Cornell Real Estate Review

Volume 1 Article 9

7-2002

South Bridge Project

Nina Brown

Jan deRoos Cornell University School of Hotel Administration, jad10@cornell.edu

Elliot Burrell-Crowe

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/crer



Part of the Real Estate Commons

Recommended Citation

Brown, N., deRoos, J., & Burrell-Crowe, E. (2002). The South Bridge Project. Cornell Real Estate Review, 1(1), 37-51. Retrieved from http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/crer/vol1/iss1/9

This Program Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Cornell Real Estate Review by an authorized editor of The Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact hotellibrary@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

South Bridge Project

Abstract

[Excerpt] Care Study- The Jean DuSable Company is facing a decision regarding the development options for the final parcels within the South Bridge Redevelopment Project, a large mixed-use development in the North Michigan Avenue sub-market of Chicago's central business district Designed as a showplace for international leaders in retail, entertainment and hospitality, the South Bridge Redevelopment Project contains approximately 898,000 square foot of retail and entertainment space, 1.2 million square feet of office space, 2,300 hotel rooms and 2,500 parking spaces, spanning a nine-block area fronting Michigan Avenue and extending west to State Street.

Keywords

Cornell, case study, redevelopment, commercial real estate, hotel property

Editors Note:

The CREJ is pleased to present our first original case study, The South Bridge Project. While the facts and numbers are largely fictional, we believe that it presents real issues of quantitative and qualitative analysis that are present in the evaluation of all real estate opportunities. Following the case study are two responses prepared by students of the Cornell Program in Real Estate. Responses from readers are welcome!

A Teacher's Note, prepared by Prof. Jan deRoos, is available upon request.

The South Bridge Project

By Nina Brown, Profesor Jan deRoos HVS International Professor Hotel Finance and Real Estate, Cornell University, and Elliott Burrell-Crowe.

The Jean DuSable Company is facing a decision regarding the development options for the final parcels within the South Bridge Redevelopment Project, a large mixed-use development in the North Michigan Avenue sub-market of Chicago's central business district. Designed as a showplace for international leaders in retail, entertainment and hospitality, the South Bridge Redevelopment Project contains approximately 898,000 square foot of retail and entertainment space, 1.2 million square feet of office space, 2,300 hotel rooms and 2,500 parking spaces, spanning a nine-block area fronting Michigan Avenue and extending west to State Street.

Development of the last component of the project, Blocks 124 and 125 (please see Figure 1), is scheduled to begin soon. The original plan called for development of a retail portion fronting Michigan Avenue at Grand Avenue and extending west across Rush Street to Wabash Avenue. This retail component would consist of three distinct elements: a four-story, 260,000 square foot, high end retailer, Fordstom Department Store, a 140,000 square feet specialty retail arcade and 222 parking spaces below the Fordstom store. A hotel was proposed above the specialty retail space linking the Fordstom store to Michigan Avenue. The hotel would be positioned as a franchise affiliated, luxury, 5-diamond AAA boutique hotel. Containing approximately 300 guestrooms, including 32 suites, amenities at the hotel would include approximately 8,700 square feet of retail space, a three-meal-a-day signature restaurant, a spa facility and a business center. The retail portion would be accessible from the hotel by a connecting elevator to the hotel's fifth floor lobby.

The Company requires construction financing for blocks 124 & 125 at the beginning of 1999. As a result of turmoil in the financial markets after the Asian economic crisis in August of 1998, debt and equity capital is in short supply. It has became difficult to find financing for projects of all types, but with the downtum in the capital markets, funds for full-service hotel projects have diminished severely. Lenders that are still active have raised their interest rates and have more stringent loan terms, requiring additional equity from borrowers and higher debt coverage ratios. Only projects with premium locations, in select markets, can attract financing. Securing financing for a project in Chicago is further complicated by conditions in the hotel market, in the city at the end of 1998. While the market fundamentals remain strong, a staggering number of new hotels are under construction or proposed for the city. Decreasing capital availability and an increasingly competitive hotel market in Chicago have caused the Company to reevaluate its development options. Since hotel financing might be difficult to obtain, the company has decided to consider the retail development and the

SOUTH BRIDGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT



Figure 1

hotel development separately. In addition, they have decided to give serious consideration to the option of developing an office building instead of either a hotel or a retail mall.

As project manager for the Jean DuSable Company, your task is to draft a memo to Jean DuSable, Chairman of the Jean DuSable Company, describing your analysis of the highest and best use of the site. Options to be considered include: developing Block 124 and 125 as a hotel project only, as a retail complex only or, as an office building or some combination of the above options. Given the location of the property along Chicago's Magnificent Mile, it is assumed that any commercial use would be of greater value than the value of the site as vacant. Furthermore, it is assumed that retail, hotel, and office uses are all legally permissible uses. Your task is to test the financial feasibility and the maximum productivity of each alternative. The following pages contain the information necessary to make your recommendation.

Background

The South Bridge Redevelopment Project is The Jean DuSable Company's largest and most innovative project to date. With more than 2.1 million square feet of new development, this master-planned, nine block development, includes a mix of retail, entertainment, restaurant, hotel and office uses and encompasses the area from North Michigan Avenue on the east to the River North entertainment district on the west.

The Jean DuSable Company

The Jean DuSable Company was established in 1981 as a real estate consulting firm addressing real estate requirements of corporations, institutions, and professional service firms. Throughout the 1980s, the Company expanded its real estate consulting activities and developed a series of high-rise office and mixed-use structures utilizing internationally acclaimed architects. The Company has developed over 20 million square feet of mixed use and office space throughout the country. The firm is headquartered in Chicago with offices around Chicago and in New York, serving clients worldwide on varied assignments. The company employs approximately 400 professional, administrative, and support staff providing a full range of real estate services.

The South Bridge Redevelopment Project

The South Bridge Redevelopment project began in 1994 when Jean DuSable signed a letter of intent to construct a 500,000 square foot shopping mall on the west side of Michigan Avenue just south of Ohio Street. The \$500 million dollar project included hotels, retail shops and entertainment venues more extensive than all but a few of the country's largest shopping centers. In total, the project encompassed nine city blocks, bounded by Ontario Street to the north, Illinois Street to the south, State Street to the west and Michigan Avenue to east. A summary of the current South Bridge Redevelopment components is presented below in Table 1.

Table 1

| Building | <u>Space</u> |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 600 N. Michigan Marriott Hotel Retail Space | 270,000 sf 400 Rooms 47,000 sf |
| Block 120 | |
| Office | 93,000 sf |
| Hotel | 250 Suites |
| Entertainment | 185,000 sf |
| Block 119 – Hilton Hotel 515 N. State - Office | 350 Rooms 620,000 sf |
| Block 127 | |
| Apartment Building | 427 units |
| Marriott Courtyard | 300 rooms |
| Block 116 | |
| Structured Parking | 900 Stalls |

Block 124

Block 124 is a portion of the subject property. As originally conceived, the centerpiece of Block 124 would be the four level Fordstom high end retailer situated in the block bounded by Rush Street, Wabash, Illinois and Grand Avenues. In order to provide Michigan Avenue access to the Fordstom store, a 140,000 square foot bridge would be constructed over Grand Avenue extending between the 520 North Michigan Avenue building, over Rush Street, and into the Fordstom store. Shoppers would enter a four-story, glass atrium on Michigan Avenue between 520 North Michigan Avenue and the Chicago Marriott Hotel and proceed down a passageway lined with 30 upper-end specialty stores. In addition, Block 124 would include 222 parking spaces below grade and street level retail along Grand Avenue.

Block 125

Block 125 represents a portion of the subject property, as well. As originally conceived Block 125 would include 115,000 square feet of retail space and a 300-room full service luxury hotel located above the retail space

The McGraw-Hill Building

The redevelopment of Blocks 124 and 125 requires the demolition of 520 North Michigan Avenue, also known as the McGraw-Hill building, a 17-story, 70 year old office building with an Art Deco façade. In response to preservationists concerns about destroying the building, the Commission on Chicago Landmarks granted the building temporary landmark status. A compromise was eventually reached whereby the city of Chicago granted landmark status only to the façade of the building. As a result, the Jean DuSable Company is required to dismantle the granite and limestone façade piece by piece, store it during construction of the new building, and then replace it without damaging the historic and delicate material. The façade contained 2,200 slabs of stone, the largest of which weighs approximately one ton. While there was already some damage to the stone, an initial survey found that more than 70 percent of the façade is in good condition and reusable. Eighteen percent of the façade will not be replaced because that area is to be the location for the building's new atrium. Since seventy-five percent of the façade has to be restored in order for the building to maintain its landmark status, there is little margin for error. To insure proper compliance, Chicago's Department of Planning and Development has hired two consultants to monitor the project on a day to day basis. The Jean DuSable Company will face work stoppage or fines if the project does not adhere to the city's plan.

CHICAGO MARKET ANALYSIS

An analysis of the properties that would directly compete with the subject as a retail, hotel or office development is described below.

Competitive Retail Properties

The subject property is located in the North Michigan Avenue submarket, which extends from the Chicago River north to Oak Street, and is often referred to as The Magnificent Mile. Historically, Water Tower Place, completed in 1975, was the retail anchor of the area. However, with the development of the Fordstom store and the other South Bridge Redevelopment project's retail components, the recent completion of 700 North Michigan Avenue, located ½ mile from the subject property, and anchored by Polo-Ralph Lauren, Pottery Barn, Tiffany & Company, and Banana Republic, and the completion of 600 North Michigan Avenue anchored by Eddie Bauer, Marshall's, and Linen N' Things, it is likely that the retail orientation of North Michigan Avenue will change. The focal point of the area is anticipated to be a multi-block area extending from the 500 block to the 700 block of North Michigan (between Ohio and Illinois streets) Avenue including the subject site. Approximately 37 percent of the total supply of retail space surveyed by the Greater North Michigan Avenue Association is situated in vertical malls which include: Water Tower Place, 900 North Michigan Avenue, and 700 North Michigan Avenue. These properties in Table 2 are anticipated to be the primary competitors for the proposed facility.

Table 2

| Name | Sq. Ft. | # of | Occupancy % | Shoppers Median | Sales/SF | Rental |
|----------|---------|--------|-------------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| | ' | Stores | | Annual Income | | rates \$/SF |
| Water | 615,000 | 120 | 100 | \$44,000 | \$500 | \$65-100 |
| Tower | | | | | | |
| place | | | | | | |
| 900 N. | 500,000 | 65 | 90 | \$50,000 | \$450 | \$55-90 |
| Michigan | | | | | | |
| 700 N. | 490,000 | 90 | 95 | \$44,000 | \$450 | \$60-95 |
| Michigan | | | | | | |

900 North Michigan Avenue

Opened in 1988, the mall is anchored by a 250,000 square foot Bloomingdale's high-fashion department store. The remainder of the retail space is comprised of high-fashion retail specialty shops. Along with the retail space, the complex includes a 345-unit Four Seasons Hotel and 125 luxury residential condominium units.

700 North Michigan Avenue

Opened in 1990, with a total of 490,000 square feet. A 154,204 square foot Saks Fifth Avenue, high-fashion department store, anchors the development. In addition to the retail component, Chicago Place features a 49-story residential tower, with over 200 luxury residential condominium units

Retail Sales

In an analysis of a retail property, levels of income and purchasing power must be compared with actual retail sales to clearly ascertain the dynamics of the marketplace. Table 3 summarizes retail sales for Cook County and the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area of Chicago, from 1988 to 1997, based on information provided by Sales and Marketing Management Survey of Buying Power.

Table 3

| RETA | IL SALES (0 | 00's) 1988-1997 | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|
| Chicago | % Increase | Cook | % Increase or Decrease | County as a % of the CMSA |
| CMSA | | County | | |
| \$55,283,011 | | \$34,571,081 | 785 | 63% |
| \$58,368,209 | 5.58% | \$35,431,590 | 2.49% | 61% |
| \$61,391,241 | 5.18% | \$37,683,384 | 6.36% | 61% |
| \$62,125,476 | 1.20% | \$37,088,030 | -1.58% | 60% |
| \$70,464,364 | 13.42% | \$40,550,354 | 9.34% | 58% |
| \$71,698,132 | 1.75% | \$40,483,853 | -0.16% | 56% |
| \$68,555,134 | -4.38% | \$43,770,495 | 8.12% | 64% |
| \$71,507,560 | 4.31% | \$45,020,565 | 2.86% | 63% |
| \$72,346,774 | 1.17% | \$44,750,490 | -0.60% | 62% |
| \$73,714,948 | 1.89% | | | 61% |
| 3.25% | - | 2.97% | | - |
| | Chicago CMSA \$55,283,011 \$58,368,209 \$61,391,241 \$62,125,476 \$70,464,364 \$71,698,132 \$68,555,134 \$71,507,560 \$72,346,774 \$73,714,948 | Chicago % Increase CMSA \$55,283,011 \$58,368,209 5.58% \$61,391,241 5.18% \$62,125,476 1.20% \$70,464,364 13.42% \$71,698,132 1.75% \$68,555,134 -4.38% \$71,507,560 4.31% \$72,346,774 1.17% \$73,714,948 1.89% | CMSA County \$55,283,011 \$55,283,011 \$58,368,209 \$5.58% \$35,431,590 \$61,391,241 \$5.18% \$37,683,384 \$62,125,476 \$1.20% \$37,088,030 \$70,464,364 \$13.42% \$40,550,354 \$71,698,132 \$1.75% \$40,483,853 \$68,555,134 \$43,770,495 \$71,507,560 \$431% \$45,020,565 \$72,346,774 \$1.17% \$44,750,490 \$73,714,948 \$1.89% \$44,970,321 | Chicago % Increase Cook % Increase or Decrease CMSA County \$34,571,081 \$55,283,011 \$58,368,209 5.58% \$35,431,590 2.49% \$61,391,241 5.18% \$37,683,384 6.36% \$62,125,476 1.20% \$37,088,030 -1.58% \$70,464,364 13.42% \$40,550,354 9.34% \$71,698,132 1.75% \$40,483,853 -0.16% \$68,555,134 -4.38% \$43,770,495 8.12% \$71,507,560 4.31% \$45,020,565 2.86% \$72,346,774 1.17% \$44,750,490 -0.60% \$73,714,948 1.89% \$44,970,321 0.49% |

Retail sales activity along North Michigan Avenue has substantially increased since 1976.

Table 4

| HI | STORICAL RETAIL SALE | S ALONG |
|-------------------|----------------------|------------|
| a Eligino all'Eli | The Magnificent Mi | le |
| Year | Retail Sales | % Increase |
| 1976 | \$150,000,000 | |
| 1977 | \$200,000,000 | +33.33% |
| 1978 | \$250,000,000 | +25.00% |
| 1979 | \$300,000,000 | +20.00% |
| 1980 | \$345,000,000 | +15.00% |
| 1981 | \$395,000,000 | +14.49% |
| 1982 | \$425,000,000 | +7.59% |
| 1983 | \$470,000,000 | +10.59% |
| 1984 | \$530,000,000 | +12.77% |
| 1985 | \$565,000,000 | +6.60% |
| 1986 | \$600,000,000 | +6.19% |
| 1987 | \$650,000,000 | +8.33% |
| 1988 | \$725,000,000 | +11.54% |
| 1989 | \$840,000,000 | +15.86% |
| 1990 | \$935,000,000 | +11.31% |
| 1991 | \$967,000,000 | +3.42% |
| 1992 | \$1,041,000,000 | +7.65% |
| 1993 | \$1,103,000,000 | +5.96% |
| 1994 | \$1,137,000,000 | +3.08% |
| 1995 | \$1,177,000,000 | +3.52% |
| 1996 | \$1,224,000,000 | +3.99% |
| 1997 | \$1,297,000,000 | +5.96% |

Retail Rental Rates

The growth in retail sales (See Table 4) has led to growth in rental rates for retail space. Average rental rates of retail space along the Magnificent mile have increased 46.3 percent from 1991 to 1998, and approximately started at \$61.09 per square foot in the fourth quarter of 1998. Rental rates according to S. Realty Group, Ltd., were as high as \$150.00 to \$200.00 per square foot, nearly double 1992 levels, for ground level retail locations along *The Magnificent Mile*. As of April 1998, the overall vacancy rate, of the Magnificent Mile, according to S. Realty Group, Ltd., is estimated at 1.3 percent.

Competitive Hotel Properties

As proposed, the subject property would contain a 300-room, luxury hotel that would be positioned as a , five-diamond , AAA boutique property. As of the fourth quarter 1998, the Ritz-Carlton Chicago and the Four Seasons Hotel Chicago were the only hotels in Chicago in this quality category. In addition to these hotels, Table 5 summarizes other four-star hotels proximate to the subject site.

Table 5

| Hotel | Rooms | ADR | Occ. % | % Compar- ability. |
|--------------|-------|-------|--------|-----------------------|
| Fairmont | 692 | \$174 | 82 | 100 |
| Four Seasons | 343 | \$325 | 80 | 100 |
| Omni | 347 | \$175 | 77 | 100 |
| Renaissance | 553 | \$191 | 76 | 100 |
| Ritz Carlton | 430 | \$295 | 75 | 100 |
| Westin | 422 | \$179 | 69 | 100 |

New and Proposed Properties

As of the fourth quarter 1998, a total of 2,027 new hotel rooms were under construction in Chicago. Of these projects, it is anticipated that the Park Hyatt will compete for room night demand on a primary basis with the proposed hotel. The Park Hyatt, located three blocks north of block 124, with 220 guestrooms is anticipated to open in January of 2000. The Allerton Crowne Plaza located on North Michigan Avenue four blocks south of the subject property will be approximately 75 percent competitive with the subject property. This hotel, with a reported 425 rooms, is scheduled to open in June of 1999. The Wyndham Suites is located one block east and two blocks south of the subject property. This first-class business hotel, with 418 guestrooms, is excepted to open in April of 1999. Even though this hotel is off of North Michigan Avenue and is positioned just below the proposed hotel in terms of quality level and price, it is anticipated to compete with the subject property on a secondary basis.

Competitive Office Properties

Major office buildings within the subject's immediate location include: The Equitable Building, The Tribune Tower, The Chicago Sun-Times Building, The IBM Building, and 541 North Fairbanks Court (Time-Warner Building). The immediate two-block radius from the subject property is developed with a wide variety of uses including hotels, residential, and office buildings, all with ground-level retail establishments. The Table6 summarizes the office building data that was considered to be the most competitive with the proposed facility.

Table 6

RESULTS OF COMPARABLE OFFICE BUILDINGS SURVEYED

| Sample Size of Survey | 5 Office Buildings |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Total Amount of Space | 7,545,618 SF |
| Surveyed | |
| Range of Net Rental Rates | \$10.00 to 24.00/SF, Net |
| Average Net Rental Rate | \$18.00/SF |
| Escalations | 35.0% CPI, 2.0% & \$0.50 per |
| | year |
| Lease Terms | 5 to 10 years |
| Tenant Improvements | \$35.00/SF new and \$10.00/SF |
| _ | renewal |

FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

The project construction costs for the retail, the hotel and the office scenarios are provided in the following Exhibits 1-4. Proforma income statements for each scenario are also provided as Exhibits 2, 3 and 4. At the end of 1998, retail projects can secure financing at interest rates of approximately 7 percent with a 25 year amortization schedule, with the mortgage lender lending up to 70 percent of the retail project's estimated value. Hotel projects, that are structured on a strong economic basis, can secure mortgage financing at interest rates of approximately 9 percent. A 25 year amortization schedule would be appropriate for the subject property as a hotel development and a mortgage lender would lend up to 70 percent of the hotel's estimated value. Office projects typically received a 6 percent mortgage interest rate with a 25 year amortization schedule and mortgage lenders are willing to loan up to 75 percent of the office project's value. The Jean DuSable Company assumes a holding period of ten years for all development projects, as long as net operating income is stabilized in the tenth and eleventh years. Selling costs are estimated at two percent for all property types. Table 7 summarizes relevant capitalization rates.

Table 7

| Fall 1998 - Abstract | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------------|----------|--------|--|--|--|
| | Capit | alization | Rates | 35 | Internal | | | | |
| | Goin | ig-In | Term | ninal | Rate of | Return | | | |
| | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | | | |
| Retail - Regional Malls | | | | | | | | | |
| Class A - Leased Asset | 7.50% | 8.30% | 7.90% | 8.80% | 10.60% | 11.50% | | | |
| Luxury/Resort Hotels | 8.00% | 11.00% | 9.00% | 12.00% | 11.50% | 19.00% | | | |
| Full Service Hotels | 9.00% | 12.00% | 9.00% | 12.50% | 12.00% | 18.00% | | | |
| Office - Urban CBD | at 10 Miles | | | Pillar San San | | | | | |
| Class A - Leased Asset | 8.30% | 8.70% | 8.60% | 9.10% | 11.00% | 11.50% | | | |

Cushman & Wakefield Valuation Advisory Services National Investor Survey

ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY

Having recently been hired as a new graduate of the Cornell Program in Real Estate, Mr. DuSable has asked you to quickly asses the South Bridge opputunity based on the information provided, as well as the following exhibits. He specifically requests that you analyze the available options and recommend a course of action, predicated upon the highest, best and permissible use.

Based on your analysis, prepare a memo to Mr. DuSable, recommending the use(s) of the site which are both financially feasible and the highest and best use. Include a discussion of the risk factors that should be considered for each property type in Chicago for the time period under consideration and describe how you would incorporate these risk factors into your investment analysis.

EXHIBIT 1

Project Components Retail, Hotel and Office Scenarios

| Retail | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Level | GBA | GLA | Anchor GLA | Specialty Tenant GLA | | | | | |
| Ground Level | 143,750 | 56,000 | 0 | 56,000 | | | | | |
| Second Floor | 143,750 | 114,667 | 86,667 | 28,000 | | | | | |
| Third Floor | 143,750 | 114,667 | 86,667 | 28,000 | | | | | |
| Fourth Floor | 143,750 | 114,667 | 86,667 | 28,000 | | | | | |
| Total | 575,000 | 400,000 | 260,000 | 140,000 | | | | | |

| | | Hotel | |
|--------------|------|--------|------------------|
| Level | Keys | Suites | Other |
| Ground Level | | | Lobby/Restaurant |
| 2nd Floor | | | Meeting Space |
| 3rd Floor | | | Spa |
| 4th Floor | 26 | 0 | |
| 5th Floor | 26 | 0 | |
| 6th Floor | 26 | 0 | |
| 7th Floor | 26 | 0 | |
| 8th Floor | 22 | 4 | |
| 9th Floor | 22 | 4 | |
| 10th Floor | 22 | 4 | |
| 11th Floor | 22 | 4 | |
| 12th Floor | 22 | 4 | |
| 13th Floor | 22 | 4 | |
| 14th Floor | 16 | 4 | |
| 15th Floor | 16 | 4 | |
| Total | 268 | 32 | 300,000 SF |

| | Office | |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| Level | GBA | GLA |
| Ground Level | 30,000 | 8,000 |
| 2nd Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 3rd Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 4th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 5th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 6th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 7th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 8th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 9th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 10th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 11th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 12th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 13th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 14th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| 15th Floor | 30,000 | 28,000 |
| Total | 450,000 | 400,000 |

| Particular and the | \$ Amount | Per SF of GBA | Per SF of GLA | Percent of Total Costs |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Land Costs | | | | |
| Land Costs | \$35,000,000 | \$77.78 | \$87.50 | 24.13% |
| Total Land Costs | \$35,000,000 | \$77.78 | \$87.50 | 24.139 |
| Hard Costs | | | | |
| Base Building | \$63,000,000 | \$140.00 | \$157.50 | 43.43% |
| Hard Cost Contingency | \$3,150,000 | \$7.00 | \$7.88 | 2.179 |
| FF&E | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| Total Hard Costs | \$66,150,000 | \$147.00 | \$165.38 | 45.60% |
| Soft Costs | | | | |
| Leasing Commissions | \$4,500,000 | \$10.00 | \$11.25 | 3.10% |
| Tenant Improvements | \$13,500,000 | \$30.00 | \$33.75 | 9.31% |
| Financing Fees | \$2,250,000 | \$5.00 | \$5.63 | 1.55% |
| Marketing | \$375,000 | \$0.83 | \$0.94 | 0.26% |
| nsurance | \$475,000 | \$1.06 | \$1.19 | 0.33% |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$950,000 | \$2.11 | \$2.38 | 0.65% |
| Management Fees | \$1,950,000 | \$4.33 | \$4.88 | 1.34% |
| Soft Cost Contingency | \$1,000,000 | \$2.22 | \$2.50 | 0.69% |
| Total Soft Costs | \$25,000,000 | \$55.56 | \$62.50 | 17.23% |
| Developer's Profit | \$18,922,500 | \$54.06 | \$47.31 | 13.04% |
| Project Total | \$145,072,500 | \$322.38 | \$362.68 | 100.00% |
| Valuation Parameters | | | | |
| Expense Inflation Rate | | 3.00% | | |
| Terminal Capitalization Rate | | 8.60% | | |
| Selling Expenses | | 2.00% | | |
| Desired Equity Yield | | 11.00% | | |
| Mortgage Parameters | | | | |
| Loan to Value Ratio | | 75% | | |

6.50%

25 years

| Office Operating Proforma (Expressed | in Year 1 Dollars) | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----|-----------------|--------------|----------------|----|----------|
| Revenue | | Percent of PGI | P | er SF of GLA | Year 3 | Percent of PGI | P | er SF of |
| Base Rental Revenue | \$8,770,553 | 63.4% | \$ | 21.93 | \$9,304,680 | 63.4% | • | 23.26 |
| Absorption & Turnover Vacancy | -\$125,294 | -0.9% | \$ | (0.31) | -\$132,924 | -0.9% | | (0.33 |
| Scheduled Base Rental Revenue | \$8,645,260 | 62.5% | \$ | 21.61 | \$9,171,756 | 62.5% | | 22.93 |
| Reimbursable Operating Expenses | \$0 | | | | | 12.6% | 8 | 4.63 |
| General Operating | \$1,746,000 | 12.6% | \$ | 4.37 | \$1,852,331 | 0.4% | | 0.15 |
| Insurance | \$58,200 | 0.4% | \$ | 0.15 | \$61,744 | 19.3% | | 7.07 |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$2,667,500 | 19.3% | \$ | 6.67 | \$2,829,951 | 1.2% | | 0.43 |
| Management Fee | \$162,960 | 1.2% | \$ | 0.41 | \$172,884 | 1.270 | Φ | 0.40 |
| Non-Reimbursable Operating Expenses | | | | | \$172,004 | 0.3% | | 0.11 |
| Advertising and Marketing | \$40,000 | 0.3% | \$ | 0.10 | \$42,436 | 5.2% | | 1.92 |
| Parking Income | \$725,000 | 5.2% | \$ | 1.81 | \$769,153 | 0.4% | 5 | 0.13 |
| Miscellaneous Revenue | \$50,000 | 0.4% | \$ | 0.13 | \$53,045 | 101.9% | | 37.38 |
| Potential Gross Revenue | \$14,094,920 | 101.9% | \$ | 35.24 | \$14,953,300 | 1.9% | _ | 0.70 |
| General Vacancy | \$263,117 | 1.9% | \$ | 0.66 | \$279,140 | 100.0% | | 36.69 |
| Effective Gross Revenue | \$13,831,803 | 100.0% | \$ | 34.58 | \$14,674,160 | 100.070 | 4 | 50.00 |
| Expenses | | | | | | 13.0% | 8 | 4.77 |
| General Operating Expenses | \$1,800,000 | 13.0% | \$ | 4.50 | \$1,909,620 | 0.4% | | 0.16 |
| Insurance | \$60,000 | 0.4% | \$ | 0.15 | \$63,654 | 19.9% | | 7.29 |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$2,750,000 | 19.9% | \$ | 6.88 | \$2,917,475 | 1.2% | | 0.45 |
| Management Fee | \$168,000 | 1.2% | \$ | 0.42 | \$178,231 | 0.3% | | 0.11 |
| Advertising and Marketing Expense | \$40,000 | 0.3% | \$ | 0.10 | \$42,436 | 34.8% | | 12.78 |
| Total Expenses | \$4,818,000 | 34.8% | \$ | 12.05 | \$5,111,416 | 34.076 | Ψ | 12.70 |
| Net Operating Income | \$9,013,803 | 65.2% | s | 22.53 | | 65.2% | \$ | 23.91 |
| not operating meeting | 40,010,000 | 00.270 | | 22.00 | \$9,562,744 | | | |
| Leasing & Capital Costs | | | | | | 4.1% | \$ | 1.52 |
| Tenant Improvements | \$571,429 | 4.1% | \$ | 1.43 | \$606,229 | 1.9% | \$ | 0.68 |
| Leasing Commissions | \$257,143 | 1.9% | \$ | 0.64 | \$272,803 | 0.4% | | 0.16 |
| Capital Reserves | \$60,000 | 0.4% | \$ | 0.15 | \$63,654 | | | |
| Income Tax | \$8,125,232 | 58.7% | \$ | 20.31 | \$8,620,058 | 58.7% | \$ | 21.55 |

Mortgage Interest Rate

Mortgage Amortization

Exhbit 3

Retail Development Budget

| | \$ Amount | Per SF of GBA | Per SF of GLA | Percent of Total Costs |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Land Costs | | | | |
| Land Costs | \$35,000,000 | \$60.87 | \$87.50 | 16.83% |
| Total Land Costs | \$35,000,000 | \$60.87 | \$87.50 | 16.83% |
| Hard Costs | | | | |
| Base Building | \$122,875,000 | \$213.70 | \$307.19 | 59.09% |
| Hard Cost Contingency | \$6,143,750 | \$10.68 | \$15.36 | 2.95% |
| FF&E | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| Total Hard Costs | \$129,018,750 | \$224.38 | \$322.55 | 62.05% |
| Soft Costs | | | | |
| Leasing Commissions | \$1,725,000 | \$3.00 | \$4.31 | 0.83% |
| Tenant Improvements | \$4,900,000 | \$8.52 | \$12.25 | 2.36% |
| Financing Fees | \$2,875,000 | \$5.00 | \$7.19 | 1.38% |
| Marketing | \$2,500,000 | \$4.35 | \$6.25 | 1.20% |
| Insurance | \$500,000 | \$0.87 | \$1.25 | 0.24% |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$1,100,000 | \$1.91 | \$2.75 | 0.53% |
| Management Fees | \$2,100,000 | \$3.65 | \$5.25 | 1.01% |
| Soft Cost Contingency | \$1,100,000 | \$1.91 | \$2.75 | 0.53% |
| Total Soft Costs | \$16,800,000 | \$29.22 | \$42.00 | 8.08% |
| Developer's Profit | \$27,122,813 | \$47.17 | \$67.81 | 13.04% |
| Project Total | \$207,941,563 | \$361.64 | \$519.85 | 100.00% |

| | | 900 | | ш | | | 200 | | | | | | и | | | |
|----|---|-----|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ıv | a | lu | a | ш | О | n | P | a | r | а | m | e | æ | e | a | æ |

| Expense Inflation Rate | 3.00% |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Terminal Capitalization Rate | 8.00% |
| Selling Expenses | 2.00% |
| Desired Equity Yield | 11.00% |
| Mortgage Parameters | |
| Loan to Value Ratio | 70% |
| Mortgage Interest Rate | 7.00% |
| Mortgage Amortization | 25 years |
| | |

Retail Operating Proforma (Expressed in Year 1 Dollars)

| Revenues | Stabilized Year | Percent of PGI | Per SF of GLA | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-------|--|
| Anchor Tenant Rent | \$5,200,000 | 26.4% | \$ | 20.00 | |
| Specialty Tenant Rent | \$9,800,000 | 49.8% | \$ | 70.00 | |
| Common Area Maintenance | \$1,382,250 | 7.0% | \$ | 3.46 | |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$2,667,500 | 13.5% | \$ | 6.67 | |
| Insurance | \$20,370 | 0.1% | \$ | 0.05 | |
| Marketing Fund | \$169,750 | 0.9% | \$ | 0.42 | |
| Parking Income | \$750,000 | 3.8% | \$ | 1.88 | |
| Potential Gross Income | \$19,989,870 | 101.5% | \$ | 49.97 | |
| Anchor V & C Loss | \$0 | 0.0% | \$ | | |
| Specialty V&C Loss | \$294,000 | 1.5% | \$ | 0.74 | |
| Effective Gross Income | \$19,695,870 | 100.0% | \$ | 49.24 | |
| Expenses | | | | | |
| Common Area Maintenance | \$1,425,000 | 7.2% | \$ | 3.56 | |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$2,750,000 | 14.0% | \$ | 6.88 | |
| Insurance | \$21,000 | 0.1% | \$ | 0.05 | |
| Marketing Fund | \$169,750 | 0.9% | \$ | 0.42 | |
| Miscellaneous | \$14,000 | 0.1% | \$ | 0.04 | |
| Total Expenses | \$4,379,750 | 22.2% | \$ | 10.95 | |
| Net Operating Income | \$15,316,120 | 77.8% | \$ | 38.29 | |
| Leasing and Capital Costs | | | | | |
| Turnover Tenant Finish Expense | \$300,000 | 1.4% | \$ | 0.75 | |
| Leasing Commissions | \$60,000 | 0.3% | \$ | 0.15 | |
| Reserve for Replacement | \$35,000 | 0.2% | \$ | 0.09 | |
| Cash Flow Before Debt Service | \$14,921,120 | 68.7% | \$ | 37.30 | |
| | | | | | |

| | \$ Amount | Per SF of GBA | Per Room Costs | Percent of Total Costs |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Land Costs | | | | |
| Land Costs | \$35,000,000 | \$116.67 | \$116,667 | 29.99% |
| Total Land Costs | \$35,000,000 | \$116.67 | \$116,667 | 29.99% |
| Hard Costs | | | | |
| Base Building | \$52,500,000 | \$175.00 | \$175,000 | 44.98% |
| Hard Cost Contingency | \$2,625,000 | \$8.75 | \$8,750 | 2.25% |
| FF&E | \$6,200,000 | \$20.67 | \$20,667 | 5.31% |
| Total Hard Costs | \$61,325,000 | \$204.42 | \$204,417 | 52.54% |
| Soft Costs | | | | |
| Leasing Commissions | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Tenant Improvements | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Financing Fees | \$1,750,000 | \$5.83 | \$5,833 | 1.50% |
| Marketing | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Insurance | \$425,000 | \$1.42 | \$1,417 | 0.36% |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$750,000 | \$2.50 | \$2,500 | 0.64% |
| Management Fees | \$1,500,000 | \$5.00 | \$5,000 | 1.29% |
| Soft Cost Contingency | \$750,000 | \$2.50 | \$2,500 | 0.64% |
| Total Soft Costs | \$5,175,000 | \$17.25 | \$17,250 | 4.43% |
| Developer's Profit | \$15,225,000 | \$50.75 | \$50,750 | 13.04% |
| PROJECT TOTAL | \$116,725,000 | \$389.08 | \$389,083 | 100.00% |
| Valuation Parameters | | | | |
| Expense Inflation Rate | | 3.00% | | |
| Terminal Capitalization Rate | | 11.50% | | |
| Selling Expenses | | 2.00% | | |
| Desired Equity Yield | | 15.00% | | |
| Mortgage Parameters | | 10.0070 | | |
| Loan to Value Ratio | | 70% | | |
| Mortgage Interest Rate | | 9.00% | | |
| Mortgage Amortization | | | years | |

Hotel Operating Proforma (Expressed in Year 1 Dollars)

| · 数据要专业的第三 | Stabilized Year | Percent of Revenues | Year 3 | Exhbit 4 |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|----------|-------------|
| Average Daily Room Rate | \$261.83 | | \$261.83 | 4 |
| Occupancy (Percent) | \$0.80 | | 80% | |
| Room Revenue Per Available Room (RevPAR) | \$209.46 | | \$209.46 | |
| Revenues | | | | |
| Rooms | \$21,619,401 | 57.44% | \$22,936 | 57.44% |
| Food & Beverage | \$12,563,861 | 33.38% | \$13,329 | 33.38% |
| Telecommunications | \$908,015 | 2.41% | \$963 | 2.41% |
| Spa Income | \$584,640 | 1.55% | \$620 | 1.55% |
| Other Income | \$1,964,000 | 5.22% | \$2,084 | 5.22% |
| Total Revenue | \$37,639,917 | 100.00% | \$39,932 | 100.00% |
| Departmental Costs | | | | |
| Rooms | \$4,756,268 | 22.00% | \$5,046 | 22.00% |
| Food & Beverage | \$9,674,173 | 77.00% | \$10,263 | 77.00% |
| Telecommunications | \$426,767 | 47.00% | \$453 | 47.00% |
| Spa Income | \$438,480 | 75.00% | \$465 | 75.00% |
| Other Income | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% |
| Total Departmental Expenses | \$15,295,688 | 40.64% | \$16,227 | 40.64% |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | | | | |
| Administrative & General | \$2,973,553 | 7.90% | \$3,155 | 7.90% |
| Management Fee | \$1,129,197 | 3.00% | \$1,198 | 3.00% |
| Marketing | \$2,258,395 | 6.00% | \$2,396 | 6.00% |
| Property Operations & Maintenance | \$1,505,597 | 4.00% | \$1,597 | 4.00% |
| Utility Costs | \$1,129,197 | 3.00% | \$1,198 | 3.00% |
| Total Undistributed Operating Expenses | \$8,995,940 | 23.90% | \$9,544 | 23.90% |
| Income Before Fixed Charges | \$13,348,288 | 35.46% | \$14,161 | 35.46% |
| Fixed Charges | | | | |
| Real Estate Taxes | \$2,750,000 | 7.31% | \$2,917 | 7.31% |
| Insurance | \$376,399 | 1.00% | \$399 | 1.00% - |
| Reserve for Replacement | \$1,129,197 | 3.00% | \$1,198 | 3.00% |
| Net Operating Income | \$9,092,692 | 24.16% | \$9,646 | 24.16% 2002 |

Cornell Real Estate Journa