

SOCIAL HOUSING TASK FORCE

Wednesday, April 22, 2026 at 6:00 PM
City Hall Basement Room 24, Kippy
Richardson Room



MEMBERS

City Councilor Kate Sykes, Co-Chair
City Councilor Sarah Michniewicz
Paul Styslinger
Bill Stauffer
Jason Spector
Cat Buxton
Wendy Cherubini
Cullen Ryan
Matthew Peters
Kristin Leffler
Jon Fetherston, Co-Chair
Jonathan Culley
Tim Wells

The Social Housing Task Force will conduct this meeting in-person. If you are not able to attend in person, a recording will be available in the [Agenda Center](#) following the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT INFORMATION:

To submit written public comment on an agenda item, email socialhousingtaskforce@portlandmaine.gov. Submissions must be received by 12:00 pm the day before the Social Housing Task Force meeting to guarantee their inclusion in the agenda packet. All submissions must include the commenter's name and legal address. To help ensure your comment is submitted for the correct item, please include the name of the agenda item (see below).

AGENDA:

- 1. Review and Approve Minutes from the April 8, 2026 Meeting**
 - i. SHTF Draft Minutes of Meeting 4.8.2026
- 2. Administrative Updates, Announcements, etc., as needed**
- 3. Group Discussion with Staff from the Portland Housing Authority**
 - i. PHA Responses to Social Housing Task Force Questions
 - ii. PHDC Memo to Social Housing Task Force

Social Housing Task Force Minutes of Business Meeting held April 8, 2026 at 6:00 pm

In attendance:

City Councilor Kate Sykes – Co-Chair

Jon Fetherston – Co-Chair

Bill Stauffer

Wendy Cherubini

Matt Peters

Jonathan Culley

Jason Spector

City Councilor Sarah Michniewicz

Paul Styslinger

Cullen Ryan

Mary Davis, Division Director, City's Housing and Community Development Division

Christian Roadman, GPCOG, Senior Planner

The meeting started at approximately 6:06 PM. It opened with approval of the minutes from February 11, 2026 (moved by Chair Fetherston, seconded by Councilor Michniewicz, with unanimous approval).

Councilor Sykes noted that the breakout groups to occur as part of the meeting should take notes to contribute to the meeting minutes.

Christian Roadman provided administrative updates, noting that: he continues to accept W9s from anyone interested in receiving a stipend for their participation; the next meeting task force meeting is 22nd with the Portland Housing Authority (PHA); Kristin Leffler asked him to report out that she is meeting with the Tenant's Union tomorrow regarding the task force's work, has spoken with the PPS Teacher's Union, and plans on reaching out to a contact of the Nurse's union.

Paul Styslinger noted that he reached out to members who could not attend the last meeting to learn which breakout group they'd like to participate in. Cullen Ryan wishes to participate in the PHA partnership group, and Tim Wells would like to participate in both the project selection and reporting groups; he is not sure where Catherine Buxton will choose. Paul, who led the breakout group selection exercise, said he would join the reporting group. Since Matt Peters was the only one present working on bonding, he would join the project selection group for this evening.

The group agreed to spend time in breakout groups until approximately 6:45 pm, unless the work finished sooner. The task force then broke into groups for discussion and focused work.

Paul Styslinger and Chair Sykes participated in the **reporting** group.

Chair Sykes said that she identified a structure for the report document and began writing some of the sections. She noted that she will be presenting it to the Housing and Economic Development Committee in May, so she is writing it with that target in mind (as an interim report to that committee and mayor).

Paul Styslinger and Chair Sykes spent most of the breakout group time reviewing Chair Syke's outline and discussing potential approaches and framings. Discussion largely involved summarizing where the overall task force seems to have cohered, including: LIHTC programs are not something to interfere with; specific reporting on dynamics and positions on items like Inclusionary Zoning are likely not in the task force's best interest; the importance of retaining some City equity in potential projects; the cost of construction as a driving barrier to housing development, above other impediments like expensive land; an emerging position that the task force's biggest potential contribution to housing issues in the City is equity via debt / opportunities for bonding.

The two decided that Councilor Sykes would upload her existing document to Google Docs, where Paul Styslinger would have access to work on it. However, sharing with the whole group (or even three task force members at a time) is not allowable because of public meeting law issues.

Councilor Michniewicz, Chair Fetherston, Jonathan Culley, and Matt Peters participated in the **project selection** group.

Jonathan Culley presented research into and potential development concepts for three City-owned sites (drawn from a larger group the task force discussed previously), including:

0 Cornell St, near Bruno's restaurant. The site has access via Allen Avenue and potentially Washington Avenue. It backs up against railroad tracks and industrial buildings. Two zoning concepts were explored: four 10-unit buildings as well as a greater number of two-unit buildings. Both scenarios involved use of available density bonuses and existing zoning. Issues include potential brownfield elements, likelihood of needing an extension of the street and public water to the site, and potential wetlands given its location along the Milliken Brook watercourse.

284 Palmer Ave, near Riverside Industrial Parkway. The site includes a detention pond and backs right up to the railroad. One of the concerns with the site is that it is largely within a single-family context, which may make it more controversial – the group noted the surprising number of backyard swimming pools visible from an aerial view. Potential development concepts that were roughly mocked up included four ten-unit buildings as well as multiple four-family buildings.

21 Randall Street, in East Deering. The site has the best neighborhood context in terms of fit – it is right next to an existing PHA development, and it is walkable to the neighborhood's Veranda Street Corridor. However, there is a significant easement running through the site, and the zoning doesn't allow for very many units – approximately eight, which wouldn't be a very big swing.

The group identified 0 Cornell Street, and particularly the four ten-unit buildings scenario, as the most promising options preliminarily.

The group determined that, with a selected site and ideas for massing and scale, Jonathan Culley and Matt Peters would develop a more specific pro forma regarding it. They also noted that additional City support regarding civil engineering expertise in the Department of Public Works will be important to raise any major issues not yet identified.

Bill Stauffer, Wendy Cherubini, Jason Spector, and Cullen Ryan participated in the **PHA partnership** group.

Wendy Cherubini shared questions developed with Bill Stauffer regarding a potential partnership, as well as an AI document from Jason Spector regarding questions and methodologies for a City-PHA partnership. She also noted the likely need for a consultant to help draft any partnership agreement, and raised the question of whether general obligation (GO) bonds can be used in combination with low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC) money.

The group discussed the possibility of an initial pilot project versus a complete memorandum of understanding agreement; a pilot project could identify what works well and what doesn't, as well as how partnerships with other developers (aside from PHA) might work.

The group discussed how social housing might complement the development work that PHA and the Portland Housing Development Corporation is already doing, wondering if those entities would be open to a development financing process that does not include LIHTC - or a project where LIHTC and local funding support mixed-income development.

Mary Davis informed the group that she will be meeting with PHA leadership on April 14 (the meeting will also be attended by Cullen Ryan and Christian Roadman), and will share the group's questions with them so that they can be better prepared for the April 22 meeting with the full task force.

The group discussed potential shared goals in a partnership, and items that could benefit the PHA such as tax breaks and lower permit fees. Mary Davis noted that the City has limited control over influencing property taxes, in terms of rebates, forgiveness or abatements.

The groups returned together as the larger task force, and reported back on each of their sessions for questions and discussion. Mary Davis noted that the City has staff who could assist with engineering analysis. Chair Sykes noted complaints regarding train noise around Palmer Avenue as a potential challenge regarding 0 Cornell Street.

The group also discussed a concept arising from Oregon of inclusionary zoning as an unfunded mandate, which municipalities should instead directly fund. They also discussed the potential "acceptance as a communication" or adoption by the City Council and how that might affect potential social housing project momentum.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:21 pm with unanimous approval.

DRAFT

PHA RESPONSES TO SOCIAL HOUSING TASK FORCE QUESTIONS

...AND SOME PHA QUESTIONS BACK TO THE TASK FORCE.

April 21, 2026

[These are initial thoughts and discussion points that could change as we have further dialogue and need approval from the PHA board and City Council]

I. Partnership Structure & Roles

Q: How does PHA envision its role?

PHA can serve in multiple roles depending on the project:

- Developer or Co-Developer for projects aligned with our strategic priorities
- Owner or Co-Owner depending on the equity stake and risk
- Long-term Property Manager, particularly for mixed-income or deeply affordable housing
- Advisor/Technical Partner to support project feasibility and structuring

We see partnership as flexible and tiered, not one-size-fits-all.

Q: Are there different tiers of partnership?

Yes. A tiered model is the most realistic and consistent with national practice :

1. Advisory / Technical Support
2. Property Management
3. Co-Development/Co-Owner
4. Lead Developer (selectively)

Q: Under what conditions would PHA:

Serve as lead developer?

- Project aligns with strategic plan
- Financing is viable and not overly experimental
- Staff capacity exists

Serve as property manager?

- Strong fit operationally
- Clear ownership/financial structure
- Long-term sustainability

Participate in joint ventures?

- Structure protects long-term affordability
- Governance and decision-making are clear
- Financial risk is appropriately allocated

II. Development Capacity & Constraints

Q: What is PHA's capacity (3–5 years)?

PHA is currently engaged in significant redevelopment and repositioning across its portfolio. We have three full time Development Officers (Project Managers) and a Director of Real Estate Development. Projects have cyclical periods of more work and less work. We believe we have capacity to add one or two pilot projects at this time.

We have the ability to:

- Continue developing housing
- Participate in partnership projects

However, capacity is not unlimited.

Q: What constraints affect scaling?

Staffing

- Development and compliance capacity are finite

Financing

- LIHTC allocations are competitive and limited
- Eliminating LIHTC must have a viable source of "soft" debt.
- Layering financing increases complexity

Regulatory

- PHA will confirm if its bylaws, or PHDC's, limit certain higher income levels in projects that might be needed for social housing;
- Federal requirements (HUD, LIHTC, BABA, Davis Bacon, etc.);
- City requirements (Fees and taxes affect operating costs and reduce debt capacity; up-front fees dilute subsidy)
- Ownership structures tied to funding

Q: Limitations on housing types or populations?

- PHA serves a broad range of incomes already
- PHA serves families and seniors / disabled
- Deep affordability is achievable, but requires subsidy layering (i.e. vouchers, etc.)
- Fully unrestricted "social housing" models with zero subsidy do not appear to be feasible at scale

III. Property Management

Q: Can PHA serve as property manager?

- Yes — depending on the project
- We act as PM for our own projects and for third parties
- Need a viable management fee to cover costs

Q: Constraints?

- Financial viability of the property
- Clear ownership structure
- Alignment with operational standards

Q: Approach to mixed-income & deeply affordable housing?

PHA has extensive experience with:

- Mixed-income communities
- Deeply affordable units integrated into developments
- Design that makes no distinction between affordable and market rate units; amenities that anyone would want in their community.

We strongly support mixed-income models as sustainable and community-oriented.

Q: AMI limits?

- No fixed limitation except under our bylaws as a non-profit
- Driven by financing and subsidy structure

IV. Land & Site Strategy

Q: Does PHA have land?

Yes - PHA has sites that may be viable for development. Some properties have already been redeveloped to the highest potential under current zoning. Other properties have hundreds of additional potential units allowed under current zoning.

Q: Under what conditions would PHA contribute land?

- Project aligns with long-term portfolio strategy
- Financially viable
- Supports mission and community goals
- Maximizes zoning for allowable units and emphasizes net new units created

Q: How are sites prioritized?

Based on:

- Feasibility (zoning, infrastructure, Smart Growth)

- Financial viability
- Community impact and meeting Comp. Plan goals
- Alignment with redevelopment strategy

V. Financing & Project Structuring

Q: What tools does PHA rely on?

- Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)
- Tax-exempt and taxable bonds
- Project-Based Vouchers
- Soft funding (state, local, federal)

Q: How does PHA view:

LIHTC

- Primary and most reliable production tool currently

Bonds

- Useful but constrained by ownership and structure
- City bonds may offer lower cost of capital

Project-Based Vouchers

- Critical for deep affordability

Q: Constraints when combining financing?

- Regulatory complexity
- Timing and approvals (especially MaineHousing)
- Structural incompatibilities (e.g., LIHTC + certain bond structures)
- Our current deals have between 3-10 funding sources. Simpler is better and less costly, but we often need larger single sources of subsidy or lower cost debt.

Q: How can City funding help?

Most effective as:

- Below market rate amortizing loans
- Gap financing / soft debt
- Land contribution
- Infrastructure investment

VI. Ownership & Governance

Q: What ownership structures has PHA used?

- Limited partnerships (LIHTC)
- Affiliate ownership structures
- Ground lease models

Q: What models would PHA consider?

- PHA/PHDC ownership
- Joint ventures
- City ownership with PHA management

All are possible depending on the project.

Q: How does ownership affect outcomes?

Financing

- Determines eligibility for LIHTC and bonds

Affordability

- Long-term restrictions tied to ownership

Control

- Governance structure dictates decision-making authority

PHA prioritizes long-term stewardship and public control.

VII. Shared Goals & Strategic Alignment

Q: Shared goals over 5 years?

- Increase total housing production
- Expand deeply affordable housing
- Maintain long-term affordability
- Strengthen financial sustainability

Q: How can partnership increase production?

- Combine City resources (land, funding) with PHA expertise
- Reduce barriers to development
- Enable projects that neither could do alone

Q: How does PHA define success?

- Units delivered
- Depth of affordability
- Financial sustainability
- Long-term asset quality
- Positive resident outcomes
- Best/highest use of available resources to support our community

VIII. Process, Timeline & Coordination

Q: What does an effective partnership look like?

- Regular coordination (monthly/quarterly)

- Shared pipeline planning
- Clear roles and measurable goals per project
- Defined decision-making structure
- Financial sustainability / good return on investment

Q: Expected timelines?

Development

- 2–5 years typical (depending on complexity)

Financing

- 6–18 months

Construction

- 12–24 months (longer for major renovations)

Additional Strategic Context

In reviewing your SHTF documents it looks like:

- Exploring bonding as a major funding source (we do not have expertise in this, and you should hire a consultant)
- Interested in pilot projects first
- Trying to define whether PHA is primary partner vs one of many
- Concerned about speed, affordability, and control simultaneously

PHA Position

PHA is open to a strong and flexible partnership with the City. We bring development, operational, and long-term stewardship expertise. The most successful approach will be a tiered partnership model that aligns financing, capacity, and project goals. We recommend starting with a small number of pilot projects, building a shared framework, and scaling over time.

PHA Questions for the Social Housing Task Force and City Leadership

- How flexible is the City in its definition of social housing? Area Median Income too high can potentially run counter to our bylaws.
- Can the City increase its ability to provide soft debt (subsidy) for projects that need it compared to current LIHTC projects that request funding?
- Similar to Providence, can Portland bond to fund the Jill Duson HTF?
- Does the Portland Renewal Authority still exist, and can it play a role or bond?
- Would the City want some ongoing return on their investment in the form of cash flow from a rental project? In which case that would likely correspond with their percentage of ownership in a project.



Memorandum

To: Social Housing Taskforce

From: Jay Waterman

Date: 4-22-2026

Subject: Potential PHA/City of Portland Collaboration Toward Social Housing Goals

PHA Understanding of the Social Housing goals:

- Social Housing Taskforce (“Taskforce”) wants to create permanently affordable housing for those above 60% Area Median Income;
- While deeper targeting is a goal, higher incomes with a mix of incomes housing is preferred;
- Avoid LIHTC or MaineHousing funding in SH projects and not use City funding to support LIHTC projects (trying not to duplicate efforts)
- City of Portland ownership or partial ownership
- City of Portland resources ideally are “revolving” by a return on equity through cash flow.

What PHA offers

- A mission that has flexibility to meet broad housing goals and income levels, within certain non-profit bylaws and IRS limits
- Depth in housing development experience
- Focus on the City of Portland geographic area
- Ability to leverage many funding sources
- A Housing Authority network here in Maine and around the northeast (Cambridge) that can offer models and consulting services.
- Our development entity, Portland Housing Development Corp., can act as owner and developer. PHA can act as property manager.

Potential Pilot Project Scenarios

On Peninsula Congress Street Site

- Downtown in-fill project that could provide 54 one-bedroom units
- PHA optioned parcel, market acquisition price around \$1MM
- Currently planned as a 9% LIHTC submission to MaineHousing in September
- Going to the planning board in June, 2026



- Assumptions as a social housing test fit
 - Set all units to 80% AMI (with UAs) to maximize rental income while still being considered affordable
 - Removed all City- and MaineHousing-based soft costs (permits, land use fees, LIHTC fees, etc.)
 - Removed all City-based operating expenses (real estate taxes, rental registrations, stormwater fees)
 - Lowered Replacement Reserve (no MaineHousing requirement)
 - Removed Deferred Developer Fee (helps with owner cash flow)
 - Removed LIHTC equity
 - Removed gap sources (AHP, Efficiency Maine, HTF, etc. that have lower targeting)
 - Set debt as I/O loan at 4% rate
- Result:
 - 54 one-bedroom 80% AMI units at about \$1,800 rent per month (utilities not incl.)
 - Annual cash flow ~\$100k in YR1
 - \$15.7 million I/O loan
 - **\$5.8 million gap funding gap (see draft pro forma attached)**

21 Randall Street

- East Deering lot near PHA's Front Street rental and condo community
- City owned; Formerly under contract with Greater Portland Land Trust
- Potential for 8-12 unit townhouse-style homeownership or rental
- Pro forma based on our Front Street Phase 3 8-unit homeownership (w/ 10% cost increase)
- Funding from MaineHousing's Affordable Homeownership Program is pending
- Assumption as a social housing test fit
 - Clean soils/no brownfields funding
 - \$0 acquisition cost
 - Removed Congressional earmarks (next year possible)
 - City 75% TIF
 - 2BR unit at \$298,000 ; 3BR units (MKT) at \$552,000 ; 4BR units at \$358,000;
 - **Approx. \$1.3MM funding gap (see draft pro forma attached)**

Other Pilot Project Opportunities

- Midtown property (City owned)
- PHA redevelopment of Kennedy Park, Bayside East public housing in East Bayside
- PHA redevelopment of 115 Anderson Street maintenance facility
- PHA development of 165 Anderson Street lot

PROJECT & SITE INFORMATION

Info	
Project Name	Mixed-Use Development
Project Address	Congress Street
City, State, Zip	Portland, ME 04102
Project Type	New Construction
Population	
Area Median Income (100%)	129,800

DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS

	Yr 1-5	Yr 6-15	Yr 16-30
Rent Inflation	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Operating Expense Inflation	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Other Income Inflation	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Reserve Deposit Inflation	3.0%		
Debt Service Coverage Ratio	1.15		
Vacancy Rate	LIHTC Units: 5.0%	PBV Units: 5.0%	
	Market Units: 5.0%	Other Inc.: 5.0%	

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

	# Mo.	# Days
Construction Duration	15 mo.	456 days
Duration per Quarter		114 days

OWNERSHIP ASSUMPTIONS

	LP	SLP	GP
Share of Ownership	99.99%	0.0%	0.01%
Cash Flow Split	10.0%	0.0%	90.0%

TIMING ASSUMPTIONS

	# Mo.	Date
Acq/CLC/Construction Start		11/1/27
25% Construction Completion		3/1/28
50% Construction Completion		7/1/28
75% Construction Completion		10/1/28
100% Construction Completion		2/1/29
Qualified Occupancy	2 mo. after 100%	4/1/29
PLC	5 mo. after 100%	7/1/29
8609/Stabilization	8 mo. after 100%	10/1/29
PIS - First Building		2/1/29
PIS - Last Building		2/1/29

ENTITIES

	Name
Owner	Owner
Developer	PHDC
Seller	879 Congress, LLC
Limited Partner	LP
Other Partner	Other

MAINEHOUSING INDEX CAP

	\$/Unit
New Construction	388,500
Rehabilitation	340,000
N/C & Rehab Blend	0

Unit Type	UNIT INFORMATION				RENTAL INCOME					
	# of BR	# of Units	LIHTC Unit	PBV Unit PBV	Income Limit (% AMI)	Max Gross LIHTC Rent	Less Utility Allowance	Max Contract LIHTC Rent	Proposed Contract Rent	Annual Rental Income
1BR @ 80% AMI	1	54	Y	N	80%	1,947	148	1,799	1,799	1,165,752
TOTAL	54	54	54	0						1,165,752

OPERATING SUBSIDY INCOME			
PBV Rent	Monthly PBV Diff. PUPM	Annual PBV Diff. Total	Total Annual Rent. + PBV Income
-	-	-	1,165,752
		0	1,165,752

OTHER INCOME	
Description	Yr 1
Laundry	1,500
TOTAL OTHER INCOME	1,500

UNIT INFO			
BR Size	U.A.	Mrkt. Study	PBV Rent
0 BR	0	0	1,615
1 BR	148	0	1,823
2 BR	0	0	2,343
3 BR	0	0	2,850
4 BR	0	0	3,102
5 BR	0	0	3,567
6 BR	0	0	4,032

EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME	
Description	Yr 1
Rental Income: LIHTC Units	1,165,752
<i>Vac. Loss - LIHTC (5.0%)</i>	<i>(58,288)</i>
Rental Income: PBV Units	0
<i>Vac. Loss - PBV (5.0%)</i>	<i>0</i>
Rental Income: Market Units	0
<i>Vac. Loss - Market-Rate (5.0%)</i>	<i>0</i>
Other Income	1,500
<i>Vac. Loss - Other Inc. (5.0%)</i>	<i>(75)</i>
Tax Increment Financing	0
Commercial Income	0
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME	1,108,889

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING	
Description	Yr 1
0% TIF	0

UTILITIES			
Utility	Payee	Type	
Electricity	Owner		
Heat	Owner		
Hot Water	Owner		
Cooking	Owner		
Water/Sewer	Owner		
Trash	Owner		

COMMERCIAL INCOME	
Description	Yr 1
Commercial Spaces	
TOTAL COMMERCIAL INCOME	0

SQUARE FOOTAGE AND APPLICABLE FRACTION		
Description	Units	Sq. Ft.
LIHTC Units	54	33,750
Non-LIHTC Units	0	0
TOTAL UNITS	54	33,750

Applicable Fraction	By Units	By Sq.Ft.
by Calculation Method:	100%	100%
APPLICABLE FRACTION		100%

Residential Units Sq. Ft.	33,750
Residential Common Areas Sq. Ft.	9,984
Commercial Rental Sq. Ft.	1,500
Other Sq. Ft.	5,830
TOTAL PROJECT SQUARE FOOTAGE	51,064

Line Item	Total	Per Unit
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES		
<i>Management Fees</i>	60,000	1,111
Office Salaries	30,000	
Supplies & Postage	500	
Bookeeping Fees/Accounting	1,000	
Training	500	
Site Internet & Telephone	5,000	
<i>Management Charges</i>	37,000	685
Marketing	500	9
Legal	1,000	19
Auditing	7,500	139
Other Admin. Background Checks	250	5
Other Admin. IT Software & Computers	750	14
Other Admin. Interpreting	500	9
<i>Other Admin.</i>	10,500	194
Subtotal Administrative Expenses	144,500	2,676

Line Item	Total	Per Unit
UTILITY EXPENSES		
Natural Gas	4,000	74
Electricity	20,000	370
Water/Sewer	35,000	648
Other Utility		
Other Utility		0
Subtotal Utility Expenses	59,000	1,093

Line Item	Total	Per Unit
MAINTENANCE EXPENSES		
Janitorial Payroll	8,000	148
Janitorial Supplies and Equipment		0
Janitorial Contractual Services	4,000	74
Garbage and Trash Removal	12,000	222
Vehicle and Equipment		0
Grounds Maintenance Payroll		0
Grounds Tools and Supplies		0
Grounds Contractual Services	8,000	148
Miscellaneous Ground Maintenance		0
Building Maintenance Payroll	30,000	556
Building Tools and Supplies		0

Line Item	Total	Per Unit
GENERAL EXPENSES		
Property Taxes		0
Property and Liability Insurance	60,000	1,111
Other Financial Expenses		0
Resident Services		0
Other General Rental Registration		0
Other General		
Other General		
Other General		0
Subtotal General Expenses	60,000	1,111

HOUSING OPEX	365,500	6,769
---------------------	----------------	--------------

Line Item	Total	Per Unit
COMMERCIAL EXPENSES		
Admin Expenses		0
Operating Expenses		0
Maintenance Expenses		0
General Expenses		0
Other Comm.		0
Subtotal Commercial Expenses	0	0

TOTAL OPEX	365,500	6,769
-------------------	----------------	--------------

Line Item	Total	Per Unit
RESERVE CONTRIBUTIONS		
Replacement Reserve	21,600	400
Other Reserve	0	

TOTAL OPEX + RESERVES	387,100	7,169
------------------------------	----------------	--------------

Line Item	Total	Per Unit	LIHTC Basis			T-E Bonds	HTC Basis			
			NC/R Basis	Acq Basis	Non-Deprec.	50% Test	QRE	Non-QRE	Allocable	
CONSTRUCTION COSTS										
Off-Site Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction: Residential	15,500,000	287,037	15,500,000	0	0	15,500,000	11,625,000	3,875,000	0	0
Construction: Commercial	375,000	6,944	0	0	375,000	375,000	375,000	0	0	0
Demolition	50,000	926	49,074	0	926	50,000	0	50,000	0	0
General Conditions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P&P Bond Premium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Builder Overhead & Profit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Contingency	796,250	14,745	597,188	0	199,063	796,250	796,250	0	0	0
Subtotal Construction Costs	16,721,250	309,653	16,146,262	0	574,988	16,721,250	12,796,250	3,925,000	0	0
SOFT COSTS										
Building Permits & Fees	45,250	838	45,250	0	0	45,250	45,250	0	0	0
Survey & Engineering	76,500	1,417	76,500	0	0	76,500	76,500	0	0	0
Architectural & Design	616,500	11,417	616,500	0	0	616,500	616,500	0	0	0
Legal	50,000	926	45,000	0	5,000	50,000	45,000	5,000	0	0
Title & Recording	32,000	593	32,000	0	0	32,000	0	32,000	0	0
Accounting	10,000	185	10,000	0	0	10,000	10,000	0	0	0
Construction Period Tax	5,000	93	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	0
Insurance	160,000	2,963	160,000	0	0	160,000	157,500	2,500	0	0
Soft Cost Contingency	60,000	1,111	60,000	0	0	60,000	60,000	0	0	0
Subtotal Soft Costs	1,055,250	19,542	1,045,250	5,000	5,000	1,055,250	1,010,750	44,500	0	0
FINANCING COSTS										
CL Interest	750,000	13,889	562,500	0	187,500	750,000	562,500	187,500	0	0
CL Origination Fee	15,000	278	15,000	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	0	0
Lender Inspections	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bond Issuance Fee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City Perf. Guarantee LOC Fee	5,000	93	5,000	0	0	5,000	5,000	0	0	0
Other Construction Loan Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSHA Perm Loan Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perm Lender Application Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perm Lender Origination Fees	274,594	5,085	274,594	0	0	274,594	0	274,594	0	0
Other Perm Loan Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Financing Costs	1,044,594	19,344	857,094	0	187,500	1,044,594	582,500	462,094	0	0

Line Item	Total	Per Unit	LIHTC Basis			T-E Bonds	HTC Basis			
			NC/R Basis	Acq Basis	Non-Deprec.	50% Test	QRE	Non-QRE	Allocable	
MISCELLANEOUS COSTS										
Market Study	3,000	56	3,000	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	
Appraisal	5,000	93	5,000	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	
Environmental	12,500	231	12,500	0	0	12,500	12,500	0	0	
LIHTC Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Syndication Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Relocation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FF&E	100,000	1,852	100,000	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	0	
Other Misc Costs	8,000	148	0	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	0	
Subtotal Miscellaneous Costs	128,500	2,380	120,500	0	8,000	120,500	17,500	111,000	0	
ACQUISITION COSTS										
Building	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Land	1,000,000	18,519	0	0	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000	0	
Repay Existing Mortgage Balance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Acquisition Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotal Acquisition Costs	1,000,000	18,519	0	0	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000	0	
RESERVES										
Operating Deficit Escrow (ODE)	507,371	9,396	0	0	507,371	0	0	507,371	0	
Replacement Reserve (RR)	159,250	2,949	0	0	159,250	0	0	159,250	0	
Tax & Insurance Reserve (T&I)	70,000	1,296	0	0	70,000	0	0	70,000	0	
Rent Up & Marketing / Working Capital	50,000	926	0	0	50,000	0	0	50,000	0	
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotal Reserves	786,621	14,567	0	0	786,621	0	0	786,621	0	
DEVELOPMENT FEES										
Subtotal Development Overhead & Fees	750,000	13,889	750,000	0	0	750,000	750,000	0	0	
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS	21,486,215	397,893	18,919,105	5,000	2,562,110	0	0	0	0	
MAINEHOUSING TDC INDEX		381,553								

Equity Source	Program Used?	Credit Rate	Annual Allocation	Total Credits	Equity Price	Total Equity
LIHTC New Construction/Rehab Credits	Y	9.00%	1,200,000	12,000,000	0.00	0
LIHTC Acquisition Credits	N	4.00%		0	0.00	0
Subtotal LIHTC Equity			1,200,000	12,000,000		0
Federal Historic Tax Credits	N	20.00%		0	0.00	0
State Historic Tax Credits	N	25.00%		0	0.00	0
State Low Income Tax Credits	Y			0	1.00	0
Solar Investment Tax Credits	Y	50.00%		0	1.00	0
TOTAL LIMITED PARTNER EQUITY				12,000,000	0.00	0

MAX LIHTC NEW CONSTRUCTION/REHAB CREDITS

Eligible Basis	18,919,105
Adjustment (i.e. HTC)	0
Adjusted Elible Basis	18,919,105
Basis Boost	100%
Applicable Fraction	100%
Qualified Basis	18,919,105
Applicable Rate	9.00%
1) NC/REHAB CREDIT CALC - or -	1,702,719
2) MAX ALLOWABLE 9% ALLOCATION - or -	1,200,000
3) AWARDED 9% ALLOCATION	0
ANNUAL NC/REHAB ALLOCATION	1,200,000
x 10 Years	10
TOTAL POSSIBLE NC/REHAB CREDITS	12,000,000
<i>Approx. Excess Basis</i>	<i>5,027,195</i>

MAX LIHTC ACQUISITION CREDITS

Eligible Basis	0
Applicable Fraction	100%
Qualified Basis	0
Applicable Rate	4.00%
ANNUAL ACQ ALLOCATION	0

FEDERAL HISTORIC TAX CREDITS

Qualified Rehab Expenditures	0
HTC Rate	20.0%
TOTAL FEDERAL HTC	0

STATE HISTORIC TAX CREDITS

Qualified Rehab Expenditures	0
HTC Rate	25.0%
1) STATE HTC CALC - or -	0
2) MAX ALLOWABLE STATE HTC	5,000,000
TOTAL STATE HTC	0

SOLAR INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Solar Investment	0
Credit Rate	50%
TOTAL STATE HTC	0

FINANCING

Source	Amount	Rate	Term	Amort.	Lien	Loan Type	Repayment Type	Annual Payment
MH Subsidy		0.00%	30	0		No Interest	CF Contingent	0
MH Interest-Only Loan	15,691,074	4.00%	30	30		Interest-Only	Must-Pay	627,643
Multifamily Loan		4.00%	10	30		Amortizing	Must-Pay	0
Commercial Loan		6.50%	10	25		Amortizing	Must-Pay	0
City HTF		0.00%	30	0		No Interest	CF Contingent	0
AHP Subsidized Advance		6.00%	20	30		Amortizing	Must-Pay	0
AHP Direct Subsidy		0.00%	30	0		No Interest	CF Contingent	0
Efficiency Maine								0
Deferred Developer Fee		0.00%	10	10		Amortizing	CF Contingent	0
								0
								0
								0
Total Financing	15,691,074							627,643

EQUITY

Source	Amount	Yield
LIHTC Equity	0	0.00
Fed HTC Equity	0	0.00
State HTC Equity	0	0.00
State LIHTC Equity	0	0.00
Solar Investment Tax Credits	0	0.00
PHDC Equity		
Other Equity	5,795,141	
Total Equity	5,795,141	

SOURCES & USES

	Total	Per Unit
Total Sources	21,486,215	397,893
Total Uses	21,486,215	397,893
CAPITALIZATION (GAP) / SURPLUS	(0)	(0)

Cash Flow - Mixed-Use Development

		6 Mo.															
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
% Infl.		2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043	2044
INCOME																	
Rental Income: LIHTC Units	2.0%	582,876	1,189,067	1,212,848	1,237,105	1,261,847	1,287,084	1,312,826	1,339,083	1,365,864	1,393,182	1,421,045	1,449,466	1,478,455	1,508,025	1,538,185	1,568,949
Vacancy Loss - LIHTC Units	5.0%	(29,144)	(59,453)	(60,642)	(61,855)	(63,092)	(64,354)	(65,641)	(66,954)	(68,293)	(69,659)	(71,052)	(72,473)	(73,923)	(75,401)	(76,909)	(78,447)
Rental Income: PBV Units	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vacancy Loss - PBV Units	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rental Income: Market Units	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vacancy Loss - Market Units	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Income	2.0%	750	1,530	1,561	1,592	1,624	1,656	1,689	1,723	1,757	1,793	1,828	1,865	1,902	1,940	1,979	2,019
Vacancy Loss - Other Income	5.0%	(38)	(77)	(78)	(80)	(81)	(83)	(84)	(86)	(88)	(90)	(91)	(93)	(95)	(97)	(99)	(101)
Tax Increment Financing	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial Income	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME		554,445	1,131,067	1,153,689	1,176,762	1,200,298	1,224,303	1,248,790	1,273,765	1,299,241	1,325,225	1,351,730	1,378,765	1,406,340	1,434,467	1,463,156	1,492,419
OPERATING EXPENSES																	
Administrative Expenses	3.0%	72,250	148,835	153,300	157,899	162,636	167,515	172,541	177,717	183,048	188,540	194,196	200,022	206,022	212,203	218,569	225,126
Utility Expenses	3.0%	29,500	60,770	62,593	64,471	66,405	68,397	70,449	72,563	74,739	76,982	79,291	81,670	84,120	86,643	89,243	91,920
Maintenance Expenses	3.0%	51,000	105,060	108,212	111,458	114,802	118,246	121,793	125,447	129,211	133,087	137,079	141,192	145,428	149,790	154,284	158,913
General Expenses	3.0%	30,000	61,800	63,654	65,564	67,531	69,556	71,643	73,792	76,006	78,286	80,635	83,054	85,546	88,112	90,755	93,478
Commercial Expenses	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPEX	3.0%	182,750	376,465	387,759	399,392	411,373	423,715	436,426	449,519	463,004	476,895	491,201	505,937	521,116	536,749	552,852	569,437
NET OPERATING INCOME		371,695	754,602	765,930	777,371	788,924	800,589	812,363	824,246	836,236	848,331	860,529	872,827	885,224	897,718	910,304	922,982
RESERVE DEPOSITS																	
Deposit to Replacement Reserve	3.0%	10,800	22,248	22,915	23,603	24,311	25,040	25,792	26,565	27,362	28,183	29,029	29,899	30,796	31,720	32,672	33,652
Deposit to Other Reserve	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPEX + RESERVES		193,550	398,713	410,674	422,995	435,684	448,755	462,218	476,084	490,367	505,078	520,230	535,837	551,912	568,469	585,523	603,089
NOI AFTER RESERVES		360,895	732,354	743,014	753,768	764,613	775,549	786,572	797,681	808,874	820,148	831,500	842,928	854,428	865,997	877,633	889,330
DEBT SERVICE																	
MH Subsidy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MH Interest-Only Loan		313,821	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643
Multifamily Loan		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial Loan		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City HTF		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHP Subsidized Advance		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHP Direct Subsidy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Efficiency Maine		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deferred Developer Fee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE		313,821	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643
DSCR		1.15	1.17	1.18	1.20	1.22	1.24	1.25	1.27	1.29	1.31	1.32	1.34	1.36	1.38	1.40	1.42
NET CASH FLOW		47,073	104,711	115,371	126,125	136,970	147,906	158,929	170,038	181,231	192,505	203,857	215,285	226,785	238,354	249,990	261,687
CASH FLOW PER UNIT		872	1,939	2,137	2,336	2,536	2,739	2,943	3,149	3,356	3,565	3,775	3,987	4,200	4,414	4,629	4,846
Rent & Income Inflation		-5,795,141.00	104,711.23	115,371.19	126,124.72	136,970.13	147,905.55	158,928.97	170,038.23	181,231.01	192,504.83	203,857.00	215,284.70	226,784.89	238,354.32	249,989.57	261,686.99
Yr 1-5: 2.0%																	
Yr 6-15: 2.0%		2%															
Yr 16-30: 2.0%																	

	% Infl.	16 2045	17 2046	18 2047	19 2048	20 2049	21 2050	22 2051	23 2052	24 2053	25 2054	26 2055	27 2056	28 2057	29 2058	30 2059
INCOME																
Rental Income: LIHTC Units	2.0%	1,600,328	1,632,334	1,664,981	1,698,281	1,732,246	1,766,891	1,802,229	1,838,273	1,875,039	1,912,540	1,950,791	1,989,806	2,029,602	2,070,194	2,111,598
Vacancy Loss - LIHTC Units	5.0%	(80,016)	(81,617)	(83,249)	(84,914)	(86,612)	(88,345)	(90,111)	(91,914)	(93,752)	(95,627)	(97,540)	(99,490)	(101,480)	(103,510)	(105,580)
Rental Income: PBV Units	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vacancy Loss - PBV Units	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rental Income: Market Units	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vacancy Loss - Market Units	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Income	2.0%	2,059	2,100	2,142	2,185	2,229	2,273	2,319	2,365	2,413	2,461	2,510	2,560	2,612	2,664	2,717
Vacancy Loss - Other Income	5.0%	(103)	(105)	(107)	(109)	(111)	(114)	(116)	(118)	(121)	(123)	(126)	(128)	(131)	(133)	(136)
Tax Increment Financing	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial Income	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME		1,522,268	1,552,713	1,583,767	1,615,442	1,647,751	1,680,706	1,714,320	1,748,607	1,783,579	1,819,251	1,855,636	1,892,748	1,930,603	1,969,215	2,008,600

OPERATING EXPENSES																
Administrative Expenses	3.0%	231,880	238,836	246,002	253,382	260,983	268,813	276,877	285,183	293,739	302,551	311,627	320,976	330,606	340,524	350,739
Utility Expenses	3.0%	94,678	97,518	100,444	103,457	106,561	109,757	113,050	116,442	119,935	123,533	127,239	131,056	134,988	139,037	143,208
Maintenance Expenses	3.0%	163,680	168,590	173,648	178,858	184,223	189,750	195,443	201,306	207,345	213,565	219,972	226,571	233,369	240,370	247,581
General Expenses	3.0%	96,282	99,171	102,146	105,210	108,367	111,618	114,966	118,415	121,968	125,627	129,395	133,277	137,276	141,394	145,636
Commercial Expenses	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPEX	3.0%	586,520	604,116	622,239	640,906	660,134	679,938	700,336	721,346	742,986	765,276	788,234	811,881	836,238	861,325	887,164

NET OPERATING INCOME		935,747	948,597	961,528	974,536	987,618	1,000,769	1,013,985	1,027,261	1,040,593	1,053,975	1,067,402	1,080,867	1,094,366	1,107,891	1,121,435
-----------------------------	--	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

RESERVE DEPOSITS																
Deposit to Replacement Reserve	3.0%	34,662	35,702	36,773	37,876	39,012	40,182	41,388	42,629	43,908	45,226	46,582	47,980	49,419	50,902	52,429
Deposit to Other Reserve	3.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPEX + RESERVES		621,182	639,817	659,012	678,782	699,146	720,120	741,724	763,975	786,895	810,501	834,816	859,861	885,657	912,227	939,593

NOI AFTER RESERVES		901,086	912,896	924,755	936,660	948,606	960,586	972,597	984,632	996,684	1,008,749	1,020,819	1,032,887	1,044,946	1,056,989	1,069,006
---------------------------	--	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

DEBT SERVICE																
MH Subsidy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MH Interest-Only Loan		627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643
Multifamily Loan		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial Loan		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City HTF		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHP Subsidized Advance		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AHP Direct Subsidy		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Efficiency Maine		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deferred Developer Fee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE		627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643	627,643

DSCR		1.44	1.45	1.47	1.49	1.51	1.53	1.55	1.57	1.59	1.61	1.63	1.65	1.66	1.68	1.70
NET CASH FLOW		273,443	285,253	297,112	309,017	320,963	332,943	344,954	356,989	369,041	381,106	393,176	405,244	417,304	429,346	441,363
CASH FLOW PER UNIT		5,064	5,282	5,502	5,723	5,944	6,166	6,388	6,611	6,834	7,058	7,281	7,505	7,728	7,951	8,173

Rent & Income Inflation		273,442.70	285,252.59	297,112.33	309,017.32	320,962.70	332,943.36	344,953.88	356,988.58	369,041.46	381,106.20	393,176.17	405,244.39	417,303.53	429,345.89	441,363.40
Yr 1-5: 2.0%																
Yr 6-15: 2.0%																
Yr 16-30: 2.0%																

21 Randall Homeownership (Template Pro Forma)

USES	TOTAL	PER UNIT
Site Improvements	\$ 582,836.09	\$ 72,854.51
Construction	\$ 2,911,911.13	\$ 363,988.89
Construction Contingency (10%)	\$ 445,580.27	\$ 55,697.53
Acquisition Costs	\$ -	\$ -
Building Permits & Fees	\$ 110,700.00	\$ 13,837.50
Survey & Engineering	\$ 113,000.00	\$ 14,125.00
Architectural & Design	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 9,375.00
Legal	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 18,750.00
Title, Recording, Transfer	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 3,750.00
Construction Period Tax & Insurance	\$ 47,500.00	\$ 5,937.50
Financing Fees (AHTIF, Origination, Appraisal)	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 1,875.00
Construction Loan Interest	\$ 96,268.00	\$ 12,033.50
AHTIF Reserve	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 9,375.00
Warranty Reserve	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 6,250.00
Consultants & Miscellaneous	\$ 13,600.00	\$ 1,700.00
Soft Cost Contingency	\$ 60,352.21	\$ 7,544.03
Developer Fee	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 31,250.00
Total Hard Costs	\$ 3,940,327.49	\$ 492,540.94
Total Soft Costs	\$ 1,207,044.21	\$ 150,880.53
Total Development Costs	\$ 5,147,371.70	\$ 643,421.46

SOURCES	TOTAL	PER UNIT
Affordable Unit Sales (2 bed units)	\$ 1,194,000.00	\$ 298,500.00
Affordable Unit Sales (4 bed units)	\$ 716,000.00	\$ 358,000.00
Market Rate Unit Sales (3 bed units)	\$ 1,105,600.00	\$ 552,800.00
MaineHousing Homeownership Program	\$ 468,747.00	\$ 78,124.50
AHTIF Loan	\$ 370,000.00	\$ 46,250.00
	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -

Total Sources	\$ 3,854,347.00	\$ 481,793.38
----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

SURPLUS/(GAP)	\$ (1,293,024.70)	\$ (161,628.09)
----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Flow of Funds at Completion/Sale Closings

Construction Sources

Construction Loan	<u>2,495,600</u>	83%
AHTIF Loan	370,000	
MH AHOP Grant	468,747	
CDS	0	
EPA Brownfields Grant	0	
Sponsor Equity - Seller Note	270,000	
Sponsor Equity - DDF	250,000	
Sponsor Equity - Other	<u>1,293,025</u>	
Total	<u>5,147,372</u>	

Gross Sale Proceeds	<u>3,015,600</u>
Less Broker Fees & Closing Costs	<u>0</u>
Net Proceeds	<u>3,015,600</u>

Use of Sale Proceeds

Repay Construction Loan	<u>-2,495,600</u>
Pay Seller Loan	-270,000
Pay DDF	-250,000
Repay Sponsor Capital	<u>-1,293,025</u>
Net Proceeds Available to Sponsor	<u>-1,293,025</u>

AHTIF Loan Sizing

Total Sales Value	\$	<u>3,015,600</u>
Projected Assessed Value	\$	2,714,040
Current Assessed Value	\$	69,300
Incremental Value "Captured Value"	\$	2,644,740
Applicable Tax Rate	\$	15.01
Projected Tax Rate at Reassessment	\$	15.92
Year 1 Incremental Tax Revenue	\$	42,115
AHTIF Share		75.00%
Projected AHTIF Loan Cash Flow	\$	30,000
AHTIF Loan Rate		6.50%
Amortization Period		27
Supportable Loan Amount		<u>\$377,249.93</u>
Rounddown		<u>\$370,000.00</u>

Assumptions

Clean soil & no brownfields funding

\$0 acquisition costs

Same unit mix as FS3 (8 units)

10% increase in hard costs

2.5% inflation contingency

10% construction contingency

5% soft cost contingency

removed Brownfields funding

removed Congressional funding

Assumed AHTIF remained the same as FS3

Assumed MSHA AHOP remained the same as FS3

Assumed home sale prices remained steady

Approx \$160K / Unit funding gap