
Baytree Apartments	1983	60	100.0%	60				
The Columns	2010	222	98.0%	218	\$880	\$1,025	\$1,215	
The Pines at Willowbrook	2003	80	93.0%	74	\$398/\$650	\$468/\$780	\$534/\$900	
Wyngrove Apartments	2000	140	95.0%	133	\$700	\$875	\$925	
Mission Ridge	1983/Ren. 2011	54	93.0%	50		\$810	\$910	
Independence Place	2010	264	66.0%	174	\$1,049	\$1,159		\$1,409
Wedgewood and Aspen Court	1982	72	77%/100%	61		\$625		

With the limited number of market comparables available in Hinesville that are garden-style apartments, comparables were also utilized properties from Savannah. The Savannah market was utilized because many of the leasing agents indicated that prospective tenants will consider apartment communities in Savannah. The following maps provide summary locations of the apartments utilized on the rent grids:

**HINESVILLE COMPARABLES**



A brief summary of the apartment communities utilized on the rent grid analysis is provided in the following section.

**Hinesville Properties**

**Raintree Apartments** is the subject. It is an income-restricted property designed to accommodate families. This community is composed of 120 one, two, three and four bedroom units. The subject was built in 1984 and is in fair condition. The property will be renovated to upgrade the appearance of the unit interiors and exteriors along with various upgrades to the property’s common areas and mechanical features of the buildings. The upgrades will bring the property back to a good quality condition and will allow it to compete with newer existing properties in the market.

**The Columns at Independence** was built in 2010 and has a total of 222 units. It is a market-rate property located in Hinesville, Georgia and is comprised of three-story garden style buildings. Project amenities include a pool, picnic and playground areas, fitness center, and a club house. The facility is also gated. The property provides good access along Grove Point Road and is located within three miles of the subject property. Pest control is the only utility included in the monthly rent. The tenant pays a flat rate for water/sewer and trash pick-up depending on the unit type they occupy. This property sets the upper end of market rent.

**The Pines at Willowbrook** is a unique property that offers both market-rate as well as LIHTC units for rent. It is located off of Willowbrook Drive in Hinesville, Georgia and was built in 2003. There are a total of 80 units split between market rate and tax-credit. For purposes of this report we only utilized the market-rated units in our comparison. Project amenities include a clubhouse, business center, playground, fitness room and a laundry facility. Normal unit amenities include fully equipped kitchens, balconies or patios and washer dryer connections. A laundry facility is included on the property, though connections

for washer and dryer units are present in every unit. Water, sewer, trash pick-up and pest control utilities are all included in the monthly rent. The Pines at Willowbrook offers one, two and three bedroom unit types.

**Wyngrove Apartments** is owned by Dryden Properties, a company with a variety of rental product in Hinesville. There is a central leasing office with sporadic availability of staff to answer the phone or answer questions to potential tenants. The management is less than aggressive. Wyngrove offers three floor plans and very limited project amenities. Built in 2000, the physical condition is average.

**Aspen Court** was built in 1985 and has a total of 24 units. It is a market-rate property located in Hinesville, Georgia and is comprised of 12 duplex style buildings. The property is adjacent to its sister property Wedgewood Apartments and shares project amenities. Project amenities include a playground and laundry facility. Pest control and trash are the only utility included in the monthly rent.

**Mission Ridge** was built in 1983 and renovated in 2011. It is a market-rate property located in Hinesville, Georgia and is comprised of two-story townhome style buildings. The property has no project amenities. Water and Sewer is a flat rate of \$30 per month which is included in rent.

**Rental Rate Analysis**

The market rent comparables discussed above were utilized in the rent adjustment grid for each unit type that is provided in the addenda. Two analyses were performed in this section. The first approach utilized methodologies to discover the “As-If Renovated” income, expenses, and net operating expenses as well as an “As-Is” value. Differences will be noted as the document progresses. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of each of the line items that were considered as part of the analysis. The comparable line items start at 3, as line item 1 is the unit type and line item 2 is the subject property address.

3. Effective Date of Rental

The market was surveyed in July 2013. All of the rent comparables were surveyed during the same time period. As such, no adjustment was made for the effective date.

4. Type of Project/Stories

The subject property and rent comparables are all garden style communities with two or three stories. Because the height of the building did not impact rents, no adjustment was made for this difference. However, the Pines at Willowbrook has both market-rate and LIHTC units. The presence of these units impacts the ability of this property to attain market rents above or equal to properties that do not have low-income housing tax credit units. As such, an adjustment was needed to account for the negative impact that the LIHTC units have on the market rated units at this property.

The calculation for this adjustment is shown in the following table:

<b>ADJUSTMENT FOR LIHTC</b>			
Property	Unit Type	SF	Rent
Wyngrove	2x2	1,106	\$875
The Pines at Willowbrook	2x1	935	\$780
Differences in base rental rates:		171	\$95
Square Footage Adjustment			\$60
Adjustment for Bathroom			(\$30)
Adjustment for Age, Rounded	3 years	@ 0.80% annual	\$20
Total Adjustment, Rounded			\$50

5. Floor of Unit in Building

The subject and the rent comparables were all analyzed based on "base" rents. Thus, no adjustments were necessary for floor of unit within a building.

6. Project Occupancy %

Chapter 7.7 I of the MAP Guide states that when the occupancy rate in a comparable project is significantly less than the long-term occupancy rate estimated for the subject, a downward adjustment should be made to the comparable's rent. If other factors such as condition have had an effect on occupancy, care should be taken to avoid excessive and duplicative adjustments for interdependent factors. The rent grids have taken into consideration individual factors that could have an effect on occupancy and no additional adjustment is made for occupancy.

7. Concessions

Concessions in the market are generally reflected in current market rents. If management finds they have an unusually high vacancy rate in a particular type of unit, a temporary move-in special might be offered. As of the survey date, special rents were utilized rather than concessions. The special rents were utilized on the rent grids.

8. Year Built/Age/Renovation

The comparables were all built at various points in time. An age adjustment was incorporated that takes into consideration based on depreciation incurred as properties age. Two sales were obtained from properties in the same market and at generally the same time frame. The difference in the sale prices reflects the age of the assets. The sales and the annual depreciation is summarized:

Age/Depreciation	Year Built	\$/Unit
Property		
Jasmine at Winters Chapel	1989	\$55,743
Oaks at Holcomb Bridge	1979	\$51,316
Compound Annual Depreciation, Rounded	10	0.80%

The depreciation is applied to each of the rent comparables. The calculation is the difference in the age of the subject and the comparable multiplied by 0.80% multiplied by the comparables rental rate.

9. Square Feet Area

An adjustment is made for differences in size between the subject units and comparable units. An analysis was conducted of similar unit types within the same complex to determine a size adjustment. The size adjustment was estimated as follows:

SF ADJUSTMENT			
Property	Unit Type	SF	Rent
The Columns at Independence	1x1	892	\$915
The Columns at Independence	1x1	944	\$935
	Difference	52	\$20.00
	Total Difference		\$20.00
	SF Adjustment		\$0.38
<b>Conclusion</b>			<b>\$0.35</b>

The square foot adjustment was applied to each of the comparables if they differed in size from the subject unit being compared. If a comparable was larger than the subject then it was adjusted downward. If a comparable was smaller than the subject unit then it was adjusted upward.

$(\text{Subject Unit Square Footage} - \text{Comparable Unit Square Footage}) * \$0.35$
---

10. Number of Bedrooms

A bedroom adjustment is made if the number of bedrooms at the subject is different than the rent comparables. A number of the comparables had to be adjusted for differences in their number of bedrooms. As such upward adjustments had to be made to account for these differences. The adjustment is provided as follows:

<b>BEDROOM ADJUSTMENT</b>			
Property	Unit Type	SF	Rent
The Pines at Willowbrook	2x2	960	\$820
The Pines at Willowbrook	3x2	1,023	\$900
	Difference	63	\$80.00
	SF Adjustment		(\$22.05)
	Remainder is Bedroom		\$57.95
<b>Conclusion</b>			<b>\$60</b>

The adjustment was made by comparing units at the same property that differed only by a bedroom. The difference in square footage was taken into account and removed from the difference in rent. The conclusion of \$60 was applied if a comparable property was deficient by one bedroom and applied twice if it was deficient by two bedrooms.

11. Number of Baths

A bathroom adjustment is made if the number of bathrooms at the subject is different from the rent comparables. The number of bathrooms varied among the subject and some of the comparables utilized. Thus, an adjustment was needed for these differences. It was calculated as shown below:

<b>BATHROOM ADJUSTMENT</b>			
Property	Unit Type	SF	Rent
The Pines at Willowbrook	2x1	935	\$780
The Pines at Willowbrook	2x2	960	\$820
	Difference	25	\$40.00
	SF Adjustment		(\$8.75)
	Remainder is Bathroom		\$31.25
<b>Conclusion</b>			<b>\$30</b>
<b>Conclusion, Half Bathroom</b>			<b>\$15</b>

This adjustment was applied where necessary for discrepancies between the subject and the comparables. It was applied twice or as a half bathroom where necessary.

12. Number of Rooms

Because an adjustment was made for differences in both the number of bedrooms and the number of bathrooms, no adjustment was necessary for this line item.

13. Balcony/Terrace/Patio

The subject offers a balcony, terrace or patio. All of the comparable properties also offer balconies, patios or terraces with each unit type; so, no adjustment was necessary.

14. Garage or Carport

The subject does not include garages or carports in their rental rates. None of the rent comparables provided garages or carports in their basic rent. As such, no adjustments were made for garages or carports.

15. Quality/Condition-Renovation

The subject will be renovated. An adjusted was made to Mission Ridge to reflect the upgrades that have occurred. No properties in Hinesville provided the ability to judge the premium commanded on renovated apartments. Bell Property in Savannah has upgraded apartments and their rent premium is about 12%.

<b>Renovated Rent Premium Analysis</b>		Rent
Bell Property Savannah	Renovated	\$962
Bell Property Savannah	Not Renovated	\$861
Change		\$101
Increase in Value with Renovation		12%

Mission Ridge was adjusted downward for their upgraded units in the “retrospective as is” scenario. The upgraded adjustment is applied in the “as if renovated” rent grids.

16. Equipment

The subject provides an array of equipment within the apartments. The equipment included at the subject property is central AC range/oven, refrigerator, dishwasher (under the “As Renovated” scenario), carpet and blinds. The complex features a recreation area as well. All of the line items being compared are shown below along with whether they are included at the subject:

<b>EQUIPMENT / PROJECT AMENITY COMPARISON</b>	
15. Equipment	
Y	a. A/C
Y	b. Range/Oven
Y	c. Refrigerator
N	d. Disposal
N	e. Microwave
N (Y under “As Renovated” scenario)	f. Dishwasher
N	g. Washer/Dryer
Y/Y	h. Carpet/Blinds
N/Y/N	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room
N/N/N	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center

Adjustments to the rent comparables were made if they provided equipment or complex amenities that were superior or inferior to the subject. For the most part, all of the complexes offered similar unit amenities. All of the comparables were adjusted downward if they provided equipment or amenities that were superior to the subject.

Adjustments for difference in complex amenities were made based on differences in line items i and j. Any type of kitchen equipment of recreation area/fitness room was considered worth \$2, respectively. For

example, the subject property offers a recreation area but does not have a fitness room or pool, so adjustments were made where necessary to account for these differences.

G. Washer/Dryer

Washer and dryers were offered by some of the comparables. Having items that are in high demand such as in-unit washer/dryers allows properties to attain higher rents. As such a downward adjustment of \$45 was made if a comparable offered this equipment. This number was determined by surveying comparable properties in the market. This is shown in the table below:

<b>WASHER AND DRYER</b>	
Colonial Village	\$45
The Links at Georgetown	\$45
The Columns at Independence	\$50
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>\$45</b>

Services

The following are the services available at the subject property and whether or not they are included in base rent.

<b>EQUIPMENT / PROJECT AMENITY COMPARISON</b>	
17. Services	
N/Electric	a. Heat/Type
N/Electric	b. Cook/Type
N/Electric	c. Electricity
N/Electric	d. Water Cold/Hot

The subject provides all electric appliances. The comparables were all similar and as such, not adjusted for services offered.

18. Storage Units

Neither the subject property nor the comparables offered storage units as part of the basic rent, so no adjustment had to be made for this line item.

19. Project Location

The subject property and all of the comparables are located in Hinesville. No location adjustment was applied.

20 Other Services/Amenities:

A. Security Guard / Gated

The subject property did not have gated or secured access. If a comparable did have this feature, a downward adjustment of \$5 was used.

B. Utilities in Rent

The subject will provide water, sewer, trash pickup and pest control in its base rents. Some of the comparable properties did not include these same utilities in their monthly base rents. As such, upward adjustments had to be made. Rates for water/sewer and trash service were collected from comparable properties in these markets. These are shown in the following tables:

<b>WATER/SEWER RATES</b>				
Property	1x1	2x1	2x2	3x2
Colonial Village	\$25	\$30	\$35	\$45
Georgetown Grove	\$20	\$30	\$35	\$45
Georgetown Crossings	\$25	\$25	\$30	-
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>\$20</b>	<b>\$30</b>	<b>\$35</b>	<b>\$45</b>

<b>TRASH ADJUSTMENT</b>			
Property	1x1	2x2	3x2
Georgetown Crossings	\$5	\$5	-
Georgetown Grove	\$8	\$8	\$10
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>\$5</b>	<b>\$5</b>	<b>\$10</b>

These adjustments were applied as necessary to account for differences in utilities depending on the unit type being compared.

**Market Rental Rate Conclusions**

As previously mentioned, two analyses were performed; the “Retrospective As-Is” and “As-Renovated” scenarios. The tables below show the market rent conclusions for the subject, respective of each analysis:

<b>SUBJECT RENT CONCLUSIONS IN COMPARISON TO HUD CENTRAL 60% RANGE-RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
Apartment Unit Type	Comparable Low End of Range	Comparable High End of Range	Central 60% Range	Retrospective As Is Rent
1x1	\$568	\$657	\$586 to \$639	\$635
2x1	\$648	\$716	\$662 to \$702	\$700
3x1	\$695	\$812	\$719 to \$789	\$785
4x1.5	\$819	\$937	\$843 to \$913	\$900

<b>SUBJECT RENT CONCLUSIONS IN COMPARISON TO HUD CENTRAL 60% RANGE-AS RENOVATED</b>				
Apartment Unit Type	Comparable Low End of Range	Comparable High End of Range	Central 60% Range	As If Renovated Rent
1x1	\$648	\$741	\$667 to \$722	\$700
2x1	\$723	\$840	\$747 to \$817	\$810
3x1	\$806	\$942	\$833 to \$915	\$885
4x1.5	\$932	\$1,074	\$960 to \$1045	\$980

The concluded market rents and potential revenue under the “Retrospective As-Is” scenario are shown below:

<b>RENTAL RATES AND REVENUE-RETROSPECTIVE AS IS MARKET</b>				
Apartment Unit Type	Unit Mix	Restricted Rent	Monthly Net	Annual
1x1	32	\$635	\$20,320	\$243,840
2x1	112	\$700	\$78,400	\$940,800
3x1	48	\$785	\$37,680	\$452,160
4x1.5	8	\$900	\$7,200	\$86,400
<b>Total/Weight Average</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>\$718</b>	<b>\$143,600</b>	<b>\$1,723,200</b>

In projecting revenue under the “As-Renovated” scenario, a comparison between the concluded market rents and in place HAP rents was completed. This is shown below:

<b>HAP RESTRICTED RENTS vs AS IF RENOVATED RENTS</b>		
Apartment Unit Type	HAP Rents	As Renovated Market
1x1	\$645	\$700
2x1	\$724	\$810
3x1	\$808	\$885
4x1.5	\$908	\$980

As indicated, the HAP contract rents are below market. The projected revenue under the “As-Renovated” scenario is based on the current, in place HAP rental rates. The revenue is as follows:

<b>RESTRICTED RENTAL RATES AND REVENUE-AS IF RENOVATED</b>				
Apartment Unit Type	Unit Mix	Restricted Rent	Monthly Net	Annual
1x1	32	\$645	\$20,640	\$247,680
2x1	112	\$724	\$81,088	\$973,056
3x1	48	\$808	\$38,784	\$465,408
4x1.5	8	\$908	\$7,264	\$87,168
<b>Total/Weight Average</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>\$739</b>	<b>\$147,776</b>	<b>\$1,773,312</b>

**Laundry Revenue**

The subject has laundry facilities that provide additional income for the property. Laundry revenue was per unit, per month, based on the historical financials. The historical revenue generated by the subject in the use of laundry facilities is shown below:

<b>HISTORICAL LAUNDRY &amp; VENDING – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion	
Per Unit/Month	\$0.00	\$0.03	\$0.17	\$0.15	<b>\$0.20</b>	
Per Unit	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$2	<b>\$2.40</b>	
Revenue	\$0	\$60	\$405	\$370	<b>\$480</b>	

The laundry revenue has been trending upwards since 2010 but generates minimal revenue. Reliance is placed on the historical trend for the projection.

**Miscellaneous Income**

Miscellaneous income can be generated from a number of other sources such as forfeited deposits, damage and repair assessments, late fees, and insufficient funds fees. This revenue was based on the historical trend at the subject. The historical range is shown below:

<b>HISTORICAL MISC REVENUE</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion	
Per Unit/Month	\$3.82	\$4.61	\$4.54	\$4.89	<b>\$4.45</b>	
Per Unit	\$46	\$55	\$54	\$59	<b>\$53</b>	
Revenue	\$9,161	\$11,075	\$10,889	\$11,731	<b>\$10,680</b>	

The conclusion is within the range of the historical operation and is therefore considered reasonable. The stabilized occupancy conclusion is assuming a vacancy of 5%.

**Total Other Revenue-Summary**

The total other income for the subject is the same under both of the scenarios as shown below:

<b>TOTAL OTHER INCOME – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS &amp; AS RENOVATED</b>				
Other Potential Income/Loss:	Units	Monthly Rate		Annual Total
Laundry	200	\$0.20	/Month	\$480
Miscellaneous	200	\$4.45	/Month	\$10,680
<b>Total Other Income:</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>\$4.65</b>	<b>/Month</b>	<b>\$11,160</b>

**Forecasted Stabilized Occupancy**

All of the properties in the market are reporting strong occupancy levels. The subject property has little competition in the area and will continue to report strong occupancies. Occupancy of the subject is therefore forecasted at 95%. The “retrospective as is” occupancy level is based on the market comparables and 93% is utilized.

**Estimate of Effective Gross Income**

The effective gross income calculation for the subject under the “Retrospective As-Is” scenario is presented in the following table:

<b>Raintree Apartments</b>				
<b>REVENUE PROJECTIONS-RETROSPECTIVE AS IS MARKET</b>				
Unit Type	Units	Monthly Rate		93.00% Annual
1x1	32	\$635	/Month	\$243,840
2x1	112	\$700	/Month	\$940,800
3x1	48	\$785	/Month	\$452,160
4x1.5	8	\$900	/Month	\$86,400
Gross Rental Revenue:	200	\$718	/Month	\$1,723,200
Other Potential Income/Loss:				
Laundry & Vending	200	\$0.20	/Month	\$480
Miscellaneous Revenue	200	\$4.45	/Month	\$10,680
Total Other Income:	200	\$4.65	/Month	\$11,160
Gross Income Potential				<b>\$1,734,360</b>
Vacancy Factor				7.0%
Vacancy Amount (Gross Rental Revenue x Vacancy)				(\$121,405)
<b>Effective Gross Income:</b>	200	\$672	/Month	\$1,612,955
<b>EGI Per Unit:</b>				<b>\$8,341</b>

The effective gross income calculation for the subject under the “As-Renovated” scenario is presented in the following:

<b>Raintree Apartments REVENUE PROJECTIONS-AS RENOVATED</b>				
				95.00%
Unit Type	Units	Monthly Rate		Annual
1x1	32	\$645	/Month	\$247,680
2x1	112	\$724	/Month	\$973,056
3x1	48	\$808	/Month	\$465,408
4x1.5	8	\$908	/Month	\$87,168
Gross Rental Revenue:	200	\$739	/Month	\$1,773,312
Other Potential Income/Loss:				
Laundry & Vending	200	\$0.20	/Month	\$480
Miscellaneous Revenue	200	\$4	/Month	\$10,680
Total Other Income:	200	\$4.65	/Month	\$11,160
Gross Income Potential				<b>\$1,784,472</b>
Vacancy Factor				5.0%
Vacancy Amount (Gross Rental Revenue x Vacancy)				(\$89,224)
<b>Effective Gross Income:</b>	200	\$706	/Month	\$1,695,248
<b>EGI Per Unit:</b>				<b>\$8,476</b>

### Historical Income and Expense Analysis

Historical income and expense data was utilized in projecting future expenses. The historical financials are located in the addendum.

### Operating Expenses

In forecasting income and expenses, we also relied upon expense data derived from Income and Expense Comparables.

### Expense Analysis

Expense comparables utilized were considered to represent the best comparables relative to the subject. Our search for expense comparables was based primarily on the location of properties that would operate in a similar manner to the subject. We were able to obtain expense information in sufficient detail to apply them to the Form-HUD-92274.

A brief summary of the income and expense comparables utilized in the analysis are presented in the following table. Detailed descriptions are located in the addenda.

<b>EXPENSE COMPARABLES</b>			
Comparable	1	2	3
Property	Celebration at Sandy Springs	The Links at Georgetown	Walden at Cathem Center
Address	7000 Roswell Road, NE	450 A1 Henderson Boulevard	100 Walden Lane
City	Atlanta	Savannah	Savannah
State	Georgia	Georgia	Georgia
Comparability	Similar	Similar	Similar
Total units	250	360	236

## Trending

An updating percentage is defined as the application of a time adjustment to comparables in order to bring them forward to the same date as the most current comparable. The subject is then compared to the trended expenses. Once the subject's expense estimates have been made, then a final upward trend is applied from the point in time of the expense estimate to the current date. The trending date is the "beginning" period of the financial information utilized. For example, a financial period from January 1 through December 31 would have a "date" of January 1. The subject's expenses are trended forward to July 2013, using annual compounding.

## Advertising

Advertising is generally the cost for local apartment guides, yellow pages, internet web pages and promotional efforts. The comparables provided the following:

<b>TOTAL ADVERTISING &amp; MARKETING –RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Advertising & Marketing	\$223	\$171	\$188	<b>\$173</b>
Projection				<b>\$34,618</b>

The subject did not report advertising expenses. This category was projected for the "retrospective as is" scenario based on market comparables.

## Management Fee

Management fees in the market are 3% to 5%. The management fee for the subject was estimated at 3.0% "retrospective as is" and 6.00% of EGI for the restricted scenario. The expense comparables gave the following in relation to total management fee:

<b>TOTAL MANAGEMENT FEE-RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Management Fee	\$240	\$290	\$400	<b>\$242</b>
	3.00%	3.08%	3.52%	<b>3.00%</b>
Projection				<b>\$48,389</b>

<b>TOTAL MANAGEMENT FEE-AS RENOVATED-RESTRICTED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Management Fee	\$240	\$290	\$400	<b>\$509</b>
	3.00%	3.08%	3.52%	<b>6.00%</b>
Projection				<b>\$101,715</b>

The total management fees for the comparables range from 3.0% to 3.52% of EGI. The projection for the subject is based on the comparables for the "retrospective as is" scenario and on the actual contract for the restricted scenario.

<b>HISTORICAL MANAGEMENT FEE</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion Retrospective As Is	Conclusion-As Renovated-Restricted
Per Unit	\$419	\$464	\$497	\$515	<b>\$242</b>	<b>\$509</b>
Revenue	5.86%	5.77%	5.72%	5.86%	<b>3.00%</b>	<b>6.00%</b>
Expense	\$83,852	\$92,759	\$99,446	\$102,991	<b>\$48,389</b>	<b>\$101,715</b>

General Administrative

The general administrative expense includes the costs related to such items as office supplies, telephones, computer equipment and maintenance, travel, training, accounting, and legal. The comparables provided the following:

<b>TOTAL OTHER GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total General Administrative	\$178	\$189	\$168	<b>\$315</b>
Projection				<b>\$62,941</b>

<b>TOTAL OTHER GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total General Administrative	\$178	\$189	\$168	<b>\$210</b>
Projection				<b>\$41,961</b>

Each comparable has a very similar general administrative cost per unit. The subject’s administrative costs will decline once renovated with the property operated with one central administrative department. Historically, the subject provided the following:

<b>HISTORICAL OTHER-GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</b>					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion
Per Unit	\$263	\$271	\$403	\$339	<b>\$315 / \$210</b>
Expense	\$52,539	\$54,116	\$80,532	\$67,850	<b>\$62,941 / \$41,961</b>

The projection reflects typical costs associated with the property with a reduction in this department as a combined, central office will operate the communities.

**Total Administration**

Total administrative expenses for the comparables compared to the subject’s projection are as follows:

<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Administrative	\$641	\$650	\$755	<b>\$730</b>
Projection				<b>\$145,947</b>

<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Administrative	\$641	\$650	\$755	<b>\$718</b>
Projection				<b>\$143,676</b>

The subject’s projection is slightly above the range set by the comparables for the “retrospective as is” scenario but within the range for the restricted scenario. The projections under the two scenarios are very close and reflect similar total administrative costs. The historical trend is as follows:

<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (ADVERTISING, MANAGEMENT, AND GENERAL)</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	<b>Conclusion Retrospective As Is</b>	<b>Conclusion-As Renovated</b>
Per Unit	\$682	\$735	\$900	\$854	<b>\$730</b>	<b>\$718</b>
Expense	\$136,391	\$147,080	\$179,978	\$170,841	<b>\$145,947</b>	<b>\$143,676</b>

The total projected expense is within the range of the historical trend.

**Utilities**

This category includes all of the costs related to the property owner’s utilities. Utility costs were examined on an individual basis for heat, water/sewer, electric, gas, and garbage removal. The subject includes all of these utilities in its base rental rates. The comparables provide the following:

<b>TOTAL UTILITIES – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
<i>Electricity</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Electricity	\$272	\$178	\$236	<b>\$273</b>
<i>Water/Sewer</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Water/Sewer	\$726	\$214	(\$47)	<b>\$404</b>
<i>Gas</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Gas	\$196	\$17	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
<i>Trash</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Trash	\$75	\$77	\$12	<b>\$210</b>

<b>TOTAL UTILITIES – AS RENOVATED</b>				
<i>Electricity</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Electricity	\$272	\$178	\$236	<b>\$262</b>
<i>Water/Sewer</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Water/Sewer	\$726	\$214	-\$47	<b>\$399</b>
<i>Gas</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Gas	\$196	\$17	\$0	<b>\$0</b>
<i>Trash</i>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Trash	\$75	\$77	\$12	<b>\$210</b>

The subject’s projected expenses for trash pick-up are the same among the two operating scenarios. There was a slight difference in the water/sewer rates, with higher costs being incurred under the “Retrospective As-Is” Market Scenario. Under the “As-Renovated” scenario, the subject will have new water saving/reducing plumbing and bathroom equipment which will reduce the cost of water/sewer utilities. As stated earlier, the subject property receives a tenant reimbursement from each tenant. The following is the historical utility expenses for the property:

<b>HISTORICAL UTILITIES</b>						
<i>Electricity</i>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	<b>Conclusion- Retrospective As Is</b>	<b>Conclusion- As Renovated</b>
Per Unit	\$232	\$236	\$266	\$258	<b>\$273</b>	<b>\$262</b>
Expense	\$46,484	\$47,134	\$53,169	\$51,583	<b>\$54,549</b>	<b>\$52,451</b>
<i>Water/Sewer</i>						
Per Unit	\$312	\$334	\$385	\$393	<b>\$404</b>	<b>\$399</b>
Expense	\$62,389	\$66,892	\$76,984	\$78,510	<b>\$80,775</b>	<b>\$79,726</b>
<i>Gas</i>						
Per Unit	\$13	\$11	\$10	\$8	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Expense	\$2,531	\$2,144	\$2,080	\$1,685	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<i>Trash Removal</i>						
Per Unit	\$146	\$168	\$156	\$201	<b>\$210</b>	<b>\$210</b>
Expense	\$29,121	\$33,666	\$31,110	\$40,166	<b>\$41,961</b>	<b>\$41,961</b>
Projection					<b>\$177,284</b>	<b>\$174,137</b>

Reliance was placed on the properties historical information when projecting utility expenses, as these are often very property specific.

#### Payroll

Payroll expenses were based on the subject's salary information. The following staffing chart was utilized as the basis for the projection of payroll expenses:

<b>PAYROLL AND RELATED – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>	<b>FTE's</b>	<b>Annual</b>	
Manager	\$50,000 /year	1.0	\$50,000
Assistant Manager	\$17.00 /hour	1.0	\$35,360
Leasing Agent	\$12.00 /hour	2.0	\$49,920
Maintenance Director	\$20.00 /hour	1.0	\$41,600
Maintenance Assistant	\$12.50 /hour	2.5	\$65,000
Total FTEs	-	7.5	-
Total Wages			\$241,880

<b>PAYROLL AND RELATED – AS RENOVATED</b>	<b>FTE's</b>	<b>Annual</b>	
Manager	\$50,000 /year	1.0	\$50,000
Assistant Manager	\$17.00 /hour	1.0	\$35,360
Leasing Agent	\$12.00 /hour	1.0	\$24,960
Maintenance Director	\$20.00 /hour	1.0	\$41,600
Maintenance Assistant	\$12.50 /hour	2.0	\$52,000
Total FTEs	-	6.0	-
Total Wages			\$203,920

The following charts contain the payroll projection for the subject in comparison to the expense comparables:

<b>TOTAL PAYROLL &amp; RELATED – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Payroll & Related	\$952	\$885	\$1,067	<b>\$1,209</b>
Projection				<b>\$241,880</b>

<b>TOTAL PAYROLL &amp; RELATED – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Payroll & Related	\$952	\$885	\$1,067	<b>\$1,020</b>
Projection				<b>\$203,920</b>

The historical payroll & related expense history for the subject is shown in the following table:

<b>HISTORICAL PAYROLL</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion – Retrospective As Is	Conclusion – As Renovated
Per Unit	\$1,012	\$1,332	\$1,284	\$1,230	<b>\$1,209</b>	<b>\$1,020</b>
Expense	\$202,313	\$266,494	\$256,877	\$246,013	<b>\$241,880</b>	<b>\$203,920</b>

The projection is based on the staffing and salary positioning at the property under the historical financials. The renovated scenario incorporates the operation of the subject under one common management group thus removing excessive management and maintenance staff.

### Total Operation

The comparable expenses provide the following in regards to total operating costs:

<b>TOTAL OPERATING – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Operating	\$2,342	\$1,530	\$1,336	<b>\$2,096</b>
Projection				<b>\$419,164</b>

<b>TOTAL OPERATING – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Operating	\$2,342	\$1,530	\$1,336	<b>\$1,890</b>
Projection				<b>\$378,057</b>

The projections are very similar under both operating scenarios and are within the range of the comparables. Total historical operation expense for the subject is provided in the following:

<b>TOTAL OPERATION EXPENSES (UTILITIES AND PAYROLL)</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion- Retrospective As Is	Conclusion-As Renovated
Per Unit	\$1,714	\$2,082	\$2,101	\$2,090	<b>\$2,096</b>	<b>\$1,890</b>
Expense	\$342,838	\$416,330	\$420,220	\$417,957	<b>\$419,164</b>	<b>\$378,057</b>

The subject has historically been trending upwards. Reliance was placed on both the historic data and the comparable range when projecting total operating expenses.

Decorating

This category includes all of the expenses associated with the decorating and cleaning of a unit. The subject and the comparables provide the following:

<b>TOTAL DECORATING – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS/AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Decorating	\$122	\$98	\$208	\$0
Projection				\$0

Total decorating for the subject has been incorporated into Contracts. The projection reflects this. Therefore there is no historical data for decorating.

Repairs

Repair expenses can vary widely by the condition of units, common areas, and turnover rates. The subject comparables provide the following:

<b>TOTAL REPAIRS – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS/AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Repairs	\$175	\$99	\$153	\$399
Projection				\$79,726

Total repairs and supplies for the subject are greater than the expense comparables utilized. The historic repair and supply costs are as follows:

<b>HISTORICAL REPAIRS AND SUPPLIES</b>					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion Retrospective As Is/As Renovated
Per Unit	\$121	\$213	\$380	\$527	\$399
Expense	\$24,255	\$42,663	\$76,051	\$105,474	\$79,726

The conclusion reflects long-term costs that will be incurred at the subject property.

Exterminating

The comparables provide the following in regards to exterminating:

<b>TOTAL EXTERMINATING – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS/AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Exterminating	\$0	\$13	\$10	\$0
Projection				\$0

The cost of exterminating has been included in the Contracts category and therefore the projection reflects this. As such, there is no historical data.

Insurance

The comparable properties presented the following for total insurance. The projection for the subject is slightly above of the expense comparables. This is shown below:

<b>TOTAL INSURANCE – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS/AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Insurance	\$163	\$181	\$396	<b>\$404</b>
Projection				<b>\$80,775</b>

The following is the historical insurance expense for the subject:

<b>HISTORICAL INSURANCE</b>					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion – Retrospective As Is/As Renovated
Per Unit	\$363	\$383	\$386	\$386	<b>\$404</b>
Expense	\$72,513	\$76,593	\$77,150	\$77,246	<b>\$80,775</b>

The projection for total insurance is based off of the historical data plus a slightly higher cost estimate.

Grounds Maintenance

The expense comparables provide the following for total grounds maintenance:

<b>TOTAL GROUNDS MAINTENANCE – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS/AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Grounds Maintenance	\$120	\$121	\$286	<b>\$0</b>
Projection				<b>\$0</b>

The historical grounds maintenance for the subject property has been \$0 because it has been included in the category of Contracts. The projection above mirrors this.

Other-Contracts

Other-contracts often include services rendered by way of contract payment for the subject property. This includes unit turnover, decorating, exterminating and ground maintenance. The comparables provided the following:

<b>TOTAL OTHER-CONTRACTS – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Elderly Service	\$0	\$21	\$0	<b>\$682</b>
Projection				<b>\$136,373</b>

<b>TOTAL OTHER-CONTRACTS – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Elderly Service	\$0	\$21	\$0	<b>\$483</b>
Projection				<b>\$96,510</b>

Projections were based purely off historical for the as-is scenario. The renovated scenario has a reduced expense projection as the property will be renovated and deferred maintenance items corrected and obsolete equipment replaced.

<b>HISTORICAL OTHER-CONTRACTS</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	<b>Conclusion Retrospective As Is</b>	<b>Conclusion As Renovated</b>
Per Unit	\$363	\$656	\$468	\$1,141	<b>\$682</b>	<b>\$483</b>
Expense	\$72,672	\$131,134	\$93,690	\$228,219	<b>\$136,373</b>	<b>\$96,510</b>

The renovated scenario is lower because it reflects repairs that will be completed. The conclusions are considered reasonable estimates that reflect long term contract expenses.

### Total Maintenance

The expense comparables provide the following:

<b>TOTAL MAINTENANCE – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Total Maintenance	\$580	\$534	\$1,054	<b>\$1,484</b>
Projection				<b>\$296,873</b>

<b>TOTAL MAINTENANCE – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	<b>Projection</b>
Total Maintenance	\$580	\$534	\$1,054	<b>\$1,285</b>
Projection				<b>\$257,010</b>

The comparables are all below the subject property because of higher insurance costs incurred by the subject property. The following is the total historical maintenance expense for the subject:

<b>TOTAL MAINTENANCE (DECORATING, REPAIRS, EXTERMINATING, INSURANCE, &amp; GROUNDS)</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	<b>Conclusion Retrospective As Is</b>	<b>Conclusion As Renovated</b>
Per Unit	\$847	\$1,252	\$1,234	\$2,055	<b>\$1,484</b>	<b>\$1,285</b>
Expense	\$169,440	\$250,390	\$246,891	\$410,939	<b>\$296,873</b>	<b>\$257,010</b>

The total maintenance expense includes the sum of decorating, repairs, exterminating, insurance, contracts and grounds maintenance. Reliance for these conclusions was placed on the historical data.

### Replacement Reserves

Replacement reserves were estimated at \$300 per unit.

<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>\$60,000</b>
-----------------------	-----------------

### Taxes and Payroll Benefits

Taxes and insurance includes employee payroll taxes, licenses and permits, workers compensation insurance, and health insurance. Reliance for real estate taxes was based on the current assessment in place. Employee taxes, workman's compensation are projected based on the specifics of the property. The projection versus the comparables is provided below:

<b>TOTAL TAXES (INCLUDING REAL ESTATE, PAYROLL AND RELATED BENEFITS) RETROSPECTIVE AS IS/AS IF RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Other Taxes	\$233	\$165	\$272	\$199

The following is the historical total tax data for the subject:

<b>HISTORICAL TOTAL REAL ESTATE, PAYROLL/RELATED BENEFITS EXPENSES</b>					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion Retrospective As Is/As Renovated
Real Estate Taxes	\$521	\$491	\$473	\$487	<b>\$490</b>
Other Taxes	\$167	\$234	\$199	\$210	\$199
Total (Per Unit)	\$687	\$725	\$672	\$697	<b>\$689</b>
Expense	\$137,469	\$144,916	\$134,437	\$139,471	<b>\$137,863</b>

Real estate taxes comprise the bulk of this category. The real estate taxes for the two scenarios were considered similar to the actual assessment in place.

### Overall Expenses

The comparables provide the following in regards to overall expense costs:

<b>TOTAL EXPENSES – RETROSPECTIVE AS IS</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Expenses	\$3,796	\$2,878	\$4,673	<b>\$5,333</b>
Projection				<b>\$1,066,568</b>

<b>TOTAL EXPENSES – AS RENOVATED</b>				
	Comp. 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	Projection
Total Expenses	\$3,796	\$2,878	\$4,673	<b>\$4,883</b>
Projection				<b>\$976,606</b>

The overall historical expenses for the subject are presented in the table below:

<b>HISTORICAL OVERALL EXPENSES</b>						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Conclusion Retrospective As Is	Conclusion As Renovated
Per Unit	\$3,931	\$4,794	\$4,908	\$5,696	<b>\$5,299</b>	<b>\$4,883</b>
Annual Expense	\$786,138	\$958,716	\$981,526	\$1,139,208	<b>\$1,059,847</b>	<b>\$976,606</b>

**Revenue and Expense Summary**

<b>NET OPERATING INCOME SUMMARY</b>		
	<b>As Renovated</b>	<b>Retrospective As Is</b>
Potential Rental Income	\$1,773,312	\$1,723,200
Other Income	\$11,160	\$11,160
Potential Gross Income	\$1,784,472	\$1,734,360
Less: Vacancy and Collection	(\$89,224)	(\$121,405)
Effective Gross Income	\$1,695,248	\$1,612,955
Less: Total Expenses	(\$976,606)	(\$1,059,847)
Net Operating Income	\$718,643	\$553,108

The historical financials followed by the 92273 rent grids for the “As-Renovated” and the “Retrospective As-Is Market” scenarios are provided in the following section.

HISTORICAL FINANCIAL ANALYSIS-RAINTREE												
Units Operating Year	200		200		200		200		200		200	
	Year End December 2009		Year End December 2010		Year End December 2011		Year End December 2012		Retrospective As Is Projection		As Renovated Projection	
	Actual	Per Unit	Actual	Per Unit	Dollars	Per Unit						
<b>Revenues</b>												
Net Rental Income	\$1,621,824	\$8,109	\$1,695,360	\$8,477	\$1,764,480	\$8,822	\$1,793,280	\$8,966	\$1,723,200	\$8,616	\$1,773,312	\$8,867
Laundry & Vending	\$0	\$0	\$60	\$0	\$405	\$2	\$370	\$2	\$480	\$2	\$480	\$2
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$9,161	\$46	\$11,075	\$55	\$10,889	\$54	\$11,731	\$59	\$10,680	\$53	\$10,680	\$53
Vacancy and Collections	(\$199,661)	(\$998)	(\$98,418)	(\$492)	(\$37,150)	(\$186)	(\$47,436)	(\$237)	(\$121,405)	(\$607)	(\$89,224)	(\$446)
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$1,431,324</b>	<b>\$7,157</b>	<b>\$1,608,077</b>	<b>\$8,040</b>	<b>\$1,738,624</b>	<b>\$8,693</b>	<b>\$1,757,945</b>	<b>\$8,790</b>	<b>\$1,612,955</b>	<b>\$8,065</b>	<b>\$1,695,248</b>	<b>\$8,476</b>
<b>Administrative</b>												
1. Adverting	\$0	\$0	\$205	\$1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34,618	\$173	\$0	\$0
2. Management Fee	\$83,852	\$419	\$92,759	\$464	\$99,446	\$497	\$102,991	\$515	\$48,389	\$242	\$101,715	\$509
3. Other - General Administrative	\$52,539	\$263	\$54,116	\$271	\$80,532	\$403	\$67,850	\$339	\$62,941	\$315	\$41,961	\$210
<b>4. Total Administrative</b>	<b>\$136,391</b>	<b>\$682</b>	<b>\$147,080</b>	<b>\$735</b>	<b>\$179,978</b>	<b>\$900</b>	<b>\$170,841</b>	<b>\$854</b>	<b>\$145,947</b>	<b>\$730</b>	<b>\$143,676</b>	<b>\$718</b>
<b>Operating</b>												
5. Elevator Main Exp.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Fuel (Heating & Domestic Hot Water)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Lighting & Misc. Power	\$46,484	\$232	\$47,134	\$236	\$53,169	\$266	\$51,583	\$258	\$54,549	\$273	\$52,451	\$262
8. Water/Utilities	\$62,389	\$312	\$66,892	\$334	\$76,984	\$385	\$78,510	\$393	\$80,775	\$404	\$79,726	\$399
9. Gas/Other Utility Processing & related	\$2,531	\$13	\$2,144	\$11	\$2,080	\$10	\$1,685	\$8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10. Garbage & Trash Removal	\$29,121	\$146	\$33,666	\$168	\$31,110	\$156	\$40,166	\$201	\$41,961	\$210	\$41,961	\$210
11. Payroll	\$202,313	\$1,012	\$266,494	\$1,332	\$256,877	\$1,284	\$246,013	\$1,230	\$241,880	\$1,209	\$203,920	\$1,020
12. Other-Security	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>13. Total Operating</b>	<b>\$342,838</b>	<b>\$1,714</b>	<b>\$416,330</b>	<b>\$2,082</b>	<b>\$420,220</b>	<b>\$2,101</b>	<b>\$417,957</b>	<b>\$2,090</b>	<b>\$419,164</b>	<b>\$2,096</b>	<b>\$378,057</b>	<b>\$1,890</b>
<b>Maintenance</b>												
14. Decorating	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15. Repairs	\$24,255	\$121	\$42,663	\$213	\$76,051	\$380	\$105,474	\$527	\$79,726	\$399	\$79,726	\$399
16. Exterminating	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
17. Insurance	\$72,513	\$363	\$76,593	\$383	\$77,150	\$386	\$77,246	\$386	\$80,775	\$404	\$80,775	\$404
18. Grounds Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
19. Other- Contract Services/Labor	\$72,672	\$363	\$131,134	\$656	\$93,690	\$468	\$228,219	\$1,141	\$136,373	\$682	\$96,510	\$483
<b>20. Total Maintenance</b>	<b>\$169,440</b>	<b>\$847</b>	<b>\$250,390</b>	<b>\$1,252</b>	<b>\$246,891</b>	<b>\$1,234</b>	<b>\$410,939</b>	<b>\$2,055</b>	<b>\$296,873</b>	<b>\$1,484</b>	<b>\$257,010</b>	<b>\$1,285</b>
<b>21. Replacement Reserves</b>									\$60,000	\$300	\$60,000	\$300
<b>Taxes</b>												
23. Real Estate Taxes	\$104,148	\$521	\$98,211	\$491	\$94,666	\$473	\$97,402	\$487	\$98,000	\$490	\$98,000	\$490
24. Personal Property Taxes, Licenses, and Permits	\$812	\$4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
25. Employee Payroll Tax	\$10,816	\$54	\$20,632	\$103	\$19,747	\$99	\$19,323	\$97	\$19,931	\$100	\$19,931	\$100
26. Workers Compensation	\$4,557	\$23	\$6,957	\$35	\$4,405	\$22	\$3,023	\$15	\$4,196	\$21	\$4,196	\$21
27. Employee Benefits	\$17,136	\$86	\$19,116	\$96	\$15,619	\$78	\$19,696	\$98	\$15,735	\$79	\$15,735	\$79
<b>28. Total Taxes</b>	<b>\$137,469</b>	<b>\$687</b>	<b>\$144,916</b>	<b>\$725</b>	<b>\$134,437</b>	<b>\$672</b>	<b>\$139,471</b>	<b>\$697</b>	<b>\$137,863</b>	<b>\$689</b>	<b>\$137,863</b>	<b>\$689</b>
<b>29. Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$786,138</b>	<b>\$3,931</b>	<b>\$958,716</b>	<b>\$4,794</b>	<b>\$981,526</b>	<b>\$4,908</b>	<b>\$1,139,208</b>	<b>\$5,696</b>	<b>\$1,059,847</b>	<b>\$5,299</b>	<b>\$976,606</b>	<b>\$4,883</b>
<b>Net Operating Income</b>	<b>\$645,186</b>	<b>\$3,226</b>	<b>\$649,361</b>	<b>\$3,247</b>	<b>\$757,098</b>	<b>\$3,785</b>	<b>\$618,737</b>	<b>\$3,094</b>	<b>\$553,108</b>	<b>\$2,766</b>	<b>\$718,643</b>	<b>\$3,593</b>

***“Retrospective As-Is Market” Scenario  
Rent Grids***

<b>Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison</b>		<b>Retrospective As-Is Rent Grids-FHA</b>		<b>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</b>		OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)						
				Office of Housing								
				Federal Housing Commissioner								
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>												
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)	Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 5		
1x1	Raintree Apartments	The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyngrove Apartments						
Address	601 Saunders Avenue	501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive						
City	Hinesville, GA 31313	Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313						
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments					
			- +		- +		- +					
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13						
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3		LH/C/Garden/2	\$50.00	Garden/2						
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base		Base		Base						
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%		93%		95%						
7. Concessions	N	N		N		N						
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$183.04)	2003	(\$98.80)	2000	(\$89.60)					
9. Sq. Ft. Area	669	803	(\$47.08)	723	(\$19.08)	525	\$50.23					
10. Number of Bedrooms	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0						
11. Number of Baths	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0						
12. Number of Rooms	4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0						
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y		Y		Y						
14. Garage or Carport	N	N		N		N						
15. Quality	N	N		N		N						
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL						
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y	Y		Y						
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y	Y		Y						
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)					
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)					
	f. Dishwasher	N	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)					
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)		N						
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y			Y/Y						
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)		N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)					
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/N/N	Y/Y/N	(\$4.00)		Y/Y/Y	(\$6.00)				\$2.00	
17. Services	a. Heat/T Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.						
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.						
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.						
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.			N/N/ELEC.						
18. Storage		N	N			N						
19. Project Location		Hinesville	Hinesville			Hinesville						
20. Other	a. Security/Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)		N						
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$20.00		WSTP						
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$880.00		\$650.00		\$700.00						
22. Total Adjustment			(\$274.12)		(\$81.88)		(\$43.38)	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00	
23. Indicated Rent		<input type="checkbox"/> \$606		\$568		\$657		\$0		\$0	\$0	
24. Correlated Subject Rent	\$635	If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.										
Note: \$5.00 added to the three bedroom water charge for the extra bedroom/person					Appraiser's Signature <i>Kay Hancock</i>		Date (mm/dd/yyyy) 7/18/2013		Reviewer's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	

Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison		Retrospective As-Is Rent Grids-FHA				U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Housing Federal Housing Commissioner				OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)			
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>													
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)			Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 5	
2x1	Raintree Apartments			The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyngrave Apartments		Aspen Court		Mission Ridge	
Address	601 Saunders Avenue			501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive		505 Mall Boulevard		802 Frank Cochran Drive	
City	Hinesville, GA 31313			Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313	
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13	
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3		LIHTC Garden/2	\$50.00	Garden/2		Garden/3		Garden/2/TH			
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base		Base		Base		Base		Base		Base	
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%		93%		95%		100%		93%			
7. Concessions	N	N		N		N		N		N		N	
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$213.20)	2003	(\$118.56)	2000	(\$112.00)	1985	(\$5.00)	1983		1983	\$6.48
9. Sq. Ft. Area	944	1,134	(\$66.68)	935	\$2.98	1,106	(\$56.88)	955	(\$4.03)	975	(\$11.03)		
10. Number of Bedrooms	2.0	2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0	
11. Number of Baths	1.0	1.0		1.0		2.0	(\$30.00)	1.0		1.0		1.0	
12. Number of Rooms	5.0	5.0		5.0		6.0		5.0		5.0		5.0	
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
14. Garage or Carport	N	N		N		N		N		N		N	
15. Quality	N	N		N		N		N		N		Y	(\$95.02)
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y		Y
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y		Y
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	N		Y		Y
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	N		N		Y		Y
	f. Dishwasher	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	Y		Y
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N		N		N		N		N
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/N/N		\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/N/N	Y/Y/N	(\$4.00)	Y/Y/Y	(\$6.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N		\$2.00
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
18. Storage	N	N		N		N		N		N		N	
19. Project Location	Hinesville	Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville	
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N		N		N		N		N
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$35.00	WSTP		WSTP		TP	\$30.00	WSTP		WSTP
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$1,025.00		\$780.00		\$875.00		\$625.00		\$810.00			
22. Total Adjustment			(\$308.88)		\$700	(\$79.59)		(\$202.88)		\$22.98			(\$101.56)
23. Indicated Rent		<input type="checkbox"/> \$716											
24. Correlated Subject Rent		\$700.00	If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.										
Note: \$5.00 added to the three bedroom water charge for the extra bedroom/person Appraiser's Signature: <i>Kay Hauck</i> Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 7/18/2013 Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____													

Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison		Retrospective As-Is Rent Grids-FHA		U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Housing Federal Housing Commissioner		OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)								
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>														
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)		Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 5			
3x1	Raintree Apartments		The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyngrove Apartments		Aspen Court		Mission Ridge			
Address	601 Saunders Avenue		501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive		505 Mall Boulevard		802 Frank Cochran Drive			
City	Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313			
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments		Data	Adjustments		Data	Adjustments		Data	Adjustments		
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13			Jul-13			Jul-13			Jul-13			
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3			L.IHT C/Garden/2	\$50.00		Garden/2			Garden/3		Garden/2/TH	
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base			Base			Base			Base		Base	
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%			93%			95%			100%		93%	
7. Concessions	N	N			N			N			N		N	
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$252.72)		2003	(\$136.80)		2000	(\$118.40)		1985	(\$5.00)	1983	\$7.28
9. Sq. Ft. Area	1,097	1,461	(\$127.58)		1,023	\$25.73		1,318	(\$77.53)		955	\$49.53	1,000	\$33.78
10. Number of Bedrooms	3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0			2.0	\$60.00	3.0	
11. Number of Baths	1.0	2.0	(\$30.00)		2.0	(\$30.00)		2.0	(\$30.00)		1.0		2.0	(\$30.00)
12. Number of Rooms	6.0	7.0			7.0			7.0			5.0		7.0	
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y			Y			Y			Y		Y	
14. Garage or Carport	N	N			N			N			N		N	
15. Quality	N	N			N			N			N		Y	(\$106.75)
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL			CENTRAL			CENTRAL		CENTRAL	
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y		Y			Y			Y		Y	
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y		Y			Y			Y		Y	
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)		N		Y	(\$2.00)
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)		N			N		Y	(\$2.00)
	f. Dishwasher	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N			N			N		N	
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y			Y/Y			Y/Y		Y/Y	
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)		N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)		N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/N/N	Y/Y/N	(\$4.00)	Y/Y/Y	(\$6.00)		N/N/N	\$2.00		N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.			N/N/ELEC.			N/N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
18. Storage	N	N			N			N			N		N	
19. Project Location	Hinesville	Hinesville			Hinesville			Hinesville			Hinesville		Hinesville	
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N			N			N		N	
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$55.00	WSTP			WSTP			TP	\$45.00	WSTP	
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$1,215.00			\$900.00			\$925.00			\$625.00		\$910.00	
22. Total Adjustment			(\$419.30)			(\$105.08)			(\$229.93)		\$151.53			(\$97.69)
23. Indicated Rent		<input type="checkbox"/> \$796			<input type="checkbox"/> \$795			<input type="checkbox"/> \$695			<input type="checkbox"/> \$777		<input type="checkbox"/> \$812	
24. Correlated Subject Rent	\$785.00	If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.												
Note: \$5.00 added to the three bedroom water charge for the extra bedroom/person														
					Appraiser's Signature	<i>Ray Fawcett</i>		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	7/18/2013		Reviewer's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	

<b>Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison</b>		<b>Retrospective As-Is Rent Grids-FHA</b>		<b>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</b> Office of Housing Federal Housing Commissioner		OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)									
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>															
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)		Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 6				
4x1.5	Raintree Apartments		The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyngrove Apartments		Aspen Court		Mission Ridge				
Address	601 Saunders Avenue		501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive		505 Mall Boulevard		802 Frank Cochran Drive				
City	Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313				
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments		Data	Adjustments		Data	Adjustments		Data	Adjustments			
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13			Jul-13			Jul-13			Jul-13				
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3			L.IHTC/Garden/2	\$50.00		Garden/2			Garden/3		Garden/2/TH		
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base			Base			Base			Base		Base		
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%			93%			95%			100%		93%		
7. Concessions	N	N			N			N			N		N		
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$252.72)		2003	(\$136.80)		2000	(\$118.40)		1985	(\$5.00)	1983	\$7.28	
9. Sq. Ft. Area	1,243	1,461	(\$76.30)		1,023		\$77.00	1,318	(\$26.25)		955	\$100.80	1,000	\$85.05	
10. Number of Bedrooms	4.0	3.0	\$60.00		3.0	\$60.00		3.0	\$60.00		2.0	\$120.00	3.0	\$60.00	
11. Number of Baths	1.5	2.0	(\$15.00)		2.0	(\$15.00)		2.0	(\$15.00)		1.0	\$15.00	2.0	(\$15.00)	
12. Number of Rooms	7.5	7.0			7.0			7.0			5.0		7.0		
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y			Y			Y			Y		Y		
14. Garage or Carport	N	N			N			N			N		N		
15. Quality	N	N			N			N			N		Y	(\$106.75)	
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL			CENTRAL			CENTRAL		CENTRAL		
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y		Y			Y			Y		Y		
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y		Y			Y			Y		Y		
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)		N	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)		N			N	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	
	f. Dishwasher	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)		Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N			N			N	(\$45.00)	N		
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y			Y/Y			Y/Y		Y/Y		
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)		N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)		N/N/N	(\$7.00)	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/N/N	Y/Y/N	(\$4.00)	Y/Y/Y	(\$6.00)		N/N/N			N/N/N	(\$2.00)		N/N/N	
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			ELECTRIC	
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			ELECTRIC	
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			N/ELEC.			ELECTRIC	
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.			N/N/ELEC.			N/N/ELEC.			ELECTRIC	
18. Storage	N	N			N			N			N		N		
19. Project Location	Hinesville	Hinesville			Hinesville			Hinesville			Hinesville		Hinesville		
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N			N			N		N		
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$55.00	WSTP			WSTP			TP	\$45.00	WSTP		
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$1,215.00		\$900.00		\$925.00		\$925.00			\$625.00		\$910.00		
22. Total Adjustment			(\$293.02)		\$21.20			(\$105.65)			\$217.80		\$937	\$26.58	
23. Indicated Rent			<input type="checkbox"/> \$922		<input type="checkbox"/> \$921			<input type="checkbox"/> \$819			<input type="checkbox"/> \$843		<input type="checkbox"/> \$937		
24. Correlated Subject Rent		\$900.00	If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.												
Note: \$5.00 added to the three bedroom water charge for the extra bedroom/person				Appraiser's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)			Reviewer's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)				
				<i>Kay Hancock</i>		7/18/2013									

***“As-Renovated Market” Scenario  
Rent Grids***

Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison		As-Renovated Rent Grids-FHA		U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development		OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.							
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)	Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3	
1x1	Raintree Apartments	The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyngrove Apartments	
Address	601 Saunders Avenue	501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive	
City	Hinesville, GA 31313	Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313	
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13	
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3		LIHTC/Garden/2	\$50.00	Garden/2	
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base		Base		Base	
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%		93%		95%	
7. Concessions	N	N		N		N	
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$183.04)	2003	(\$98.80)	2000	(\$89.60)
9. Sq. Ft. Area	669	803	(\$47.08)	723	(\$19.08)	525	\$50.23
10. Number of Bedrooms	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0	
11. Number of Baths	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0	
12. Number of Rooms	4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y		Y		Y	
14. Garage or Carport	N	N		N		N	
15. Quality/Condit/Renovation	Y	N	\$103.23	N	\$76.25	N	\$82.11
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL	CENTRAL	
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y		Y	Y	
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y		Y	Y	
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	Y	(\$2.00)
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	N	
	f. Dishwasher	Y	Y		Y	Y	
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N	N	
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y	Y/Y	
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/Y/N	Y/Y/N	(\$2.00)	Y/Y/Y	N/N/N	\$2.00
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.	
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.	
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.	
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.	
18. Storage		N	N		N	N	
19. Project Location		Hinesville	Hinesville		Hinesville	Hinesville	
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N	N	
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$25.00	WSTP	WSTP	
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$880.00		\$650.00		\$700.00	
22. Total Adjustment			(\$161.89)		(\$1.63)	\$40.74	\$0.00
23. Indicated Rent		\$718		\$648		\$741	\$0
24. Correlated Subject Rent		\$700					\$0
<input type="checkbox"/> If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.							
Note: Assumes dishwasher is provided as Renovated		Appraiser's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Reviewer's Signature	
		<i>Jay Faulkner</i>		7/18/2013			
Previous versions are obsolete							

Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison		As-Renovated Rent Grids-FHA		U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Housing Federal Housing Commissioner		OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)					
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>											
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)	Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 5	
2x1	Raintree Apartments	The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wingrove Apartments		Aspen Court		Mission Ridge	
Address	601 Saunders Avenue	501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive		505 Mall Boulevard		802 Frank Cochran Drive (Veterans Prkwy)	
City	Hinesville, GA 31313	Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313	
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13	
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3		LIHTC/Garden/2	\$50.00	Garden/2		Garden/3		Garden/2/TH	
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base		Base		Base		Base		Base	
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%		93%		95%		100%		93%	
7. Concessions	N	N		N		N		N		N	
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$213.20)	2003	(\$118.56)	2000	(\$112.00)	1985	(\$5.00)	1983	\$6.48
9. Sq. Ft. Area	944	1,134	(\$66.68)	935	\$2.98	1,106	(\$56.88)	955	(\$4.03)	975	(\$11.03)
10. Number of Bedrooms	2.0	2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0	
11. Number of Baths	1.0	1.0		1.0		2.0	(\$30.00)	1.0		1.0	
12. Number of Rooms	5.0	5.0		5.0		6.0		5.0		5.0	
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
14. Garage or Carport	N	N		N		N		N		N	
15. Quality/Condit/Renovation	Y	N	\$120.24	N	\$91.50	N	\$102.64	N	\$73.32	Y	
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL	
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y		Y	
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y		Y	
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	Y	(\$2.00)	N		Y	(\$2.00)
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	N		N		Y	(\$2.00)
	f. Dishwasher	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y		Y	
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N	N		N		N	
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y	
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	Y/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/Y/N	Y/Y/N	(\$2.00)	Y/Y/Y	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
18. Storage		N	N		N	N		N		N	
19. Project Location		Hinesville	Hinesville		Hinesville	Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville	
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N	N		N		N	
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$35.00	WSTP	WSTP		TP	\$30.00	WSTP	
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$1,025.00		\$780.00		\$875.00		\$625.00		\$810.00	
22. Total Adjustment			(\$184.64)		\$15.91		(\$98.23)		\$98.29		(\$4.55)
23. Indicated Rent		\$840		\$796		\$777		\$723		\$805	
24. Correlated Subject Rent		\$810	<input type="checkbox"/> If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.								
Note: Assumes dishwasher is provided as Renovated				Appraiser's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Reviewer's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	
				<i>Kay Hancock</i>		7/18/2013					
Previous versions are obsolete											form HUD-92273 (07/2009)

<b>Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison</b>		<b>As-Renovated Rent Grids-FHA</b>		<b>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</b>				OMB Approval No. 2502-0029			
				Office of Housing				(exp. 07/31/2009)			
				Federal Housing Commissioner							
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>											
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)	Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 5	
3x1	Raintree Apartments	The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyngrave Apartments		Aspen Court		Mission Ridge	
Address	601 Saunders Avenue	501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive		505 Mall Boulevard		802 Frank Cochran Drive (Veterans Prkwy)	
City	Hinesville, GA 31313	Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313	
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments
			- +		- +		- +		- +		- +
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13	
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3		LIHTC/Garden/2	\$50.00	Garden/2		Garden/3		Garden/2/TH	
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base		Base		Base		Base		Base	
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%		93%		95%		100%		93%	
7. Concessions	N	N		N		N		N		N	
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$252.72)	2003	(\$136.80)	2000	(\$118.40)	1985	(\$5.00)	1983	\$7.28
9. Sq. Ft. Area	1,097	1,461	(\$127.58)	1,023	\$25.73	1,318	(\$77.53)	955	\$49.53	1,000	\$33.78
10. Number of Bedrooms	3.0	3.0		3.0		3.0		2.0	\$60.00	3.0	
11. Number of Baths	1.0	2.0	(\$30.00)	2.0	(\$30.00)	2.0	(\$30.00)	1.0		2.0	(\$30.00)
12. Number of Rooms	6.0	7.0		7.0		7.0		5.0		7.0	
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
14. Garage or Carport	N	N		N		N		N		N	
15. Quality/Condit./Renovation	Y	N	\$142.53	N	\$105.57	N	\$108.51	N	\$73.32	Y	
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL			CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL	
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y			Y		Y		Y	
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y			Y		Y		Y	
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	N	Y	(\$2.00)
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	N		N	Y	(\$2.00)
	f. Dishwasher	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y	Y	
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N		N		N	N	
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y	Y/Y	
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/Y/N	Y/Y/N	(\$2.00)	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC
18. Storage		N	N		N		N		N		N
19. Project Location		Hinesville	Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N		N		N		N
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$55.00	WSTP		WSTP		TP	\$45.00	WSTP
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$1,215.00		\$900.00		\$925.00		\$625.00		\$910.00	
22. Total Adjustment			(\$272.77)		\$4.50		(\$119.42)		\$226.84		\$11.06
23. Indicated Rent		\$942		\$904		\$806		\$852		\$921	
24. Correlated Subject Rent		\$885	<input type="checkbox"/> If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.								
Note: Assumes dishwasher is provided as Renovated											
					Appraiser's Signature	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Reviewer's Signature	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)			
					<i>Kay Haincheck</i>	7/18/2013					
Previous versions are obsolete											form HUD-92273 (07/2009)

Estimates of Market Rent by Comparison		As-Renovated Rent Grids-FHA				U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development				OMB Approval No. 2502-0029 (exp. 07/31/2009)			
						Office of Housing							
						Federal Housing Commissioner							
<p><b>Public reporting burden</b> for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This information is required to obtain benefits. HUD may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625, which requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions, or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.</p>													
1. Unit Type	2. Subject Property (Address)			Comparable 1		Comparable 2		Comparable 3		Comparable 4		Comparable 5	
4x1.5	Raintree Apartments			The Columns at Independence		The Pines at Willowbrook		Wyn Grove Apartments		Aspen Court		Mission Ridge	
Address	601 Saunders Avenue			501 Burke Drive		841 Willowbrook Drive		942 Grove Point Drive		505 Mall Boulevard		802 Frank Cochran Drive (Veterans Prkwy)	
City	Hinesville, GA 31313			Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313		Hinesville, GA 31313	
Characteristics	Data	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments	Data	Adjustments
3. Effective Date of Rental	Jul-13	Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13		Jul-13	
4. Type of Project/Stories	Garden/2	Garden/3		LIHTC/Garden/2	\$50.00	Garden/2		Garden/3		Garden/2/TH			
5. Floor of Unit in Building	Base	Base		Base		Base		Base		Base			
6. Project Occupancy %	95%	98%		93%		95%		100%		93%			
7. Concessions	N	N		N		N		N		N			
8. Year Built	1984	2010	(\$252.72)	2003	(\$136.80)	2000	(\$118.40)	1985	(\$5.00)	1983		1983	\$7.28
9. Sq. Ft. Area	1,243	1,461	(\$76.30)	1,023	\$77.00	1,318	(\$26.25)	955	\$100.80	1,000	\$85.05		
10. Number of Bedrooms	4.0	3.0	\$60.00	3.0	\$60.00	3.0	\$60.00	2.0	\$60.00	3.0	\$60.00		
11. Number of Baths	1.5	2.0	(\$15.00)	2.0	(\$15.00)	2.0	(\$15.00)	1.0	\$15.00	2.0	(\$15.00)		
12. Number of Rooms	7.5	7.0		7.0		7.0		5.0		7.0			
13. Balc/Terrace/Patio	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y			
14. Garage or Carport	N	N		N		N		N		N			
15. Quality/Condit/ Renovation	Y	N	\$142.53	N	\$105.57	N	\$108.51	N	\$73.32	Y			
16. Equipment	a. A/C	CENTRAL	CENTRAL	CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL		CENTRAL	
	b. Range/Oven	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
	c. Refrigerator	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
	d. Disposal	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)
	e. Microwave	N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)	N		N	Y	(\$2.00)	Y	(\$2.00)
	f. Dishwasher	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y		Y	
	g. Washer/Dryer	N	Y	(\$45.00)	N		N		N			N	
	h. Carpet/Blinds	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y		Y/Y	
	i. Pool/Rec. Area/Fitness Room	N/Y/N	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/Y/Y	(\$2.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00	\$2.00
	j. Clubhouse/Meeting Rooms/Business Center	N/Y/N	Y/Y/N	(\$2.00)	Y/Y/Y	(\$4.00)	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00	N/N/N	\$2.00	\$2.00
17. Services	a. Heat/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	b. Cook/Type	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	c. Electricity	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.	N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
	d. Water Cold/Hot	Y/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.	N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		N/N/ELEC.		ELECTRIC	
18. Storage	N	N		N		N		N		N		N	
19. Project Location	Hinesville	Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville		Hinesville	
20. Other	a. Security/ Gated	N	Y	(\$5.00)	N		N		N		N		
	b. Utilities in Rent	WSTP	P	\$60.00	WSTP		WSTP		TP	\$50.00	WSTP		
21. Unit Rent per Month		\$1,215.00		\$900.00		\$925.00		\$625.00		\$910.00			
22. Total Adjustment			(\$141.49)		\$130.77		\$6.86		\$358.12				\$137.33
23. Indicated Rent		<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,074		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$1,031		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$932		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$983		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$1,047			
24. Correlated Subject Rent		\$980	If there are any Remarks, check here and add the remarks to the back of the page.										
Note: Assumes dishwasher is provided as Renovated					Appraiser's Signature	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Reviewer's Signature		Date (mm/dd/yyyy)			
Note: Assumes half bath added as renovated					<i>Kay Fauchack</i>	7/18/2013							

*Income and Expenses*  
*“Retrospective As-Is Market” Scenario*

Operating Expense Analysis Worksheet										U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Housing Federal Housing Commissioner				OMB Approval No. 2502-0331 (exp. 4/30/2006)			
See Instructions on back and Refer to Handbook 4480.1 for details on completing this form.																	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 16 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.																	
This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625 which requires the Department of to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207,221,223,232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accord with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.																	
Project Name		Raintree Apartments				RETROSPECTIVE AS IS SCENARIO				Project Number		0.00					
City		601 Saunders Avenue				Hinesville				Date of Appraisal (mm/dd/yyyy)		July 18, 2013					
Signature of Processor						Signature of Reviewer						Date (mm/dd/yyyy)					
Project Name		Celebration at Sandy Springs				The Links at Georgetown				Walden at Chatham Center				Raintree Apartments			
Project Number														0.00			
Location		0.00				450 Al Henderson Blvd, Savannah				Walden Lane, Savannah				Hinesville			
Type of Project		Market Rate				Market Rate				Market Rate				AS IS SCENARIO			
No. of Stories		2.00				3.00				3.00				2			
Type of Construction		Wood Frame				Masonry/Wood Frame				Wood Frame				Class D			
No. of Living Units		250				360				236				200			
Age of Project		1969, 2007 R															
Project Unit Composition		BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM
Composition		( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )
No. of Each Type Unit		40	183	27		134	226			83	153			32	112	48	8
Sq. Ft. Each Type Unit		780	1,136	1,350		802	1,216			834	1,245			669	944	1,097	1,243
Average Unit Area		1102				1062				1100				948			
Same Tax Rate as Subject*																	
Effective Date/Updating		1/2011				1/1/2011				2/1/2011				7/18/2013			
Months/Percentage		100	0.2%			100	0.2%			0.00	0.0%						
Same Utility Rate *																	
Equip. & Services Inc. in Rent		1,2,3,4,6,8,				1,2,3,4,5,6,8,21,				1,2,3,4,5,6,8,21				1,2,3,4,5,6,21			
Equipment Included in Rent										Services Included in Rent							
1	Ranges & Refrig.	2	Carpet & Drapes	3	Disposal	10	Gas	11	Heat	12	Cooking	13	Hot Water	14	A/C		
4	Dishwasher	5	Laundry Fac.	6	Air Cond.	14	Heat	15	Cooking	16	Hot Water	17	A/C	18	Lights		
7	Microwave	8	Pool/Tennis	9	Other	19	Heat	20	Hot Water	21	Water	22	Other	19	Cable/internet		

Items of Expense by Units of Comparison ***	Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.					Com late d Expense
1. Advertising	\$223	\$0	\$223	\$171	\$171	\$0	\$171	\$188	\$188	\$0	\$188					\$165
2. Management	\$240	\$0	\$240	\$289	\$290	\$0	\$290	\$400	\$400	\$0	\$400					\$231
3. Other	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$189	\$189	\$0	\$189	\$168	\$168	\$0	\$168					\$300
<b>4. Total Admin.</b>																\$696
5. Elevator	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
6. Fuel	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
7. Lighting & Mis. Power	\$272	\$0	\$272	\$178	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$236	\$236	\$0	\$236					\$260
8. Water	\$726	\$0	\$726	\$214	\$214	\$0	\$214	(\$47)	(\$47)	\$0	(\$47)					\$385
9. Gas	\$196	\$0	\$196	\$17	\$17	\$0	\$17	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
10. Garbage & Trash	\$75	\$0	\$75	\$77	\$77	\$0	\$77	\$12	\$12	\$0	\$12					\$200
11. Payroll	\$952	\$0	\$952	\$884	\$885	\$0	\$885	\$1,067	\$1,067	\$0	\$1,067					\$1,153
12. Other	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$158	\$158	\$0	\$158	\$67	\$67	\$0	\$67					\$0
<b>13. Total Operating</b>																\$1,998
14. Decorating	\$122	\$0	\$122	\$98	\$98	\$0	\$98	\$208	\$208	\$0	\$208					\$0
15. Repairs	\$175	\$0	\$175	\$99	\$99	\$0	\$99	\$153	\$153	\$0	\$153					\$380
16. Exterminating	\$0	\$0		\$13	\$13	\$0	\$13	\$10	\$10	\$0	\$10					\$0
17. Insurance	\$163	\$0	\$163	\$181	\$181	\$0	\$181	\$396	\$396	\$0	\$396					\$385
18. Ground Expenses	\$120	\$0	\$120	\$121	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$286	\$286	\$0	\$286					\$0
19. Other	\$0	\$0		\$21	\$21	\$0	\$21	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$650
<b>20. Total Maint.</b>																\$1,415
<b>20a. Total Operating Expense Exclusive of Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 4, 13 and 20)</b>																\$4,109
20b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13					AnnualRate	2.00%			4.90%
21. Replacement Reserve (Per Applicable Formula from Forms HUD-92264 or HUD-92264B)																300
<b>22. Total Operating Expenses Including Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 20a, 20b and 21)</b>																\$4,610
23. Taxes/Real Estate	\$1,025	(\$535)	\$490	\$922	\$924	(\$434)	\$490	\$1,257	\$1,257	(\$767)	\$490					\$467
24. Personal Prop. Tax	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
25. Emp. Payroll Tax	\$233	\$0	\$233	\$62	\$62	\$0	\$62	\$97	\$97	\$0	\$97					\$95
26. Other	\$0	\$0		\$40	\$40	\$0	\$40	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$20
27. Other	\$0	\$0		\$63	\$63	\$0	\$63	\$174	\$174	\$0	\$174					\$75
<b>27a Total Taxes w/o trend</b>																
27b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13					AnnualRate	2.00%			4.90%
<b>28. Total Taxes (Including Time and Trend) (Sum of Lines 27a and 27b)</b>																\$689
<b>29. Total Expense (Sum of Lines 22 and 28)</b>																\$5,299

*Income and Expenses  
“As-If-Renovated” Scenario*

Operating Expense Analysis Worksheet													U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Housing Federal Housing Commissioner				OMB Approval No. 2502-0331 (exp. 4/30/2006)			
See Instructions on back and Refer to Handbook 4480.1 for details on completing this form.																				
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 16 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.																				
This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625 which requires the Department of to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207,221,223,232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accord with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.																				
Project Name		Raintree Apartments				AS IF RENOVATED				Project Number		0.00								
City		601 Saunders Avenue				Hinesville				Date of Appraisal (mm/dd/yyyy)		July 18, 2013								
Signature of Processor						Signature of Reviewer						Date (mm/dd/yyyy)								
Project Name		Celebration at Sandy Springs				The Links at Georgetown				Walden at Chatham Center				Raintree Apartments						
Project Number														0.00						
Location		0.00				450 AI Henderson Blvd, Savannah				Walden Lane, Savannah				Hinesville						
Type of Project		Market Rate				Market Rate				Market Rate				AS IF RENOVATED						
No. of Stories		2.00				3.00				3.00				2						
Type of Construction		Wood Frame				Masonry/Wood Frame				Wood Frame				Class D						
No. of Living Units		250				360				236				200						
Age of Project		1969, 2007 R																		
Project Unit Composition		BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM			
Composition		( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )			
No. of Each Type Unit		40	183	27		134	226			83	153			32	112	48	8			
Sq. Ft. Each Type Unit		780	1,136	1,350		802	1,216			834	1,245			685	963	1,119	1,265			
Average Unit Area		1102				1062				1100				968						
Same Tax Rate as Subject*																				
Effective Date/Updating		1/2011				1/1/2011				2/1/2011				7/18/2013						
Months/Percentage		100 0.2%				100 0.2%				0.00 0.0%										
Same Utility Rate *																				
Equip. & Services Inc. in Rent		1,2,3,4,6,8,				1,2,3,4,5,6,8,21,				1,2,3,4,5,6,8,21				1,2,3,4,5,6,21						
Equipment Included in Rent						Services Included in Rent														
1	Ranges & Refrig.	2	Carpet & Drapes	3	Disposal	10	Gas	11	Heat	12	Cooking	13	Hot Water	14	A/C					
4	Dishwasher	5	Laundry Fac.	6	Air Cond.	14	Heat	15	Cooking	16	Hot Water	17	A/C	18	Lights					
7	Microwave	8	Pool/Tennis	9	Other	19	Heat	20	Hot Water	21	Water	22	Other	23	Cable/internet					

Items of Expense by Units of Comparison ***	Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.					Correlated Expense
1. Advertising	\$223	\$0	\$223	\$171	\$171	\$0	\$171	\$188	\$188	\$0	\$188					\$0
2. Management	\$240	\$0	\$240	\$289	\$290	\$0	\$290	\$400	\$400	\$0	\$400					\$485
3. Other	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$189	\$189	\$0	\$189	\$168	\$168	\$0	\$168					\$200
<b>4. Total Admin.</b>																\$685
5. Elevator	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
6. Fuel	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
7. Lighting & Mis. Power	\$272	\$0	\$272	\$178	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$236	\$236	\$0	\$236					\$250
8. Water	\$726	\$0	\$726	\$214	\$214	\$0	\$214	(\$47)	(\$47)	\$0	(\$47)					\$380
9. Gas	\$196	\$0	\$196	\$17	\$17	\$0	\$17	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
10. Garbage & Trash	\$75	\$0	\$75	\$77	\$77	\$0	\$77	\$12	\$12	\$0	\$12					\$200
11. Payroll	\$952	\$0	\$952	\$884	\$885	\$0	\$885	\$1,067	\$1,067	\$0	\$1,067					\$972
12. Other	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$158	\$158	\$0	\$158	\$67	\$67	\$0	\$67					\$0
<b>13. Total Operating</b>																\$1,802
14. Decorating	\$122	\$0	\$122	\$98	\$98	\$0	\$98	\$208	\$208	\$0	\$208					\$0
15. Repairs	\$175	\$0	\$175	\$99	\$99	\$0	\$99	\$153	\$153	\$0	\$153					\$380
16. Extenuating	\$0	\$0		\$13	\$13	\$0	\$13	\$10	\$10	\$0	\$10					\$0
17. Insurance	\$163	\$0	\$163	\$181	\$181	\$0	\$181	\$396	\$396	\$0	\$396					\$385
18. Ground Expenses	\$120	\$0	\$120	\$121	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$286	\$286	\$0	\$286					\$0
19. Other	\$0	\$0		\$21	\$21	\$0	\$21	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$460
<b>20. Total Maint.</b>																\$1,225
<b>20a. Total Operating Expense Exclusive of Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 4, 13 and 20)</b>																\$3,712
20b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13			AnnualRate	2.00%					4.90%
21. Replacement Reserve (Per Applicable Formula from Forms HUD-92264 or HUD-92264B)																300
<b>22. Total Operating Expenses Including Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 20a, 20b and 21)</b>																\$4,194
23. Taxes/RealEstate	\$1,025	(\$535)	\$490	\$922	\$924	(\$434)	\$490	\$1,257	\$1,257	(\$767)	\$490					\$467
24. Personal Prop. Tax	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
25. Emp. Payroll Tax	\$233	\$0	\$233	\$62	\$62	\$0	\$62	\$97	\$97	\$0	\$97					\$95
26. Other	\$0	\$0		\$40	\$40	\$0	\$40	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$20
27. Other	\$0	\$0		\$63	\$63	\$0	\$63	\$174	\$174	\$0	\$174					\$75
<b>27a Total Taxes w/o trend</b>																
27b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13			AnnualRate	2.00%					4.90%
<b>28. Total Taxes (Including Time and Trend)(Sum of Lines 27a and 27b)</b>																\$689
<b>29. Total Expense (Sum of Lines 22 and 28)</b>																\$4,883

### Direct Capitalization

There are several methods of deriving a capitalization rate in order to convert anticipated income into a value estimate. The best method is by direct extraction of capitalization rates from market transactions. In this instance, we were able to obtain capitalization rate information from each of the improved sales within the market area. A summary of the overall capitalization rates obtained from sales in the general region follows:

OVERALL CAPITALIZATION RATES	
Pinnacle Place	7.37%
Ponderosa Pines	9.81%
Southland	7.50%

The first three sales are generally higher quality and/or within strong apartment markets and set the low end of the range. The subject’s renovation requirement would place this property in the “value added” asset class.

Activity in the sales arena is from regional buyers who are able to secure financing from their lenders as well as private investment deals. Lenders continue to favor larger investment groups with experience managing apartments. A national survey is presented:

	Class A				Class B				Class C			
	Stabilized	Trend#	Value-Add	Trend#	Stabilized	Trend#	Value-Add	Trend#	Stabilized	Trend#	Value-Add	Trend#
Atlanta	6.50% - 7.00%	↓	8.00% - 8.50%	↑	7.50% - 8.00%	↓	9.00% - 9.50%	↑	8.50% - 10.00%	↓	10.00% - 12.00%	→
Baltimore	7.50% - 8.00%	↓	9.00%	↔	8.75% - 9.25%	↓	10.00%	↔	11.00% - 12.00%	↑	12.00%	↑
Boston	4.75% - 5.25%	↑	5.50% - 6.00%	↑	5.50% - 6.00%	↓	6.50% - 7.00%	↓	6.50% - 7.00%	↓	8.00% - 8.50%	↓
Charlotte	6.50% - 7.00%	↓	7.50% - 8.50%	↔	7.25% - 7.75%	↓	8.50% - 10.00%	↑	9.00% - 10.00%	↔	10.00% - 12.00%	↔
Jacksonville	7.50% - 8.50%	↔	9.00% - 10.00%	↔	9.50% - 10.50%	↑	10.00% - 10.50%	↓	10.50% +	↔	10.50% +	↓
Manhattan	4.00% - 5.00%	↓	5.00% - 6.00%	↔	5.00% - 6.00%	↔	6.00% - 6.50%	↔	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Memphis	8.50% - 9.00%	↔	9.00% - 10.00%	↔	9.00% - 10.00%	↔	10.00% - 11.00%	↑	11.00% - 12.00%	↑	11.00% - 12.00%	↔
Miami	5.50% - 6.25%	↓	6.50% - 7.50%	↓	6.00% - 6.75%	↓	6.75% - 7.75%	↓	6.75% - 7.50%	↓	7.50% - 8.50%	↓
Nashville	6.50% - 7.00%	↓	7.50% - 8.00%	↓	8.00% - 8.50%	↓	8.50% - 9.00%	↓	8.75% - 9.50%	↓	9.50% - 9.75%	↓
Orlando	6.50% - 7.00%	↓	6.00% - 8.00%	↔	7.00% - 8.50%	↔	8.00% - 9.00%	↑	8.50% - 9.50%	↑	9.50% - 10.00%	↑
Philadelphia	7.00% - 7.75%	↔	7.50% - 8.25%	↔	8.50% - 9.00%	↔	9.00% - 9.50%	↔	9.00% - 9.50%	↔	9.50% - 10.00%	↔
Pittsburgh	7.00% - 7.50%	↓	8.00% - 8.50%	↔	8.50% - 9.00%	↔	9.50% - 10.50%	↔	10.50% - 11.00%	↔	11.00% - 12.00%	↔
Raleigh	6.50% - 7.50%	↓	8.00% - 8.50%	↔	8.50% - 9.00%	↑	9.00% - 9.50%	↔	9.00% - 10.00%	↔	9.50% - 10.50%	↓
Tampa	6.50% - 7.50%	↔	7.50% - 8.50%	↓	8.00% - 9.25%	↓	8.75% - 9.75%	↓	9.25% - 10.25%	↓	9.75% - 10.75%	↓
Washington, DC	4.75% - 5.75%	↑	5.50% - 6.50%	↑	6.00% - 7.50%	↑	6.50% - 7.50%	↔	7.00% - 8.00%	↓	8.00% - 9.50%	↓

\* Compared to 1st half 2012

The subject “retrospective as is” would be considered a Class C Value Added asset. Therefore, the 8.5% to 12.00% range would be reasonable.

**Band of investment**— this method of building an overall rate is based on the basic market-derived components plus investor perceptions that formulate capitalization rates. These are the return of and on the investment (payback of financing) as well as the return “of” and “on” the equity (equity dividend rate). Equity dividend rates were typically not available from the sales because of a lack of sufficient information regarding financing arrangements for the purchases. We have reviewed the industry for prevailing equity return requirements. Given the property’s management requirement, location, age, and

condition, we believe that an equity dividend rate of 7% to 9% will be required to attract a suitable investor.

<b>Raintree Apartments</b>					
<b>BAND OF INVESTMENT AND DEBT COVERAGE RATIO</b>					
Mortgage Interest Rate					4.25%
Amortization Term					37.5
Loan to Value Ratio					80.0%
Debt Coverage Ratio					1.20
Equity Divided Rate					8.00%
<b>BAND OF INVESTMENT</b>					
Debt Portion (includes MIP)	80%	x	0.0584	=	0.0467
Equity Portion	20%	x	0.0800	=	0.0160
					6.27%
<b>DEBT COVERAGE</b>	80%	x	1.2	x	0.0534
					5.12%

The band of investment and debt coverage models do not account for the secondary location of the subject since they are calculated off interest rates, debt coverage and equity dividends. Reliance was not placed on these models when determining the capitalization rate.

#### Conclusion/Overall Rate Analysis

In considering all factors, the hypothetical "Retrospective As Is Market" value estimate is as follows

<b>MARKET VALUE ESTIMATE SUMMARY</b>	
<b>HYPOTHETICAL ASSUMPTION</b>	
	Retrospective As Is Market
Potential Rental Income	\$1,723,200
Other Income	\$11,160
Potential Gross Income	\$1,734,360
Less: Vacancy and Collection	(\$121,405)
Effective Gross Income	\$1,612,955
Less: Total Expenses	(\$1,059,847)
Net Operating Income	\$553,108
Divided by Overall Rate	10.00%
Estimated Value	\$5,531,075
<b>Total "Retrospective As-Is" Value (Rounded)</b>	<b>\$5,500,000</b>
Per Unit	\$27,500

### Final Value Estimate

The purpose of this appraisal was to estimate the hypothetical “Retrospective As-Is” market value of the fee simple interest in the subject. The value concluded via the income approach is provided as follows:

Raintree Apartments	
VALUE RECONCILIATION	
Approach to Value	Retrospective As Is-Market Hypothetical Assumption
Land Value	\$960,000
Income Approach	\$5,500,000
Sales Comparison	\$5,500,000
Reconciliation	<b>\$5,500,000</b>

The **cost approach** is the sum of the land value and the cost new of the improvements less accrued depreciation. The cost approach is based on the premise that an informed, rational investor/purchaser would pay no more for an existing property than it would cost him to reproduce a substitute property with the same utility without undue delay. The Cost Approach provides an excellent valuation method for recently constructed or proposed improvements as well as unique or special purpose property types in which improved sales or comparable leases are not readily available. The subject is older and the cost approach provides no reliability to value.

The **income approach** is based on the premise that a prudent investor would pay no more for the subject property than they would for another investment with similar risk and return characteristics. Since the value of an investment can be considered equal to the present worth of anticipated future benefits in the form of dollar income or amenities, this approach estimates the present value of the net income that the property is capable of producing. This amount is capitalized at a rate that should reflect risk to the investor and the amount of income necessary to support debt service or the mortgage requirement. The income approach provides a good indication of value.

The **sales comparison approach** (market approach) is the process of comparing prices paid for properties having a satisfactory degree of similarity to the subject property adjusted for differences in time, location, and physical characteristics. This approach is based upon the principle of substitution, which implies that a prudent purchaser will not pay more to buy a property than it would cost him to buy a comparable substitute property in a similar location. The sales comparison approach provided a good check on value derived via the income approach.

Each technique or approach to value has its strengths and weaknesses, depending largely on the type of property being appraised and the quality of available data. In most instances, one or more of these approaches will produce a more reliable value indication than the other approach or approaches.

The final step in the appraisal process is the reconciliation and correlation of all of the value indications into a final value estimate. This step usually begins with a discussion of the merits and demerits of each approach and an analysis of the reliability of the data used in each approach. It concludes with the statement of final value estimate. In this instance, only the income approach was utilized in forming reliable market value indications for the subject property.

As a result of our investigation into those matters affecting market value, and by virtue of our experience and training, we estimated that the “**Retrospective As-Is**” market value of the fee simple interest in the subject effective July 18, 2013 was:

**HYPOTHETICAL RETROSPECTIVE “AS-IS” MARKET VALUE  
FIVE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS  
(\$5,500,000)**

**NOI-As Renovated**

The Net Operating Income for the subject property in an “As-Renovated” scenario is given in the following table:

<b>NET OPERATING INCOME SUMMARY</b>	
	As Renovated
Potential Rental Income	\$1,773,312
Other Income	\$11,160
Potential Gross Income	\$1,784,472
Less: Vacancy and Collection	(\$89,224)
Effective Gross Income	\$1,695,248
Less: Total Expenses	(\$976,606)
Net Operating Income	\$718,643

*ADDENDUM A*

*SUBJECT INFORMATION*

- A. For Section 223(f). The property must be evaluated under two scenarios: a) the “hypothetical market value” of the property without regard to any Section 8 project based subsidies, rent restrictions or LIHTC, and b) a debt service analysis that considers all Section 8 project based subsidies and other low income rent restrictions must be performed. Two independent Section C rent schedules must be prepared, one for a hypothetical market rent estimate and one that recognizes all rent restrictions and subsidies.
1. Criteria 3 Market Value: The appraiser must ignore the Section 8 contract rents, tax exempt bond or LIHTC restricted rents when determining market value and the income to be capitalized for a determination of market value for the purposes of determining Section K, Form HUD-92264, and Criteria 3 Form HUD-92264-A Value. To be consistent, the appraiser must use a market capitalization rate and must assume market rents in the income approach to value. Note that the comparable sales approach to value must be completed without regard to Section 8 or LIHTC awards.
  2. Criteria 5 Debt Service Analysis: In calculating net operating income to be used for Criteria 5 Debt Service, rent restrictions must be observed. For the Criteria 5 debt service analysis, the Line 6, Form HUD-92264-T rents must be used. This applies to projects receiving LIHTCs that may use either tax exempt bond or market-rate financing.
  3. Form HUD-92264T for LIHTC projects without Section 8: Follow existing form instructions. Processing will be based upon the lesser of Lines 1, 4 or 5.
  4. Form HUD-92264T for Section 8 Project Based Assistance without LIHTC:
    - a. Enter the market rent by comparison on Line 1
    - b. Enter Personal Benefit Expenses on Line 2
    - c. Line 3 is Not Applicable
    - d. Line 4 is Not Applicable
    - e. Enter the Project Based Section 8 Contract Rent on Line 5
    - f. Subtract Line 2 from Line 5 (if applicable)
    - g. Process using the lesser of Line 1 or Line 5
  5. Form HUD-92264T for Section 8 Project Based Assistance with LIHTC:
 

The LIHTC rent must be recorded but is not used as a limiting criterion because the total income to the project is the LIHTC rent combined with the Section 8 rent, so that the actual amount of rental income to the project will be the Project Based Section 8 rent, as follows.

2 Bedroom Section 8 Contract Rent	\$850/Month
2 Bedroom LIHTC Rent limit	\$350/Month
Resident’s Rent Obligation to Project:	\$350/Month
Section 8 Payment to Project:	\$500/Month
Total Income to Project	\$850/Month
- B. Fee Income. If additional fees for project amenities are mandatory for all residents, the mandatory fee income from restricted units must be excluded from the calculation of net income. The mandatory fee income from non-restricted units may be included if these amenity fees are indicated by comparable properties in the market and it must be explained in the remarks section of Form HUD-92264.
- C. Expenses/Fees: Properties with LIHTC restricted units will commonly have a higher operating expense ratio per unit than market rate properties, which may be due to increased administrative costs for tax credit compliance monitoring, performing resident income certifications and staffing to provide on-site resident services. Estimating operating expenses for projects that are to be funded through the sale of LIHTC, requires the analysis of LIHTC comparables if available, and consultation with other experts (i.e. appraisers and property managers) in the context of current

market conditions which should consider the size of the project and unit mix. Utility expense unit rent adjustments in LIHTC projects may be estimated by the analysis of actual costs supplied by the developer, the utility company or by use of the Section 8 utility allowances.

1. If the property has the same operating expenses under LIHTC or Project Based Section 8 operation as it would under market rate operation, enter expenses as usual.
2. If a property has different expense needs as a subsidized property, the expenses used for Criteria 3 must be market rate expenses and the expenses used for Criteria 5 debt service shall be the actual expenses under its' proposed usage. This will insure that the Criteria 5 - debt service analysis of the HUD 92264a is calculated based on the actual estimate of the rent restricted NOI for the property.
3. Audit Fee no Longer Recognized. With the elimination of the requirement for an audited cost certification for mortgage insurance transactions with LIHTC, assuming the ratio of loan proceeds to the actual cost of the project is less than 80 percent, the audit fee will no longer be recognized as an allowable cost in the Total Estimated Replacement Cost of Project, Section G line 66 Form HUD-92264.

D. Sections 220 and 221(d) Site Value and "As Is" Value:

The site value of land in new construction or the "As Is" value in substantial rehabilitation cases is to be estimated using a capitalization rate and property NOI as if the units and the property were unrestricted and market rate, without considering: a) any additional value that may be attributable to subsidies available to the project or any LIHTCs or other tax benefits the property will receive, or b) any value reduction due to any NOI or value limitations caused by regulatory agreements or affordability restrictions imposed by any subsidy program or tax regulation. This valuation methodology permits sponsors to acquire property at its market value for new construction or rehabilitation of affordable housing. The value attributable to the presence of LIHTCs diminishes over time and is not always freely transferable, and thus should not be taken into consideration.

- E. Income Limits. The review appraiser must ascertain that the correct income limits are employed in calculating the maximum LIHTC rents and in completing Form HUD-92264-T. HERA modified HUD's income limit methodology for calendar years after 2008 to require HUD to increase applicable area median incomes by the amount area median incomes rise, even if the HUD-determined area median incomes would be frozen under HUD's 2007 and 2008 income limit methodology. For LIHTC, HERA defines area median income in rural areas as the greater of the area median income and the national non-metropolitan median income, effective for income determinations made after date of HERA enactment, as applicable only to 9 percent LIHTC developments.


## Legal Description

### EXHIBIT "A"


All that certain tract or parcel of land situate, lying and being in the 17th G.M. District of Liberty County, Georgia, and being in the City of Hinesville, containing 24.68 acres, more or less, and being described as follows, to-wit: Commencing at a point at the intersection of the western right of way of General Screven Way with the Southerly right of way of the proposed road as shown on the plat hereinafter referred to and running South 80 degrees 52' West a distance of 348.4 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, thence running North 88 degrees 35' West a distance of 1878.67 feet to a point; thence running North 54 degrees 49' East a distance of 1769.87 feet to a point; thence running along the arc of a curve along the right of way of the Fort Stewart Railroad a distance of 1168.74 feet to the point of beginning. Said tract of land being triangular in shape and being bounded as follows: On the Northeast by the Westerly right of way of the Fort Stewart Railroad; on the South by lands of Glenn Bryant, Charles Jones and A. W. Tyson; and on the Northwest by the Fort Stewart Reservation. For a more complete description of said land, reference is hereby made to that certain plat of survey made and prepared by Earl F. Floyd, Georgia Registered Land Surveyor #1349, dated July 22, 1980.

## Site Plan/General Layout

A site plan of the subject property is shown below:



# Flood Map



***ADDENDUM B***  
***COMPARABLES***

***LAND SALES***

**LAND SALE NO. 1**

<b>Property Type:</b>	Vacant Land			
<b>Project Name:</b>	<b>Independence Place</b>			
<b>Address:</b>	<b>County:</b>			
West 15th Street	Liberty			
Hinesville, GA				
<b>Parcel:</b>	035C001			
<b>Sale Data:</b>				
<b>Grantor</b>	Horse Creek Partners, LLC			
<b>Grantee</b>	Independence Place Fort Stewart, LLC			
<b>Sale Date</b>	April-07			
<b>OR Book/Page</b>	035C001			
<b>Property Rights</b>	Fee Simple			
<b>Condition of Sale</b>	Arm's Length			
<b>Financing</b>	Cash to Seller			
<b>Sale History</b>	N/A			
<b>Verification</b>	Representative of Developer, Public Records			
<b>Consideration</b>	\$1,420,120			
<b>Land Data:</b>				
<b>Topography</b>	Generally level			
<b>Utilities</b>	All available			
<b>Dimensions</b>	N/A			
<b>Shape</b>	Irregular			
<b>Frontage</b>	West 15th Street			
<b>Access</b>	West 15th Street			
<b>Gross Land Size (acres)</b>	41.57			
<b>Useable Land Size (acres)</b>	27.44			
<b>Useable Land Size (sf)</b>	1,195,286			
<b>Purpose</b>	Apartments			
<b>Planned Units</b>	264			
<b>Density</b>	6.35			
<b>Zoning</b>	Multi-Family			
<b>Legal Conforming</b>	Yes			
<b>Indicators:</b>				
<b>Sale Price/Gross Acre</b>	\$34,162			
<b>Sale Price/Net Acre</b>	\$51,754			
<b>Sale Price/Gross SF</b>	\$1.19			
<b>Sale Price/Unit</b>	\$5,379.24			
<b>Comments:</b>				

Land Sale 3 was purchased for the development of Rice Creek Apartments. This site sold for \$1,853,000 in March 2008. The site is located north of the Pooler submarket and is west of Interstate 95. This property is made up of 16.65 acres and offers good access and exposure along Georgia State Road 21. This development consists of 240 units. Land Sale Three represents a sale that was somewhat affected by the economic downturn when lending was beginning to tighten. The land is located to the north of the subject and is considered to be slightly inferior regarding location.

**LAND SALE NO. 2**

<b>Property Type:</b>	Multi Family Land			
<b>Project Name:</b>	<b>Savannah Highlands</b>			
<b>Address:</b>	<b>County:</b>			
2170 Benton Boulevard Savannah, GA	Chatham			
<b>Parcel:</b>	2-1016-02-48			
<b>Sale Data:</b>				
<b>Grantor</b>	Beach Highlands, LLC			
<b>Grantee</b>	Savannah Highlands LLC			
<b>Sale Date</b>	November-09			
<b>OR Book/Page</b>	3450/217			
<b>Property Rights</b>	Fee Simple			
<b>Condition of Sale</b>	Arm's Length			
<b>Financing</b>	Cash to Seller			
<b>Sale History</b>	N/A			
<b>Verification</b>	Public Records	Jay Boaen County Appraiser verified		
<b>Consideration</b>	\$1,489,600			
<b>Land Data:</b>				
<b>Topography</b>	Generally level			
<b>Utilities</b>	All available			
<b>Dimensions</b>	N/A			
<b>Shape</b>	Irregular			
<b>Frontage</b>	Benton Boulevard			
<b>Access</b>	Benton Boulevard			
<b>Gross Land Size (acres)</b>	21.28			
<b>Useable Land Size (acres)</b>	21.28			
<b>Useable Land Size (sf)</b>	926,957			
<b>Purpose</b>	MF Residential			
<b>Planned Units</b>	222			
<b>Density</b>	10.43			
<b>Zoning</b>	Multifamily			
<b>Legal Conforming</b>	Yes			
<b>Indicators:</b>				
<b>Sale Price/Gross Acre</b>	\$70,000			
<b>Sale Price/Net Acre</b>	\$70,000			
<b>Sale Price/Gross SF</b>	\$1.61			
<b>Sale Price/Unit</b>	\$6,710			
<b>Comments:</b>	Land Sale 1 was purchased for the development of Savannah Highlands Apartments. The property was purchased in November 2009 for a price of \$1,489,600. The site is located at 2170 Benton Boulevard, Savannah, Georgia. The property was developed with 222 market-rate units. Land Sale One represents a newer sale and was purchased at a time where lending became constricted due to the economic downturn. The land is located within the Pooler submarket and is generally located in a similar location relative to the same major highways and community support services as the subject. The property was purchased with a phased concept. The Sale was able to purchase the land for a reduced price due to understanding that the site work would carry a higher cost to do both phases.			

**LAND SALE NO. 3**

**Property Type:** Multi Family Land  
**Project Name:** Villas at Park Avenue

**Address:** 505 Pooler Parkway  
Savannah, Ga  
**County:** Chatham

**Parcel:** 5-0017A-01-095

**Sale Data:**

**Grantor** South Godley Enterprises  
**Grantee** Villas Pooler Partners, LL  
**Sale Date** 10/19./2011  
**OR Book/Page** N/A  
**Property Rights** Fee Simple  
**Condition of Sale** Arm's Length  
**Financing** Cash to Seller  
**Sale History** N/A  
**Verification** Cushman and Wakefield

**Consideration** \$1,445,000

**Land Data:**

**Topography** Generally level  
**Utilities** All available  
**Dimensions** N/A  
**Shape** Irregular

**Gross Land Size (acres)** 17.00  
**Useable Land Size (acres)** 17.00  
**Useable Land Size (sf)** 740,520  
**Purpose** MF Residential  
**Planned Units** 238  
**Density** 14.00  
**Zoning** Multifamily  
**Legal Conforming** Yes

**Indicators:**

**Sale Price/Gross Acre** \$85,000  
**Sale Price/Net Acre** \$85,000  
**Sale Price/Gross SF** \$1.95  
**Sale Price/Unit** \$6,071

**Comments:**

Land Sale 2 was purchased for the development of Villas at Park Avenue. The property was purchased in October 2011 for a purchase price of \$1,445,000. The site contains 17 acres.

***RENT COMPARABLES***

**SUBJECT PROPERTY**

**RAINTREE APARTMENTS**

<b>Property Name</b>	Raintree Apartments
<b>Address</b>	601 Saunders Avenue
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA
<b>Date</b>	July-13
<b># of Units</b>	200
<b>Year Built/Renovated</b>	1984
<b>Type</b>	Section 8
<b>Occupancy</b>	99%
<b>Tenant Characteristics</b>	1
	1
<b>Verification</b>	1
<b>Phone</b>	912-876-0906
<b>By</b>	1



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Rent/SF	Concessions	Range
1x1	32		680	\$769	\$1.13		
2x1	112		957	\$866	\$0.90		
3x1	48		1,113	\$983	\$0.88		
4x1.5	8		1,260	\$1,122	\$0.89		
Total/Average	200		962	\$889	\$0.94		

**Concessions**

<b>Duration</b>	No Concessions
<b>Concessions</b>	

**Unit Amenities:**

**Property Amenities:**

<b>Carpet (C)</b>	Yes	<b>Central A/C</b>	Yes	<b>Clubhouse</b>	Yes	<b>Laundry</b>	Yes
<b>Blinds (B)</b>	Yes	<b>Range Oven</b>	Yes	<b>Business Center</b>	No	<b>Gated</b>	No
<b>Balcony/Patio</b>	Yes	<b>Refrigerator</b>	Yes	<b>Fitness Room</b>	No	<b>Car Wash</b>	No
<b>Ceiling Fan</b>	Yes	<b>Disposal</b>	No	<b>Pool</b>	No	<b>Security Officer</b>	No
<b>Outside Storage</b>	No	<b>Microwave</b>	No	<b>Spa</b>	No	<b>Elevator</b>	No
<b>Screened Porch</b>	No	<b>Dishwasher</b>	No	<b>Rec Area</b>	Yes		
<b>Security System</b>	No	<b>Washer/Dryer</b>	No				
<b>Fireplace</b>	No	<b>Washer/Dryer Conn.</b>	Yes				
<b>Garage or Carport</b>	No						

**Utilities Included:**

**Services:**

**Market Information:**

<b>Water</b>	Yes	<b>Cook Type</b>	No/E	<b>Annual Turnover</b>			
<b>Sewer</b>	Yes	<b>Heat/Type</b>	No/E	<b>Leasing Pace</b>			
<b>Trash</b>	Yes	<b>Electricity</b>	No	<b>Annual Chg. In Rents</b>			
<b>Pest Control</b>	Yes	<b>Water Cold/Hot</b>	No				
<b>Cable</b>	No						
<b>Internet</b>	No						

**NORTHGATE APARTMENTS**

Property Name	Northgate Apartments
Address	804 Frank Cochran Drive
City, State Zip	Hinesville, GA 31313
Date	July-13
# of Units	80
Year Built/Renovated	1982
Type	Section 8
Occupancy	98%
Tenant Characteristics	1
	1
Verification	1
Phone	912-369-8279
By	1



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Rent/SF	Concessions	Range
2x1		48		\$680			
3x1.5		16		\$838			
4x2		8		\$913			
Total/Average							

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions
Concessions	

**Unit Amenities:**

**Property Amenities:**

Carpet (C)	Yes	Central A/C	Yes	Clubhouse	No	Laundry	Yes
Blinds (B)	Yes	Range Oven	Yes	Business Center	No	Gated	No
Balcony/Patio	Yes	Refrigerator	Yes	Fitness Room	No	Car Wash	No
Ceiling Fan	Yes	Disposal	No	Pool	No	Security Officer	No
Outside Storage	No	Microwave	No	Spa	No	Elevator	No
Screened Porch	No	Dishwasher	No	Rec Area	No		
Security System	No	Washer/Dryer	No				
Fireplace	No	Washer/Dryer Conn.	Yes				
Garage or Carport	No						

**Utilities Included:**

**Services:**

**Market Information:**

Water	Yes	Cook Type	No/E	Annual Turnover			
Sewer	Yes	Heat/Type	No/E	Leasing Pace			
Trash	Yes	Electricity	No	Annual Chg. In Rents			
Pest Control	Yes	Water Cold/Hot	No				
Cable	No						
Internet	No						

**BAYTREE APARTMENTS**

Property Name	Baytree Apartments
Address	217 Baytree Street
City, State Zip	Hinesville, GA 31313
Date	July-13
# of Units	60
Year Built/Renovated	1983
Type	Section 8
Occupancy	95%
Tenant Characteristics	1
	1
Verification	1
Phone	912-369-8255
By	1



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Rent/SF	Concessions	Range
1x1	4	60%	642				
2x1	3	60%	849				
2x1	37	60%	849				
3x2	16	60%	1,054				
Total/Average	60		890				

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions
Concessions	

**Unit Amenities:**

**Property Amenities:**

Carpet (C)	Yes	Central A/C	Yes	Clubhouse	No	Laundry	Yes
Blinds (B)	Yes	Range Oven	Yes	Business Center	No	Gated	No
Balcony/Patio	Yes	Refrigerator	Yes	Fitness Room	No	Car Wash	No
Ceiling Fan	Yes	Disposal	No	Pool	No	Security Officer	No
Outside Storage	No	Microwave	No	Spa	No	Elevator	No
Screened Porch	No	Dishwasher	No	Rec Area	Yes		
Security System	No	Washer/Dryer	No				
Fireplace	No	Washer/Dryer Conn.	No				
Garage or Carport	No						

**Utilities Included:**

**Services:**

**Market Information:**

Water	Yes	Cook Type	No/E	Annual Turnover			
Sewer	Yes	Heat/Type	No/E	Leasing Pace			
Trash	Yes	Electricity	No	Annual Chg. In Rents			
Pest Control	Yes	Water Cold/Hot	No				
Cable	No						
Internet	No						

**THE COLUMNS**

<b>Property Name</b>	The Columns
<b>Address</b>	501 Burke Drive
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA
<b>Verification:</b>	Ellie
<b>Phone:</b>	912-320-4788
<b>By:</b>	MJ
<b>Date:</b>	July-13
<b>Year Built</b>	2010
<b># of Units</b>	222
<b>Type</b>	Garden
<b>Occupancy</b>	98%
<b>Tenant Characteristics</b>	Market-Rate
<b>Achieving Max Rents (tax crdt)</b>	NA



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Concessions	Range
1/1	24		803	\$880	\$1.10	
1/1	30		892	\$915	\$1.03	
1/1	24		944	\$935	\$0.99	
2/1	24		1,134	\$1,025	\$0.90	
2/2	48		1,180	\$1,125	\$0.95	
2/2	48		1,227	\$1,150	\$0.94	
3/2	24		1,461	\$1,215	\$0.83	
Total/Average	222		1110	N/A	\$0.96	N/A

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions
Concessions	

**Unit Amenities:**

**Property Amenities:**

Carpet (C)	Yes	Central A/C	Yes	Clubhouse	Yes	Laundry	No
Blinds (B)	Yes	Range Oven	Yes	Business Center	Yes	Gated	Yes
Balcony/Patio	Yes	Refrigerator	Yes	Fitness Room	Yes	Car Wash	No
Ceiling Fan	No	Disposal	Yes	Pool	Yes	Security Officer	No
Outside Storage	No	Microwave	Yes	Spa	No	Elevator	No
Screened Porch	No	Dishwasher	Yes	Tennis Court	No	Playground	Yes
Security System	No	Washer/Dryer	Yes	Racquetball	No	Picnic Area	Yes
Fireplace	No	Washer/Dryer Conn.	Yes	Basket Ball	No		
Garage or Carport	No						

**Utilities Included:**

**Services Included:**

**Market Information:**

Water	No	Cook Type	No/E	Annual Turnover	
Sewer	No	Heat/Type	No/E	Leasing Pace	
Trash	No	Electricity	No	Annual Chg. In Rents	
Pest Control	Yes	Water Cold/Hot	C/H		
Cable	No				
Internet	No				

**Premiums/Options:**

Type	\$	# of Units Available	Total Units	% Occupied	Additional Premium Information
Storage		Available			
W/D		Included in rent			
Det. Garages		Available			
View					
Floor					
Carports					

**Comments:**

According to the leasing agent residents are mostly military, DOD and teachers.

**THE PINES AT WILLOWBROOK**

<b>Property Name</b>	The Pines at Willowbrook
<b>Address</b>	841 Willowbrook Drive
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA 31313
<b>Verification:</b>	Cynthia
<b>Phone:</b>	912-877-2162
<b>By:</b>	Mike
<b>Date:</b>	July-13
<b>Year Built</b>	2003
<b># of Units</b>	80
<b>Type</b>	Garden/2
<b>Occupancy</b>	93%
<b>Tenant Characteristics</b>	Market & Restricted (50% & 60% AMI)
<b>Achieving Max Rents (tax crdt)</b>	Yes



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Rents 50% AMI	Rents 60% AMI	Market	Range
1x1			723	\$398	\$491.00	\$650	
2x1			935	\$468	\$579.00	\$780	
2x2			960	\$468	\$579.00	\$820	
3x2			1,023	\$534	\$664.00	\$900	
Total/Average							

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions
Concessions	

**Unit Amenities:**

<b>Carpet (C)</b>	Yes	<b>Central A/C</b>	Yes
<b>Blinds (B)</b>	No	<b>Range Oven</b>	Yes
<b>Balcony/Patio</b>	Yes	<b>Refrigerator</b>	Yes
<b>Ceiling Fan</b>	Yes	<b>Disposal</b>	Yes
<b>Outside Storage</b>	No	<b>Microwave</b>	Yes
<b>Screened Porch</b>	No	<b>Dishwasher</b>	Yes
<b>Security System</b>	No	<b>Washer/Dryer</b>	No
<b>Fireplace</b>	No	<b>Washer/Dryer Conn.</b>	Yes
<b>Garage or Carport</b>	No		

**Property Amenities:**

<b>Clubhouse</b>	Yes	<b>Laundry</b>	Yes
<b>Business Center</b>	Yes	<b>Gated</b>	No
<b>Fitness Room</b>	Yes	<b>Car Wash</b>	No
<b>Pool</b>	No	<b>Security Officer</b>	No
<b>Spa</b>	No	<b>Elevator</b>	No
<b>Tennis Court</b>	No	<b>Playground</b>	Yes
<b>Racquetball</b>	No	<b>Picnic Area</b>	No
<b>Basket Ball</b>	No		

**Utilities Included:**

<b>Water</b>	Yes	<b>Cook Type</b>	No/E
<b>Sewer</b>	Yes	<b>Heat/Type</b>	No/E
<b>Trash</b>	Yes	<b>Electricity</b>	No
<b>Pest Control</b>	Yes	<b>Water Cold/Hot</b>	C/H
<b>Cable</b>	No		
<b>Internet</b>	No		

**Market Information:**

<b>Annual Turnover</b>	
<b>Leasing Pace</b>	
<b>Annual Chg. In Rents</b>	

**Premiums/Options:**

Type	\$	# of Units Available	Total Units	% Occupied	Additional Premium Information
<b>Storage</b>					
<b>W/D</b>					
<b>Det. Garages</b>					
<b>View</b>					
<b>Floor</b>					
<b>Carports</b>					

**Comments:**

This property is also one of the newer in the Hinesville market. Amenities are good and are comparable to other market rate properties in the market. The leasing agent indicated they are full with a wait list. They have rents at Market, 50% and 60% AMI

**WYNGROVE APARTMENTS**

<b>Property Name</b>	Wyngrove Apartments
<b>Address</b>	942 Grove Point Dr.
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA 31313
<b>Verification:</b>	Leasing Agent
<b>Phone:</b>	(912)-368-6105
<b>By:</b>	MJ
<b>Date:</b>	July-13
<b>Year Built</b>	2000
<b># of Units</b>	140
<b>Type</b>	Garden/2
<b>Occupancy</b>	95%
<b>Tenant Characteristics</b>	Market-Rate
<b>Achieving Max Rents (tax crdt)</b>	NA



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Concessions	Range
1x1	32		525	\$700	\$1.33	
2x2	88		1,106	\$875	\$0.79	
3x2	20		1,318	\$925	\$0.70	
Total/Average	140		1003	\$842	\$0.90	

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions
Concessions	

**Unit Amenities:**

Carpet (C)	Yes	Central A/C	Yes
Blinds (B)	Yes	Range Oven	Yes
Balcony/Patio	Yes	Refrigerator	Yes
Ceiling Fan	Yes	Disposal	Yes
Outside Storage	No	Microwave	No
Screened Porch	Yes	Dishwasher	Yes
Security System	No	Washer/Dryer	No
Fireplace	No	Washer/Dryer Conn.	Yes
Garage or Carport	No		

**Property Amenities:**

Clubhouse	No	Laundry	Yes
Business Center	No	Gated	Yes
Fitness Room	No	Car Wash	No
Pool	No	Security Officer	No
Spa	No	Elevator	No
Tennis Court	No	Playground	No
Racquetball	No	Picnic Area	Yes
Basket Ball	No		

**Utilities Included:**

Water	Yes	Cook Type	No/E
Sewer	Yes	Heat/Type	No/E
Trash	Yes	Electricity	No
Pest Control	Yes	Water Cold/Hot	C/H
Cable	No		
Internet	No		

**Market Information:**

Annual Turnover	
Leasing Pace	
Annual Chg. In Rents	

**Premiums/Options:**

Type	\$	# of Units Available	Total Units	% Occupied	Additional Premium Information
Storage					
W/D					
Det. Garages					
View					
Floor					
Carports					

**Comments:**

Wyngrove offers few community amenities but has a lot of unit amenities. Built in 2000 and is in average to good condition.

**MISSION RIDGE**

<b>Property Name</b>	Mission Ridge	
<b>Address</b>	802 Frank Cochran Drive	
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA	
<b>Verification:</b>	Michelle	
<b>Phone:</b>	912-368-5715	
<b>By:</b>	M.J. Kopakin	
<b>Date:</b>	July-13	
<b>Year Built</b>	1983/2011 Ren.	
<b># of Units</b>	54	
<b>Type</b>	TH/2	
<b>Occupancy</b>	93%	50.22
<b>Tenant Characteristics</b>	Market-Rate	
<b>Achieving Max Rents (tax crdt)</b>	NA	



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Base Market Rent	\$/SF	Rent with W/S	\$/SF
2x1	30		975	\$780	\$0.80	\$810	\$0.83
2x1.5	18		1,000	\$880	\$0.88	\$910	\$0.91
3x2	6		1,000	\$880	\$0.88	\$910	\$0.91
Total/Average	54		986	\$824	\$0.84		

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions						
Concessions							

**Unit Amenities:**

Carpet (C)	Yes	Central A/C	Yes
Blinds (B)	Yes	Range Oven	Yes
Balcony/Patio	Yes	Refrigerator	Yes
Ceiling Fan	No	Disposal	Yes
Outside Storage	No	Microwave	Yes
Screened Porch	Yes	Dishwasher	Yes
Security System	No	Washer/Dryer	No
Fireplace	No	Washer/Dryer Conn.	Yes
Garage or Carport	No		

**Property Amenities:**

Clubhouse	No	Laundry	No
Business Center	No	Gated	No
Fitness Room	No	Car Wash	No
Pool	No	Security Officer	No
Spa	No	Elevator	No
Tennis Court	No	Playground	No
Racquetball	No	Picnic Area	No
Basket Ball	No		

**Utilities Included:**

Water	Yes	Cook Type	No/E
Sewer	Yes	Heat/Type	No/E
Trash	No	Electricity	No
Pest Control	Yes	Water Cold/Hot	C/H
Cable	No		
Internet	No		

**Market Information:**

Annual Turnover	
Leasing Pace	
Annual Chg. In Rents	

**Premiums/Options:**

Type	\$	# of Units Available	Total Unit:	% Occupied	Additional Premium Information
Storage					
W/S	\$30	Included in Rent Above			
Det. Garages					
View					
Floor					
Carports					

**Comments:**

The property has energy efficient windows which reduce the electrical cost for each tenant. They also provide a reduced cost on internet and cable because of an agreement with the local provider Comcast. The property was originally built in 1985 but underwent a substantial rehab project in 2010. All units were re-done and new appliances and amenities added.

**Independence**

<b>Property Name</b>	Independence Place
<b>Address</b>	1500 Independence Place Dr
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA
<b>Verification:</b>	Tania
<b>Phone:</b>	912-877-2270
<b>By:</b>	Michael Perry
<b>Date:</b>	July-13
<b>Year Built</b>	2010
<b># of Units</b>	264
<b>Type</b>	Market Rate
<b>Occupancy</b>	66%
<b># Rooms</b>	524



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Concessions	Range
1/1	44			\$1,049		
2/2	208			\$1,159		
4/4	16			\$1,409		
Total/Average	268			\$1,156		

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions
Concessions	

**Unit Amenities:**

Carpet (C)	Yes	Central A/C	Yes
Blinds (B)	Yes	Range Oven	Yes
Balcony/Patio	Yes	Refrigerator	Yes
Ceiling Fan	Yes	Disposal	Yes
Outside Storage	Yes	Microwave	Yes
Screened Porch	No	Dishwasher	Yes
Security System	No	Washer/Dryer	Yes
Fireplace	No	Washer/Dryer Com.	Yes
Garage or Carport	No		

**Property Amenities:**

Clubhouse	Yes	Laundry	No
Business Center	Yes	Gated	Yes
Fitness Room	Yes	Car Wash	Yes
Pool	Yes	Security Officer	No
Spa	No	Elevator	No
Tennis Court	No	Playground	Yes
Racquetball	No	Picnic Area	Yes
Basket Ball	Yes		

**Utilities Included:**

Water	Yes
Sewer	Yes
Trash	Yes
Pest Control	Yes
Cable	Yes
Internet	Yes

**Services Included:**

Cook Type	Elect
Heat/Type	Elect
Electricity	Yes
Water Cold/Hot	C/H
Furniture	Yes

**Market Information:**

Annual Turnover	
Leasing Pace	
Annual Chg. In Rents	

**Premiums/Options:**

Type	\$	# of Units Available	Total Units	% Occupied	Additional Premium Information
Storage	\$20		64		
W/D					
Det. Garages	\$55		72		
View					
Floor					
Carports					

**Comments:**

This property leases by the room. They have roommates matching programs. The rents are all inclusive including furniture and utilities. This property will typically operate near capacity. They lost a brigade in late 2012 and have not recovered from the loss. They are attempting to market to the local community.

**WEDGEWOOD AND ASPEN COURT**

<b>Property Name</b>	Wedgewood and Aspen Court	
<b>Address</b>	939 South Main Street	
<b>City, State Zip</b>	Hinesville, GA	
<b>Verification:</b>	LaWanna Webster, Manager	
<b>Phone:</b>	912-368-2244	
<b>By:</b>	Chris Hamblen	
<b>Date:</b>	June-13	
<b>Year Built</b>	1982	
<b># of Units</b>	72	48/24
<b>Type</b>	TH	
<b>Occupancy</b>	77%/100%	
<b>Tenant Characteristics</b>	Market-Rate	
<b>Achieving Max Rents (tax crdt)</b>	NA	



**Floor Plans:**

Bed/Bath	Units	Type or Name	SQFT	Market Rent	Concessions	Range
2/1.5	48	Wedgewood -Townhome	960	\$625	\$0.65	
2/1	24	Asphen Court-Flat	955	\$625	\$0.65	
Total/Average	72		958	N/A	\$0.65	N/A

**Concessions**

Duration	No Concessions					
Concessions						

**Unit Amenities:**

**Property Amenities:**

<b>Carpet (C)</b>	Yes	<b>Central A/C</b>	Yes	<b>Clubhouse</b>	No	<b>Laundry</b>	Yes
<b>Blinds (B)</b>	Yes	<b>Range Oven</b>	Yes	<b>Business Center</b>	No	<b>Gated</b>	No
<b>Balcony/Patio</b>	Yes	<b>Refrigerator</b>	Yes	<b>Fitness Room</b>	No	<b>Car Wash</b>	No
<b>Ceiling Fan</b>	No	<b>Disposal</b>	Yes	<b>Pool</b>	No	<b>Security Officer</b>	No
<b>Outside Storage</b>	No	<b>Microwave</b>	No	<b>Spa</b>	No	<b>Elevator</b>	No
<b>Screened Porch</b>	No	<b>Dishwasher</b>	Yes	<b>Tennis Court</b>	No	<b>Playground</b>	Yes
<b>Security System</b>	No	<b>Washer/Dryer</b>	No	<b>Racquetball</b>	No	<b>Picnic Area</b>	No
<b>Fireplace</b>	No	<b>Washer/Dryer Conn.</b>	Yes	<b>Basket Ball</b>	No		
<b>Garage or Carport</b>	No						

**Utilities Included:**

**Services Included:**

**Market Information:**

<b>Water</b>	No	<b>Cook Type</b>	No/E	<b>Annual Turnover</b>			
<b>Sewer</b>	No	<b>Heat/Type</b>	No/E	<b>Leasing Pace</b>			
<b>Trash</b>	Yes	<b>Electricity</b>	No	<b>Annual Chg. In Rents</b>			
<b>Pest Control</b>	Yes	<b>Water Cold/Hot</b>	C/H				
<b>Cable</b>	No						
<b>Internet</b>	No						

**Premiums/Options:**

Type	\$	# of Units Available	Total Units	% Occupied	Additional Premium Information
Storage					
W/D					
Det. Garages					
View					
Floor					
Carports					

**Comments:**

These are two sister properties with a central playground as the main amenity. Aspen Court is fully occupied with a wait list. They allow pets at Aspen Court. According to the property manager most residents work locally or are military There was a deployment at the end of December and they are slowly regaining occupancy.

***IMPROVED SALES***

**PINNACLE PLACE**



<b>Name/Address</b>		<b>Study Area:</b>	
Pinnacle Place		Hephzibah	
500 Caldwell Dr.			
Hephzibah, GA 30815		<b>County</b>	
		Richmond	
<b>Verification:</b>	Wilkinson Pinnacle Place LLC		
<b>Phone:</b>	770-952-4200		
<b>By:</b>	Mark Holmes		
<b>Folio</b>	140-0-266-00-0	<b>Year Built</b>	1987/2005R
<b>Grantor</b>	Stonemark Management	<b>Net SF</b>	118,200
<b>Grantee</b>	Wilkinson Pinnacle Place LLC	<b># of Units</b>	120
<b>Sale Price</b>	\$4,382,500	<b>Type</b>	Garden-Style
<b>Sale Date</b>	April-11	<b>Condition</b>	Good

<b>Floor Plans:</b>					
<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Unit Mix</b>	<b>Size(s.f.)</b>	<b>Rent</b>	<b>Rent/S.F.</b>	
1/1	16	740	\$555	\$0.75	
2/2	72	975	\$635	\$0.65	
3/2	32	1,130	\$750	\$0.66	
Total/Average	120	985	\$655	\$0.67	

<b>Financial Considerations:</b>					
Financing	Cash to Seller				
Condition of Sale	Arm's Length				
Recorded Document	Deed				
Book/Page	1300/261				
Price/Unit	\$36,521				
Price/SF	\$37.08				
Occupancy	95%				
Effective Gross Income	\$886,785				
Expenses	(\$563,949)	64%			
NOI	\$322,836				
EGIM	4.94				
OAR	7.37%				

**Comments:**  
 This is a garden style apartment complex and is located in Hephzibah, GA. The property was built in 1987 and renovated in 2005 and has 120 units. The property includes typical amenities for an apartment. The property sold in April 2011 for \$4,382,500 or \$36,521 per unit. Occupancy at the time of sale was 95%. The actual cash flow and the buyer's anticipated operating performance were provided. The cap rate of 8.05% is based on actual financials and includes a management fee and replacement reserves of \$250/unit.

**GLYNN PINES I, II**



<b>Name/Address</b>	Ponderosa	<b>Study Area:</b>	<b>Glynn Pines</b>
Glynn Pines I, II	Ponderosa Forest 4920 Laroche Ave Savannah, GA 31404 912-232-4252		
<b>Verification:</b>	Broker		
<b>Phone:</b>	818-808-0600		
<b>By:</b>	Kay Kauchick, MAI		

<b>Folio</b>		<b>Year Built</b>	1979, 1978, 1980
<b>Grantor</b>	Ponderosa Forest & Glynn Pines	<b>Net SF</b>	103,680
<b>Grantee</b>	GH Capital	<b># of Units</b>	144
<b>Sale Price</b>	\$4,050,000	<b>Type</b>	Garden, Section 8
<b>Sale Date</b>	March-12	<b>Condition</b>	Average

**Floor Plans:**

<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Unit Mix</b>	<b>Size(s.f.)</b>	<b>Rent</b>	<b>Rent/S.F.</b>
Glynn Pines I One Bed	46	602	542	\$0.90
Glynn Pines II One Bed	26	602	550	\$0.91
Glynn Pines I Two Bed	8	734	601	\$0.82
Glynn Pines II Two Bed	8	734	625	\$0.85
Ponderosa-1 Bed	16	680	\$539	\$0.79
Ponderosa 2 Bed	24	865	\$596	\$0.69
Ponderosa 3 Bed	16	1,055	\$680	\$0.64
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>\$575</b>	<b>0.82</b>

**Financial Considerations:**

Financing	Cash to Seller
Condition of Sale	Arm's Length
Recorded Document	Deed
Book/Page	
Price/Unit	\$28,125
Price/SF	\$39.06
Occupancy	100%
Effective Gross Income	\$989,881
Expenses	(\$592,533)
NOI	\$397,348
EGIM	4.09
OAR	9.81%

**Comments:**

Glynn Pines I has 54 units and Glynn Pines II has 34 units with a Section 8 Elderly Contract. The purchase price was \$4,050,000 that included \$150,000 allocated for repairs.

**SOUTHLAND HEIGHTS APARTMENTS**



<b>Name/Address</b>		<b>Study Area:</b>	
Southland Heights Apartments 113 Highway 27 East Americus, GA 31709		Americus	
<b>Verification:</b>	Love Properties, Inc.-Roy Wright	<b>County:</b>	
<b>Phone:</b>	678-336-6303	Sumter	
<b>By:</b>	Jon Hurt		

<b>Folio</b>	338-70	<b>Year Built</b>	1973
<b>Grantor</b>	Southland Heights Apartments LLC	<b>Net SF</b>	83,482
<b>Grantee</b>	Southland Heights Apartments Inc.	<b># of Units</b>	89
<b>Sale Price</b>	\$2,250,000	<b>Type</b>	Garden
<b>Sale Date</b>	July-12	<b>Condition</b>	Good

<b>Floor Plans:</b>				
<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Unit Mix</b>	<b>Size(s.f.)</b>	<b>Rent</b>	<b>Rent/S.F.</b>
Studio	1	600	\$420	\$0.70
1x1	32	875	\$395	\$0.45
2x1	24	950	\$435	\$0.46
2x1.5 TH	24	975	\$500	\$0.51
3x2.5	8	1,100	\$595	\$0.54
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>\$452</b>	<b>\$0.48</b>

<b>Financial Considerations:</b>				
Financing	Cash to Seller			
Condition of Sale	Arm's Length			
Recorded Document	Deed			
Book/Page	1261/218			
Price/Unit	\$25,281			
Price/SF	\$26.95			
Occupancy	99%			
Effective Gross Income	\$478,289			
Expenses	(\$309,539)	65%		
NOI	\$168,750			
EGIM	4.70			
OAR	7.50%			

**Comments:**  
 This is a garden style apartment complex and is located in Americus, GA. The property was built in 1973 and has 89 units. The roofs were replaced in 2010 and the property is in good condition. No major capital expenditures were made after sale. The property includes typical amenities for an apartment including a pool. The property sold in July 2012 for \$2,250,000 or \$25,281 per unit. Occupancy at the time of sale was 99% which is typical. The cap rate of 7.50% is based on actual financials and includes a management fee and replacement reserves of \$250/unit.

***ADDENDUM C***

***HUD FORMS***

This form is in compliance with the requirements of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice for written reports, except where the Jurisdictional Exception is invoked to allow for minor deviations, as noted throughout.  
 Additional technical direction is contained in the HUD Handbooks referenced in the lower right corner.

**Application Processing Stage**  SAMA  Feasibility (Rehab)  Firm  
**Property Rights Appraised**  Fee Simple  Leasehold

Project Name: Raintree Apartments Project Number:

**Purpose.** This appraisal evaluates the subject property as security for a long-term insured mortgage. Included in the appraisal (consultation for Section 221) are the analyses of market need, location, earning capacity, expenses, taxes, and warranted cost of the property.  
**Scope.** The Appraiser has developed, and hereunder reports, conclusions with respect to: feasibility; suitability of improvements; extent, quality, and duration of earning capacity; the value of real estate proposed or existing as security for a long-term mortgage; and several other factors which have a bearing on the economic soundness of the subject property.

**A. Location and Description of Property**

1. Street Nos. 2. Street 3. Municipality  
 601 Saunders Avenue Hinesville  
 4a. Census Tract No. 4b. Placement Code 4c. Legal Description (Optional) 5. County 6. State and Zip Code  
 101 Liberty Georgia 31313

7. Type of Project  Highrise  2 - 5 sty. Elev. 8. No. Stories 9a. Foundation 9b. Basement Floor  
 Elevator(s)  Walkup  Row House  Slab on Grade  Full Basement  Structural Slab  
 Detached  Semi-detached  Town House  Partial Basement  Crawl Space  Slab on Grade

10.  Proposed  Existing 11. Number of Units Revenue Non Revenue 12. No. of 13a. List Accessory Bldgs. and Area  
 Existing 200 0 200

13b. List Recreational Facilities and Area  
 On site management, laundry, play area Area (s.f.):

**13c. Neighborhood Description**

Location  Urban  Suburban  Rural Present Land Use 15% 1 Family  % 2 to 4 Family  
 Built Up  Fully Developed  Over 75%  25% to 75%  Under 25% 20% Multifamily  % Condo/Coop  
 Growth Rate  Rapid  Steady  Slow 65% Commer.  % Industrial  
 Property Values  Increasing  Stable  Declining % Vacant  
 Demand/Supply  Shortage  In Balance  Oversupply Change in Use  Not Likely  Likely  Taking Place  
 Rent Controls  Yes  No  Likely From to

Predominant Occupancy  Owner  Tenant <10% Vacant

Description of Neighborhood. (Note: Race and racial composition of the neighborhood are not appraisal factors.) Describe the boundaries of the neighborhood and those factors, favorable or unfavorable, that affect marketability, including neighborhood stability, appeal, property conditions, vacancies, rent control, etc.  
 The subject is located near the entrance to Ft. Stewart. The property is set back off the main street with a protected landscaped barrier. The neighborhood is residentially dominated to the south. The north is the installation.

**Site Information**

14. Dimensions ft. by ft. or 1,075,061 sq. ft 15a. Zoning (if recently changed, submit evidence)  
 R-A-1: Multi-Family Dwelling  
 15b. Zoning Compliance  Legal  Illegal  Legal nonconforming (Grandfathered use)  No zoning  
 15c. Highest and Best Use as Improved  Present Use  Proposed Use  Other use (explain)  
 15d. Intended M/F Use (summarize: e.g., Market Rent: Hi - Med. - Lo-End; Rent Subsidized; Rent Restricted with or without Subsidy; Applicable Percentages)  
 Market rent medium

**Building Information**

16a. Yr. Built 16b.  Manufactured Housing  Conventionally Built  Modules  Components  
 1984  
 17a. Structural System 17b. Floor System 17c. Exterior Finish 18. Heating/A/C System  
 Gable & Hip Slab on grade Wood / Stucco / Brick Central/Electric

B. Additional Information Concerning Land or Property		AS-RENOVATED	
19. Date Acquired	20. Purchase Price	21. Additional Costs Paid or Accrued	22. If Leasehold, Annual Ground Rent N/A
		23a. Total Cost	23b. Outstanding Balance
24b. Has the Subject Property been sold in the past 3 years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If "Yes," explain:			
Between Seller and Buyer Business			
25. Utilities	Public	Community	Distance from Site
Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ft.
Sewers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ft.
26. Unusual Site Features			
<input type="checkbox"/> Cuts	<input type="checkbox"/> Fills	<input type="checkbox"/> Rock Formations	<input type="checkbox"/> Erosion
<input type="checkbox"/> High Water Table	<input type="checkbox"/> Retaining Walls	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor Drainage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None
Other (Specify)			
C. Estimate of Income (Attach forms HUD-92273, 92264-T, as applicable)			
27. No. of Each Family Type Unit	Rentable Living Area (Sq. Ft.)	Composition of Units	Unit Rent per Mo. (\$)
(a)	32.00	669	1x1
(b)	112.00	944	2x1
(c)	48.00	1,097	3x1
(d)	8.00	1,243	4x1.5
28. Total Estimated Rentals for All Family Units			\$147,776.00
29. Number of Parking Spaces	Offstreet Parking and Other Non-Commercial Ancillary Income (Not Included in Unit Rent)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Attended	Open Spaces	total, with	@ \$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Self Park	Covered Spaces	total, with	@ \$
<input type="checkbox"/> Garages	Laundry	Sq. Ft. or Living Units	@ \$
Total Spaces	Other		
309	Laundry & Vending		per month = \$ 40.00
	Miscellaneous Revenue		per month = \$ 890.00
	Other		per month = \$
	Total Monthly Ancillary Income		\$ 930
30. Commercial Income (Attach Documentation)			
Area-Ground Level	0.00	sq. ft. @ \$	0.00
Other Levels	0.00	sq. ft. @ \$	0.00
Other	0.00	sq. ft. @ \$	0.00
Total Monthly Commercial Income			\$ -
31. Total Estimated Monthly Gross Income at 100 Percent Occupancy			\$148,706
32. Total Annual Rent (Item 31 x 12 months)			\$ 1,784,472
33. Gross Floor Area	Sq. Ft.	34. Net Rentable Residential Area	Sq. Ft.
		189,640	
36. Non-Revenue Producing Space		35. Net Rentable Commercial Area	
Type of Employee	No. Rms.	Composition of Unit	Location of Unit in Project
36a. Personal Benefit Expense (PBE) (May produce additional revenue and expenses to be considered above and below.)			
Tenant/Employee-Paid Utilities	Type(s)	Monthly Cost	\$ -
Landlord/Employer-Paid Utilities	Type(s)	Monthly Cost	\$ -
Page 2 of 8		form HUD-92264 (8/95)	
Previous editions are obsolete		ref Handbooks 4465.1 & 4480.1	

**D. Amenities and Services Included in Rent** (Check and circle appropriate items; fill-in number where indicated) "As-Renovated"

37a. Unit Amenities				37b. Project Amenities				
<input type="checkbox"/> e	Ranges - Gas or Electric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Disposal/Compactor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Guest room(s) No.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	Community room(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
<input type="checkbox"/> e	Refrig. - Gas or Electric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Air Conditioning - Central/Electric	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sauna/Steam room No.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Swimming Pool(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Micro Wave	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Dishwasher	<input type="checkbox"/>	Exercise room(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Racquetball court(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Carpet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Window treatmt - Blinds	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tennis Court(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Picnic/Play area(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Balcony/Patio	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fireplace(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	Laundry Facilities (coin)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Laundry hookups (in units)	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Upper level vaulted ceiling/Sky light(s) No.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Wash/Dryer (in units)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Security System(s) (Describe)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other(Specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>						

37c. Unit Rating				37d. Project Rating				
	Good	Aver.	Fair	Poor	Good	Aver.	Fair	Poor
Condition of Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Location	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Room Sizes and Layout	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	General Appearance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequacy of Closets and Storage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Amenities & Rec. Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kitchen Equip., Cabinets, Workspace	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Density (units per acre)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plumbing - Adequacy and Condition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unit Mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electrical - Adequacy and Condition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quality of Construction (matl. & finish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Soundproofing - Adequacy and Condition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Condition of Exterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insulation - Adequacy and Condition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Condition of Interior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Livability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appeal to Market	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appeal and Marketability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Soundproofing - Vertical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
					Soundproofing - Horizontal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>

38. Services				39. Special Assessments					
Gas:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Heat	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hot Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cooking	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Conditioning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elec:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Heat	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hot Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cooking	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Conditioning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Heat	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hot Water	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (speci	Trash collect & Pest Control
				a. <input type="checkbox"/> Prepayable <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Prepayable					
				b. Principal Balance <input type="checkbox"/>					
				c. Annual Payment <input type="checkbox"/>					
				d. Remaining Term <input type="checkbox"/> 50.00 Years					

**E. Estimate of Annual Expense**

<b>Administrative</b>		<b>Maintenance</b>	
1. Advertising	\$0	14. Decorating	\$0
2. Management	\$101,715	15. Repairs	\$79,726
3. Other	\$41,961	16. Exterminating	\$0
4. <b>Total Administrative</b>	<b>\$ 143,676</b>	17. Insurance	\$80,775
		18. Ground Expense	\$0
		19. Other	\$96,510
<b>Operating</b>		<b>20. Total Maintenance</b>	
5. Elevator Main. Exp.	\$0	\$257,010	
6. Fuel (Heating and Domestic Hot Water)	\$0	21. Replacement Reserve (0.006 x total structures Line G41)	
7. Lighting & Misc. Power	\$52,451	or (0.004 x MTG. for Rehab)	
8. Water	\$79,726	\$60,000	
9. Gas	\$0	<b>22. Total Operating Expense</b>	
10. Garbage & Trash Removal	\$41,961	\$ 838,743	
11. Payroll	\$203,920		
12. Other	\$0		
13. <b>Total Operating</b>	<b>\$ 378,057</b>		
		<b>Taxes</b>	
		23. Real Estate: Est. Assessed Value	
		at \$ 43.130000 per \$1000	
		\$98,000	
		24. Personal Prop. Est. Assessed Value	
		at \$ per \$1000	
		\$0	
		25. Empl. Payroll Tax	
		\$19,931	
		26. Workers Comp	
		\$4,196	
		27. Employee Benefits	
		\$15,735	
		28. <b>Total Taxes</b>	
		\$ 137,863	
		29. <b>Total Expenses</b> (Attach form HUD-92274, as necessary)	
		\$ 976,606	

F. Income Computations		As Renovated			
30a. Estimated Residential Project Income (Line C28 x 12)	\$	\$1,773,312		c. Effective Gross Commercial Income (Line 32a. x Line 32b.)	\$ 0.00
b. Estimated Ancillary Project Income (Line C29 x 12)	\$	11,160		d. Total Commercial Project Expenses (From Attached Analysis)	\$ 0.00
c. Residential and Ancillary Occupancy Percentage *		95.0%	%	33. Net Commercial Income to Project (Line 32c. minus Line 32d.)	\$ 0.00
d. Effective Gross Residential and Ancillary Income (Line 30c. x (Line 30a. plus Line 30b.))	\$	1,695,248		34. Total Project Net Income (Line 31 plus Line 33)	\$ 718,643
e. Total Residential and Ancillary Project Expenses (Line E29)	\$	976,606		35a. Residential and Ancillary Project Expense Ratio (Line E29 divided by Line 30d.)	57.61%
31. Net Residential and Ancillary Income to Project (Line 30d. minus Line 30e.)	\$	718,643		35b. Commercial Expense Ratio (Line 32d. divided by 32c.)	0%
32a. Estimated Commercial Income (Line C30 x 12)	\$	0		* Vacancy and collection loss rates and corresponding residential and commercial occupancy percentages are analyzed through market data, but subject by	
b. Commercial Occupancy (See instructions)		0.0%	%		

G. Estimated Replacement Cost				Carrying Charges & Financing	
36a. Unusual Land Improvements	\$	0		53. Interest: 2 Mos. at 4.25%	\$ 0
b. Other Land Improvements	\$	0		54. Taxes	\$
c. Total Land Improvements	\$	0		55. Insurance	\$

Structures					
37. Main Buildings	\$	0		56. FHA Mtg. Ins. Prem. (	\$ 0
38. Accessory Buildings	\$	0		57. FHA Exam Fee	\$ 0
39. Garages	\$	0		58. FHA. Inspec. Fee	\$ 0
40. All other Buildings	\$	0		59. Financing Fee	\$ 0
41. Total Structures	\$	0		60. AMPO (N. P. only)	\$ 0
42. General Requirements	\$	0		61. FNMA/GNMA Fee (	\$ 0
				62. Title & Recording	\$

Fees				63. Total Carrying Charges & Financing	
44. Builder's Profit at	%	\$	0	64. Legal	\$
45. Arch. Fee-Design at	%	\$	0	65. Organizational	\$
46. Arch. Fee-Supvr. at	%	\$	0	66. Cost Certification Audit Fee	\$ 0
47. Bond Premium at	%	\$	0	67. Total Legal, Organization & Audit Fees (64+65+66)	\$ 0
48. Other Fees at	%	\$	0	68. Sponsor Profit & Risk", "Builder and Sponsor Profit & R	\$ 0
49. Total Fees		\$	0	69. Ground Rent during Construction", "Developer's Fee	\$ 0
50. Total All Improvements (Lines 36c. plus 41 plus 42 plus 49)		\$	0	70. Depreciation 0 50 0.0%	\$ 0
51. Cost Per Gross Sq. Ft.				71. Contingency Reserve (Sec. 202 or Rehab only)	\$ 0
52. Estimated Construction Time (Months)				72. Total Est. Development Cost (Excl. of Land or	\$ 0

Note 1: Jurisdictional Exception: In HUD programs, land, and/or existing improvements are not valued for their "highest and best use," but instead, for their intended multifamily use (See Section J analysis below.) (Exception: Title II or VI Preservation). Offsite improvements are assumed completed in new construction land valuations (See Line M17 for estimated cost.) Unusual costs of site preparation are deducted from the "Value of the Site Fully Improved" to determine "Warranted Price of Land Fully Improved."

H. Remarks					
(Note 2: For Rehab only: Estimated Value of land without Improvements		\$5,500,000		73a. Warranted Price of Land J-14(3)	

I. Estimate of Operating Deficit								
Commercial Periods		Gross Income	Occup. %	Effec. Gross	Expenses	Net Income	Debt Serv. Reqmt.	Deficit
1. 1st	Mos		0.0%					
2. 2nd	Mos		0.0%					
Residential Periods		Gross Income	Occup. %	Effec. Gross	Expenses	Net Income	Debt Serv. Reqmt.	Deficit
1. 1st			0.0%					
2. 2nd			0.0%					

J. Project Site Analysis and Appraisal (See Chapter 2, Handbook 4465.1)					
1.	Is Location and Neighborhood acceptable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
2.	Is Site adequate in Size for proposed Project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
3.	Is Site Zoning permissive for intended use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
4.	Are Utilities available now to serve the Site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
5.	Is there a Market at this location for the Facility at the proposed Rents?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
6.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site acceptable for type of Project proposed under Section 223(f). (If checked, acceptance subject to qualifications listed at bottom of page 6.)				
7.	<input type="checkbox"/> Site not acceptable (see reasons listed at bottom of page 6.)				
Date of Inspection		7/18/13	Note: The Effective Date of all land valuations is the date of inspection.		
		Location of Project			Size of Subject Property
<b>8. Value Fully Improved</b>		601 Saunders Avenue		Hinesville	Georgia
					24.68
					<b>Acres</b>
		Comparable Sale 1	Comparable Sale 2	Comparable Sale 3	Subject
		Independence Place Apartments	Savannah Highlands	Villas at Park Ave	601 Saunders Avenue
			2-1016-025-048	5-0017A-01-095	
Date of Sale		April-07	November-09	October-11	
Sales Price		\$1,420,120	\$1,489,600	\$1,445,000	
Size (Acres)		27.44	21.28	17.00	24.68
Size (SF)		1,195,286	926,957	740,520	1,075,061
Number of Units		264	222	238	200
Density		9.62	10.43	14.00	8.10
Price per Unit		\$5,379	\$6,710	\$6,071	
Price Per Acre		\$51,754	\$70,000	\$85,000	
Price Per SF		\$1.19	\$1.61	\$1.95	
Unit of Comparison		\$5,379	\$6,710	\$6,071	
Adjustments (%)					
Time		-10%	0%	0%	
Location		0%	-35%	-35%	
Zoning/Density		0%	0%	0%	
Plottage		0%	0%	0%	
Demolition		0%	0%	0%	
Unusal Site conditions		0%	0%	0%	
Other		0%	15%	0%	
Total Adjustment Factor		-10.0%	-20.0%	-35.0%	
Adjusted Price		\$4,841	\$5,368	\$3,946	
Indicated Value by Comparison		\$968,264	\$1,073,586	\$789,286	
<b>Conclusion :</b>		<b>\$4,800</b>		<b>9. Value of Site Fully Improved</b>	
<b>\$960,000</b>					
<b>LEASEHOLD VALUATION:</b>					
10.	<b>Value "As is" No. 1</b>	<b>Value "As is" No. 2</b>	<b>Value "As is" No. 3</b>		
Date of Sale					
Sales Price					
Price per Unit					
Price Per Acre					
Price Per SF					
Unit of Comparison					
Adjustments (%)					
Time					
Location					
Zoning					
Plottage					
Demolition					
Piling, Etc.					
Other					
Total Adjustment Factor					
Adjusted Sq. Ft. Price					
Indicated Value by Comparison					
				<b>11. Value of Site "As Is" by Comparison</b>	
				\$0.00	
Page 5 of 8					
form HUD-92264 (8/95)					
ref Handbooks 4465.1 & 4480.1					
Previous editions are obsolete					

<b>12. Acquisition Cost (Last Arms-Length Transaction)</b>			
Buyer		Address	
Seller		Address	
Date		Price	
Source			

<b>13. Other Costs</b>			
(1)	Legal Fees and Zoning Costs		
(2)	Recording and Title Fees		
(3)	Interest on Investment		
(4)	Other		
(5)	Acquisition Cost (From 12 above)	\$	-
(6)	Total Cost to Sponsor	\$	-

<b>14. Value of Land and Cost Certification</b>			
(1)	Fair Market Value of land fully improved (from 9 above)	\$	-
(2)	Deduct unusual items from Section G, item 36a	\$	-
(3)	Warranted price of land fully improved (Replacement Cost items excluded) (enter G-73)	\$	-
	For Cost Certification Purposes		
	(3a) Deduct cost of demoli 0 and required off-site 0		
	to be paid by Mtgor. or by special assessments	\$	-
(4)	Estimate of "As Is" by subtraction from improved value	\$	-
(5)	Estimate of "As Is" by direct comparison with similar unimproved sites (from 11 above)	\$	-
(6)	"As Is" based on acquisition cost to sponsor (from 13 above)	\$	-
(7)	Commissioner's estimated value of land "As Is" (the lesser of [4] or [5] above)*	\$	-
* Where land is purchased from LPA or other Governmental authority for specific reuse, use the least of 4, 5, or 6.			

<b>K. Income Approach to Value</b>			
(1)	Estimated Remaining Economic Life		50.0 Years
(2)	Capitalization Rate Determined By (See Chapter 7, Handbook 4465.1)		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall Rate From Comparable Projects		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rate From Band of Investment		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash Flow to Equity		
(3)	Rate Selected		
(4)	Net Income		
(5)	Capitalized Value (Line 4 divided by Line 3)		
(5)	Capitalized Value Rounded		
(6)	Value of Leased Fee (See Chapter 3, Handbook 4465.1) Group	\$0	
	divided by Cap. Ra 0 equals Value of Leased Fee		\$ -

**Remarks:** (See item 6 and 7 on page 5)

Item	Subject				Comparable				Comparable				Comparable																																		
	Property				Sale No. 1				Sale No. 2				Sale No. 3																																		
Address	601 Saunders Hinesville				Pinnacle Place				Ponderosa, Glynn Pines I & II				Southland																																		
Proximity to subject					500 Caldwell Drive, Hephzibah, GA				4920 Laroche Ave, Savannah				113 Highway 27 E, Americus GA																																		
Sales price					\$4,382,500				\$4,050,000				\$2,250,000																																		
Sales price per GBA					\$37.08				\$39.06				\$26.92																																		
Effective Gross Income					\$886,785				\$989,881				\$478,289																																		
Effective Gross Rent Multiplier (1)*					4.94				4.09				4.70																																		
Sales price per unit					\$36,521				\$28,125				\$25,281																																		
Sales price per room					\$6,087				\$6,099				\$5,220																																		
Data source					Broker																																										
Adjustments		Description				Description				+ (-) \$ Adjust				Description				+ (-) \$ Adjust																													
Sales or financing Concessions						Cash to seller								Cash to Seller																																	
Date of sale/time						April-11								March-12																																	
Location		Good				Similar								Inferior				15.00%																													
Site/view		Good				Similar								Similar																																	
Design and appeal		Average				Average								Similar																																	
Quality of construction		Average				Average								Similar																																	
Year built		1984				1987				-4.00%				1979, 1978, 1980				4.00%																													
Condition		Fair				Average				-10.00%				Average				-10.00%																													
Gross Building Area		193,608		Sq. ft.		118,200		Sq. ft.		103,680		Sq. ft.		83,571		Sq. ft.		10.00%																													
Average Unit Size		948		Sq. ft.		985		Sq. ft.		720		Sq. ft.		939		Sq. ft.																															
Unit Breakdown	No.	Room count				No.	Room count				No.	Room count				No.	Room count																														
	of Units	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	of Units	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	of Units	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.	of Units	Tot.	Br.	Ba.	Vac.																											
	32	4	1	1		16	4	1	1		88	4	1	1		1	3	0	1																												
	112	6	2	2		72	6	2	2		40	5	2	1		32	4	1	1																												
	48	6	3	1		32	7	3	2		16	7	3	2		48	5	2	1																												
	8	7.5	4	1.5		2					2					8	7.5	3	2.5																												
	0	2				2					2																																				
	200	1148				120	720				144	664				89	431																														
	Basement description																				N/A																										
	Functional utility																				Average				Similar				Similar				Similar														
Heating/cooling																				Electric				Similar				Similar				Similar															
Parking on/off site																				On Site				Similar				Similar				Similar															
Project amenities and fee																				Typical				Similar				Similar				Similar															
Other																																															
Net Adjustment (Total)																								+ -				-14.0%				+ -				-6.0%				+ -				23.0%			
Adjusted sales price of comparables																												\$31,408								\$26,438								\$31,096			
8. Value by Sales Comparison via Per Unit																												\$27,000								200								\$5,400,000			
9. Indicated Value by EGIM																				EGIM: 3.50				Effective Gross Income:				\$1,612,955																\$5,645,342			
<b>10. Concluded Value Via Comparison Approach</b>																																												<b>\$5,500,000</b>			
<b>Reconciliation</b>																																															
Capitalization																				\$5,500,000				Summation								Comparison				\$5,500,000											
9. The market value of the subject property, as of the effective date of the appraisal, is \$																												\$ 5,500,000																** see note below			
** Note: For Section 221 mortgage insurance application processing, acceptable risk analysis produces a supportable replacement cost estimate, and the estimate reflected here is the replacement cost new/summation approach result. In effect, such "appraisals" are in fact USPAP "consultations" concerning economically supportable cost limits. For Section 207 and 223 processing, all three approaches to value are included in the appraisal, but the subject property is appraised for its intended multifamily use, not necessarily its "highest and best use." The definition provided in USPAP for "market value" is generally observed, but see Handbook 4465.1, paragraph 8-4, for qualifications. Effective Dates: For new construction or substantial rehabilitation proposals, the effective date of the improvements component cost estimation is the Line G53 month estimate added to the report and certification date below. The land component is valued as of the inspection date. For Section 223, the effective date of the appraisal is the same as the reporting date, but assumes (hypothetically) the completion of all required repairs/work write-up items.																																															
Comments on: (continue on separate page if necessary)																																															
1. Sales comparison (including reconciliation of all indicators of value as to consistency and relative strength and evaluation of the typical investors'/purchasers' motivation in that market).																																															
2. Analysis of any current agreement of sale, option, or listing of the subject property and analysis of any prior sales of subject and comparables within three years of the date of appraisal.																																															
Previous editions are obsolete																				Page 7 of 8																form HUD-92264 (8/95) ref Handbooks 4465.1 & 4480.1											

M. To Be Completed by Construction Cost Analyst			
Cost Not Attributable to Dwelling Use		Area (s.f.)	Estimated Cost
10. Parking			\$
11. Garage			\$
12. Commercial			\$
13. Special Ext Land Improvements			\$
14. Other			\$
15. Total			\$
			%
Total Est. Cost of Off-Site Requirements		Off-Site	Estimated Cost
16. Off-Site			\$
			\$
			\$
			\$
			\$
			\$
17. Total Off-Site Costs			\$

N. Signatures and Appraiser Certification			
Architectural Processor	Date	Architectural Reviewer	Date
Cost Processor	Date	Cost Reviewer	Date

I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- the statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- the reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions, and are my personal, unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
- I have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report, and I have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.
- my compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value estimate, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event.
- my analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; HUD Handbook 4465.1, *The Valuation Analysis Handbook for Project Mortgage Insurance*; HUD Handbook 4480.1, *Multifamily Underwriting Forms Catalog*; and other applicable HUD handbooks and Notices.
- I have made a personal inspection of the property that is the subject of this report.
- no one provided significant professional assistance to the appraisers signing this report, except for the Architectural and Engineering, and Cost Estimation professionals signing above. These professionals' estimations of the subject property's dimensions and "hard" replacement costs have been relied upon by the Appraiser and Review Appraiser.

**Warning:** HUD will prosecute false claims and statements. Conviction may result in criminal and/or civil penalties. (18 U.S.C. 1001, 1010, 1012; 31 U.S.C. 3729, 3802)

Appraiser	Date	Review Appraiser	Date
Kay Kauchick, MAI <i>Kay Kauchick</i>	7/18/13		
State Certification Number 251355 (GA)	State Georgia	State Certification Number	State

The Review Appraiser certifies that he/she  Did  Did not inspect the subject property

Signature (Proposed Mortgagee)	Date	Director, Housing Development	Date
--------------------------------	------	-------------------------------	------

**O. Remarks and Conclusions** (continue on separate page if necessary. Appraisal reports must be kept for a minimum of five years.)

Public Reporting Burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 114 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.

This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625 which requires the Department of to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207,221,223,232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accord with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.

Previous editions are obsolete

Page 8 of 8

form HUD-92264 (8/95)  
ref Handbooks 4465.1 & 4480.1

Section or Title Number

Valuation Trial  Pre-Application  Firm See last page for Public Reporting burden statement before completing this form.

**Privacy Act Notice:** The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration, is authorized to solicit the information requested in the form by virtue of Title 12, United States Code, Section 1701 et seq., and regulations promulgated thereunder at Title 12, Code of Federal Regulations. While no assurance of confidentiality is pledged to respondents, HUD generally discloses this data only in response to a Freedom of Information Act request.

Name of Mortgagor (Borrower) \_\_\_\_\_ Project Number

Name of Project  
 Raintree Apartments  
 Location of Project (street, city & state)  
 601 Saunders Avenue Hinesville Georgia 31313

**Type of Borrower**  
 Private  Profit  Public  Nonprofit  State or Federal Instrumentality, etc.  
 Management Coop.  Sales Coop.  Investor-Sponsor  Builder-Seller  Limited Distribution

**Type of Project**  
 Rental Housing  Mobile Home Court  Board and Care  New Construction  Non-Elevator  
 Cooperative  Nursing Home  Assisted Living  Rehabilitation  Elevator  
 Condominium  Intermediate Care Facility  Redevelopment  Existing  
 Capital Advance 202/811  Housing for the Elderly  Supplemental Loan

**I. Determination of Maximum Insurable Mortgage**

Criteria	column 1	column 2	column 3
<b>1. Mortgage or Loan Amount Requested in Application</b>			
<b>2. Amount Based on Replacement Cost</b>			
3. #			
a. Value Replacement Cost in Fee Simple	x		
b. (1) Value of Leased Fee			
(2) Grant/Loan funds attributable to R.C. items			
(3) Excess Unusual Land Improvement			
(4) Cost Containment Mortgage Deduction			
(5) Total lines (1) to (4)			
c. #NAME?			
d. Total line b plus line c			
e. Line a minus line d			\$ -
<b>4. Amount Based on Limitations Per Family Unit</b>			
a. Number of <b>no</b> Bedroom Units			
Number of <b>one</b> Bedroom Units			
Number of <b>two</b> Bedroom Units			
Number of <b>three</b> Bedroom Units			
Number of <b>four</b> or more Bedroom Units			
b. Cost Not Attributable to Dwelling Use			
c. Warranted Price of Land			
d. Total lines a through c			
e. Total number of Spaces			
f. Sum: Value of Leased Fee and Unpaid Balance of Special Assessment(s)			
g. Line d or line e, whichever is applicable, minus line f			\$ -
<b>5. Amount Based on Debt Service Ratio</b>			
a. Mortgage Interest Rate			
b. Mortgage Insurance Premium Rate			
c. Initial Curtail Rate			
d. Sum of Above Rates			
e. Net Income	x		
f. Debt Svc on Existing Loan Am			
g. Line e minus line f			\$ -
h. Line g divided by line d			
i. Interest Reduction Payment Amt		divided by	
i. Annual Tax Abatement Savings		divided by	
j. Line h plus line I			

# Operating Expense Analysis Worksheet

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Office of Housing  
Federal Housing Commissioner

OMB Approval No. 2502-0331  
(exp. 4/30/2006)

*Kay Faulstich*

See Instructions on back and Refer to Handbook 4480.1 for details on completing this form.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 16 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.

This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625 which requires the Department of to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207, 221, 223, 232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accord with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.

Project Name	Raintree Apartments		<b>RETROSPECTIVE AS IS SCENARIO</b>				Project Number				0.00					
City	601 Saunders Avenue		Hinesville				Date of Appraisal (mm/dd/yyyy)				July 18, 2013					
Signature of Processor					Signature of Reviewer					Date (mm/dd/yyyy)						
Project Name	Celebration at Sandy Springs				The Links at Georgetown				Walden at Chatham Center				Raintree Apartments			
Project Number	0.00				450 Al Henderson Blvd, Savannah				Walden Lane, Savannah				0.00			
Location	0.00				Market Rate				Market Rate				AS IS SCENARIO			
Type of Project	Market Rate				Market Rate				Market Rate				AS IS SCENARIO			
No. of Stories	2.00				3.00				3.00				2			
Type of Construction	Wood Frame				Masonry/Wood Frame				Wood Frame				Class D			
No. of Living Units	250				360				236				200			
Age of Project	1969, 2007 R															
Project Unit Composition	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM
Composition	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )
No. of Each Type Unit	40	183	27		134	226			83	153			32	112	48	8
Sq. Ft. Each Type Unit	780	1,136	1,350		802	1,216			834	1,245			669	944	1,097	1,243
Average Unit Area	1102				1062				1100				948			
Same Tax Rate as Subject*																
Effective Date/Updating	1/2011				1/1/2011				2/1/2011				7/18/2013			
Months/Percentage	100 0.2%				100 0.2%				0.00 0.0%							
Same Utility Rate *																
Equip. & Services Inc. in Rent	12,3,4,6,8,				12,3,4,5,6,8,21,				12,3,4,5,6,8,21				12,3,4,5,6,21			
Equipment Included in Rent					Services Included in Rent											
1 Ranges & Refrig.	2 Carpet & Drapes	3 Disposal			10 Gas	11 Heat	12 Cooking	13 Hot Water	14 A/C							
4 Dishwasher	5 Laundry Fac.	6 Air Cond.			14 Elec.	14 Heat	15 Cooking	16 Hot Water	17 A/C	18 Lights						
7 Microwave	8 Pool/Tennis	9 Other			19 Other Fuel	19 Heat	20 Hot Water	21 Water	22 Other	Cable/internet						

Items of Expense by Units of Comparison ***	Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.					Correlated Expense
1. Advertising	\$223	\$0	\$223	\$171	\$171	\$0	\$171	\$188	\$188	\$0	\$188					\$165
2. Management	\$240	\$0	\$240	\$289	\$290	\$0	\$290	\$400	\$400	\$0	\$400					\$231
3. Other	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$189	\$189	\$0	\$189	\$168	\$168	\$0	\$168					\$300
<b>4. Total Admin.</b>																\$696
5. Elevator	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$0
6. Fuel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$0
7. Lighting & Mis. Power	\$272	\$0	\$272	\$178	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$236	\$236	\$0	\$236					\$260
8. Water	\$726	\$0	\$726	\$214	\$214	\$0	\$214	(\$47)	(\$47)	\$0	(\$47)					\$385
9. Gas	\$196	\$0	\$196	\$17	\$17	\$0	\$17	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$0
10. Garbage & Trash	\$75	\$0	\$75	\$77	\$77	\$0	\$77	\$12	\$12	\$0	\$12					\$200
11. Payroll	\$952	\$0	\$952	\$884	\$885	\$0	\$885	\$1,067	\$1,067	\$0	\$1,067					\$1,153
12. Other	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$158	\$158	\$0	\$158	\$67	\$67	\$0	\$67					\$0
<b>13. Total Operating</b>																\$1,998
14. Decorating	\$122	\$0	\$122	\$98	\$98	\$0	\$98	\$208	\$208	\$0	\$208					\$0
15. Repairs	\$175	\$0	\$175	\$99	\$99	\$0	\$99	\$153	\$153	\$0	\$153					\$380
16. Extenuating	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$13	\$0	\$13	\$10	\$10	\$0	\$10					\$0
17. Insurance	\$163	\$0	\$163	\$181	\$181	\$0	\$181	\$396	\$396	\$0	\$396					\$385
18. Ground Expenses	\$120	\$0	\$120	\$121	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$286	\$286	\$0	\$286					\$0
19. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21	\$21	\$0	\$21	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$650
<b>20. Total Maint.</b>																\$1,415
<b>20a. Total Operating Expense Exclusive of Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 4, 13 and 20)</b>																\$4,109
20b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13					AnnualRate	2.00%			4.90%
21. Replacement Reserve (Per Applicable Formula from Forms HUD-92264 or HUD-92264B)																300
<b>22. Total Operating Expenses Including Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 20a, 20b and 21)</b>																\$4,610
23. Taxes/Real Estate	\$1,025	(\$535)	\$490	\$922	\$924	(\$434)	\$490	\$1,257	\$1,257	(\$767)	\$490					\$467
24. Personal Prop. Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$0
25. Emp. Payroll Tax	\$233	\$0	\$233	\$62	\$62	\$0	\$62	\$97	\$97	\$0	\$97					\$95
26. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40	\$40	\$0	\$40	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$20
27. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$63	\$63	\$0	\$63	\$174	\$174	\$0	\$174					\$75
<b>27a. Total Taxes w/o trend</b>																
27b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13					AnnualRate	2.00%			4.90%
<b>28. Total Taxes (Including Time and Trend) (Sum of Lines 27a and 27b)</b>																\$689
<b>29. Total Expense (Sum of Lines 22 and 28)</b>																\$5,299
*If "NO," reflect in adjustments.																
**Enter appropriate numbers from table for subject and comparables and reflect in adjustments.																
***Enter expense items in suitable unit of comparison.																
(Attach additional pages to Explain Adjustments as Needed)																
Previous editions are obsolete																
form HUD-92274 (05/2003)																

# Operating Expense Analysis Worksheet

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Office of Housing  
Federal Housing Commissioner

OMB Approval No. 2502-0331  
(exp. 4/30/2006)

*Kay Faulkner*

See Instructions on back and Refer to Handbook 4480.1 for details on completing this form.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 16 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.

This information is being collected under Public Law 101-625 which requires the Department of to implement a system for mortgage insurance for mortgages insured under Sections 207,221,223,232, or 241 of the National Housing Act. The information will be used by HUD to approve rents, property appraisals, and mortgage amounts, and to execute a firm commitment. Confidentiality to respondents is ensured if it would result in competitive harm in accord with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) provisions or if it could impact on the ability of the Department's mission to provide housing units under the various Sections of the Housing legislation.

Project Name	Raintree Apartments	AS IF RENOVATED	Project Number	0.00
City	601 Saunders Avenue	Hinesville	Date of Appraisal (mm/dd/yyyy)	July 18, 2013
Signature of Processor			Signature of Reviewer	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)

Project Name	Celebration at Sandy Springs				The Links at Georgetown				Walden at Chatham Center				Raintree Apartments			
Project Number													0.00			
Location	0.00				450 Al Henderson Blvd, Savannah				Walkden Lane, Savannah				Hinesville			
Type of Project	Market Rate				Market Rate				Market Rate				AS IF RENOVATED			
No. of Stories	2.00				3.00				3.00				2			
Type of Construction	Wood Frame				Masonry/Wood Frame				Wood Frame				Class D			
No. of Living Units	250				360				236				200			
Age of Project	1969, 2007 R															
Project Unit Composition	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM	BRM
Composition	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )	( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )
No. of Each Type Unit	40	183	27		134	226			83	153			32	112	48	8
Sq. Ft. Each Type Unit	780	1,136	1,350		802	1,216			834	1,245			685	963	1,119	1,265
Average Unit Area	1102				1062				1100				968			
Same Tax Rate as Subject*																
Effective Date/Updating	1/2011				1/2011				2/1/2011				7/18/2013			
Months/Percentage	100		0.2%		100		0.2%		0.00		0.0%					
Same Utility Rate *																
Equip. & Services Inc. in Rent	12,3,4,6,8,				12,3,4,5,6,8,21				12,3,4,5,6,8,21				12,3,4,5,6,21			

Equipment Included in Rent									Services Included in Rent														
1 Ranges & Refrig.	2 Carpet & Drapes	3 Disposal	4 Dishwasher	5 Laundry Fac.	6 Air Cond.	7 Microwave	8 Pool/Tennis	9 Other	10 Gas	11 Heat	12 Hot Water	13 A/C	14 Elec.	15 Cooking	16 Hot Water	17 A/C	18 Lights	19 Other Fuel	20 Heat	21 Hot Water	22 Water	23 Other	24 Cable/internet

Items of Expense by Units of Comparison ***	Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.	Exp.	Up-dated Exp.	Adj. + -	Ind. Exp.					Correlated Expense
1. Advertising	\$223	\$0	\$223	\$171	\$171	\$0	\$171	\$188	\$188	\$0	\$188					\$0
2. Management	\$240	\$0	\$240	\$289	\$290	\$0	\$290	\$400	\$400	\$0	\$400					\$485
3. Other	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$189	\$189	\$0	\$189	\$168	\$168	\$0	\$168					\$200
<b>4. Total Admin.</b>																\$685
5. Elevator	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
6. Fuel	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
7. Lighting & Mis. Power	\$272	\$0	\$272	\$178	\$178	\$0	\$178	\$236	\$236	\$0	\$236					\$250
8. Water	\$726	\$0	\$726	\$214	\$214	\$0	\$214	(\$47)	(\$47)	\$0	(\$47)					\$380
9. Gas	\$196	\$0	\$196	\$17	\$17	\$0	\$17	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
10. Garbage & Trash	\$75	\$0	\$75	\$77	\$77	\$0	\$77	\$12	\$12	\$0	\$12					\$200
11. Payroll	\$952	\$0	\$952	\$884	\$885	\$0	\$885	\$1,067	\$1,067	\$0	\$1,067					\$972
12. Other	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$158	\$158	\$0	\$158	\$67	\$67	\$0	\$67					\$0
<b>13. Total Operating</b>																\$1,802
14. Decorating	\$122	\$0	\$122	\$98	\$98	\$0	\$98	\$208	\$208	\$0	\$208					\$0
15. Repairs	\$175	\$0	\$175	\$99	\$99	\$0	\$99	\$153	\$153	\$0	\$153					\$380
16. Exterminating	\$0	\$0		\$13	\$13	\$0	\$13	\$10	\$10	\$0	\$10					\$0
17. Insurance	\$163	\$0	\$163	\$181	\$181	\$0	\$181	\$396	\$396	\$0	\$396					\$385
18. Ground Expenses	\$120	\$0	\$120	\$121	\$121	\$0	\$121	\$286	\$286	\$0	\$286					\$0
19. Other	\$0	\$0		\$21	\$21	\$0	\$21	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$460
<b>20. Total Maint.</b>																\$1,225
<b>20a. Total Operating Expense Exclusive of Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 4, 13 and 20)</b>																\$3,712
20b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13			AnnualRate	2.00%					4.90%
21. Replacement Reserve (Per Applicable Formula from Forms HUD-92264 or HUD-92264B)																300
<b>22. Total Operating Expenses Including Reserve Time and Trend (Sum of Lines 20a, 20b and 21)</b>																\$4,194
23. Taxes/Real Estate	\$1,025	(\$535)	\$490	\$922	\$924	(\$434)	\$490	\$1,257	\$1,257	(\$767)	\$490					\$467
24. Personal Prop. Tax	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0						\$0
25. Emp. Payroll Tax	\$233	\$0	\$233	\$62	\$62	\$0	\$62	\$97	\$97	\$0	\$97					\$95
26. Other	\$0	\$0		\$40	\$40	\$0	\$40	\$0	\$0	\$0						\$20
27. Other	\$0	\$0		\$63	\$63	\$0	\$63	\$174	\$174	\$0	\$174					\$75
<b>27a Total Taxes w/o trend</b>																
27b. Trend Adjustment							Jul-13			AnnualRate	2.00%					4.90%
<b>28. Total Taxes (including Time and Trend) (Sum of Lines 27a and 27b)</b>																\$689
<b>29. Total Expense (Sum of Lines 22 and 28)</b>																\$4,883
*If "NO," reflect in adjustments.																
**Enter appropriate numbers from table for subject and comparables and reflect in adjustments.																
***Enter expense items in suitable unit of comparison.																
(Attach additional pages to Explain Adjustments as Needed)																
Previous editions are obsolete															form HUD-92274 (05/2003)	

***ADDENDUM D***  
***QUALIFICATION/LICENSE***

**PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF  
KAY KAUCHICK, MAI**

<p><b>EXPERIENCE:</b></p>	<p><b>Value Tech Realty Services, Inc.- President</b></p> <p>Ms. Kauchick is co-founder of Value Tech Realty Services, Inc. She is a real estate consultant and Member of the Appraisal Institute. Her consulting services cover a broad spectrum of industries including market analytics, economic evaluations and financial valuations with deliverables that include a variety of real estate related services such as appraisals, market studies, economic impact reports and investment consulting. Reports have been prepared for a variety of private and governmental entities including Housing and Urban Development (HUD) including MAP applications, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, LIHTC and various Bond programs.</p> <p>Ms. Kauchick has been actively engaged in real estate valuation and consulting since 1979 on a national and international basis. Her background includes nearly 30-years of experience creating economic development programs for third world countries utilizing tourism and real estate development as a stimulus for growth and detail market studies for private and public entities. She assisted world banks, international investment funds, and various profit and non-profit entities, evaluate investment opportunities. Her specialization has been within the housing, Healthcare, Multi-family, retail, office and hospitality industries. Clients served include accountants, investment firms, law firms, and lenders, private and public agencies. Valuations and market studies have been done on proposed, partially completed, renovated and existing structures.</p> <p>Military-related work has been completed for the Navy, Air Force, Army, Army Core of Engineers, AAFES and developers providing services to each of the divisions. Economic and market program models have been created for the ability to evaluate various development scenarios. Demand studies were developed to interface with financial modeling programs in order to judge the highest and/or best use for military projects.</p>
<p><b>HUD/FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC:</b></p>	<p>Numerous projects have been completed for the military, HUD, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac underwriters for assignments nationwide. The market studies and appraisals performed have been prepared in conformance with their individual agency requirements and with adherence to USPAP. Ms. Kauchick completed the HUD sponsored MAP training session in October 2000.</p>
<p><b>PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:</b></p>	<p>Member: Appraisal Institute (MAI No. 10510)  Licensed: Florida State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser- RZ 2066  Alabama – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser G00706  Georgia – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – 251355  Mississippi – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – GA-813  Kentucky - - State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – 003868  Ohio – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – 2006006410  New Jersey – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – 42RG00194800  Texas – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – TX-1336610-G  Indiana – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – CG40700410  North Carolina – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – A6711  Virginia – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser – 4001-015705  Michigan – State-Certified General Real Estate Appraiser - 12011006024</p>
<p><b>EDUCATION:</b></p>	<p>Bachelor of Arts-Michigan State University with specializations in Tourism and Travel Management, Economics and Marketing.</p> <p>Successfully completed numerous real estate related courses and seminars sponsored by the Appraisal Institute, accredited universities and others.</p> <p>Currently certified by the Appraisal Institute’s voluntary program of continuing education for its designated members.</p>

**STATE OF GEORGIA**  
**REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BOARD**

**KAY C KAUCHICK**

**251355**

IS AUTHORIZED TO TRANSACT BUSINESS IN GEORGIA AS A  
**CERTIFIED GENERAL REAL PROPERTY APPRAISER**

THE PRIVILEGE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THIS APPRAISER CLASSIFICATION SHALL CONTINUE IN EFFECT AS LONG AS THE APPRAISER PAYS REQUIRED APPRAISER FEES AND COMPLIES WITH ALL OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF THE OFFICIAL CODE OF GEORGIA ANNOTATED, CHAPTER 43-39-A. THE APPRAISER IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PAYMENT OF ALL FEES ON A TIMELY BASIS.

CHARLES B. BRAMLETT  
Chairperson

SANDRA MCALISTER WINTER  
Vice Chairperson

WILLIAM R. COLEMAN, JR.  
D. SCOTT MURPHY  
MARILYN R. WATTS

62236402