



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller
ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Daniel Lurie
President Rafael Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Greg Wagner, Controller
Ted Egan, Chief Economist

DATE: April 30, 2026

SUBJECT: **Inclusionary Housing: Triennial Review of Economic Feasibility, 2026**

Background

Section 415.10 of the Planning Code requires the Controller to prepare a feasibility study of the City's inclusionary housing requirements every three years, with the assistance of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and consultants. The required 2026 feasibility study has recently been completed, and this report summarizes its findings and recommendations.

Inclusionary housing refers to the inclusion of permanently affordable housing units within a market-rate housing development. Since 2002, the City has required market-rate housing developers to provide inclusionary housing, either within a market-rate development, off-site, or through paying an in-lieu fee to fund other affordable housing projects.

The City's policy has been to maximize the affordable housing requirements without harming the financial feasibility of market-rate development. Since market conditions change, the amount of affordable housing that a project can provide, while remaining financially feasible, can change as well.

The last triennial feasibility analysis took place in 2022-23. Following that analysis, the Board of Supervisors enacted Ordinance [201-23](#), which temporarily reduced inclusionary housing requirements and other development impact fees. Requirements were reduced, to differing degrees, for projects that had already been approved by November 1, 2023 ("pipeline projects"),

and for new projects approved after that date (“interim projects”). All temporary reductions are due to expire on November 1, 2026.

Process

In late 2025, the Controller’s Office contracted with Century Urban, the consulting firm that conducted the inclusionary housing feasibility analysis in 2017 and 2023. As was the case in 2023, Century Urban was joined by a sub-consultant, TBD Consultants (TBD). TBD is a construction cost-estimation firm that was brought on to provide construction cost estimates for the prototype projects to be analyzed.

Starting on December 18, 2025, the TAC convened and conducted four meetings. At the final TAC meeting held on April 7, 2026, the TAC unanimously agreed to the policy recommendations detailed at the end of this report.

Approach

The consultants used a similar methodology to past studies. First, a representative sample of typical housing construction projects, or prototypes, was considered. The same prototypes were also used in the 2023 study:

1. Case A: Low-rise, Type V construction, 55 feet height
2. Case B: Mid-rise, Type III construction, 85 feet height
3. Case C: High-rise, Type I construction, 135 feet height
4. Case D: High-rise, Type I construction, 245 feet height
5. Case E: Small Low-rise, Type V construction, 45 feet height

For each of these five prototypes, four financial scenarios were analyzed to assess the feasibility of development. These four scenarios included developing each prototype as condominiums or apartments, each using either local zoning (Base) or the State Density Bonus (SDB)¹.

The feasibility of each financial scenario was evaluated under four inclusionary requirements: the pipeline onsite requirements, the interim onsite requirements, the interim requirements with the in lieu fee, and a hypothetical 100% market rate project with no inclusionary requirement. 80 models were built in total.

Analyses of the 80 models were based on research regarding the revenues that a project is projected to generate and expenses that a project is expected to incur in the current market environment, as well as the costs of development including financing, and inclusionary housing and other exactions. To ensure that development costs were estimated as accurately as possible, TBD provided construction cost estimates for each of the base case prototypes. Based on this research and TBD’s estimates, the consulting team estimated revenues, expenses, and costs for

¹ The State Density Bonus is a State policy that provides developers with the ability to build more units in a project based on the level of affordable housing included in the project

each scenario and made adjustments after receiving feedback from the TAC. Additional detail regarding the underwriting assumptions for each scenario is provided in the Appendix.

Based on these financial analyses, a *residual land value* (RLV) – the amount that a potential project can afford to pay for land based on the estimated revenues, expenses, costs, and developer return – is estimated. If the RLV exceeds the estimated current market value of land, the project may be feasible; if it is below the estimated land value, it would generally not be considered feasible.

To assess current land values, Century Urban reviewed recent land transactions for proposed residential development projects. Since the last inclusionary feasibility analysis in 2023, only 1 market rate land sale transaction was identified at a land cost per unit of \$68,000, which falls within the previously estimated land cost per unit range of \$60,000 - \$70,000.

Findings

In brief, the study found that the financial feasibility of market-rate housing development is currently very challenging. None of the financial models could support any inclusionary housing, and each was significantly worse than the same models in the 2023 study. The remainder of this section details those findings.

In the tables below, the first three rows show estimated RLVs per unit for the Base scenarios, using the onsite inclusionary requirements for current², pipeline, and interim projects respectively. The fourth row shows the estimated RLV per unit for interim projects using the SDB. The fifth row shows the estimated RLV per unit using payment of the in lieu fee required for interim projects, and, for illustrative purposes only, the sixth row shows the estimated RLV per unit for a hypothetical case of a 100% market rate project, with no inclusionary housing requirement.

For apartments, shown below, the estimated RLV per unit is negative for every prototype, under current, pipeline, or interim requirements (both Base and SDB cases), as well as the in-lieu fee case and the hypothetical 100% market rate example. Essentially, this means that these projects are not projected to be financially feasible, even if land costs were zero.

² "Current" refers to the requirements that will apply, absent legislative action, on November 1, 2026.

<i>Apartments</i>	<i>Residual Land Value per Unit (g)</i>				
<i>Case</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>
<i>Building Type (Base Program)</i>	<i>Lowrise</i>	<i>Midrise</i>	<i>Highrise</i>	<i>Highrise</i>	<i>Lowrise</i>
1.) Base - Current Projects (a)	(\$177,000)	(\$152,000)	(\$206,000)	(\$292,000)	(\$353,000)
2.) Base - Pipeline Projects (b)	(\$166,000)	(\$138,000)	(\$192,000)	(\$281,000)	(\$353,000)
3.) Base - Interim Projects (c)	(\$173,000)	(\$148,000)	(\$206,000)	(\$292,000)	(\$353,000)
4.) State Density Bonus - Interim Projects (d)	(\$155,000)	(\$204,000)	(\$210,000)	(\$298,000)	(\$280,000)
5.) Base - In-Lieu Fee (e)	(\$187,000)	(\$152,000)	(\$201,000)	(\$294,000)	(\$363,000)
6.) Hypothetical 100% Market Rate (f)	(\$131,000)	(\$96,000)	(\$144,000)	(\$236,000)	(\$308,000)

For condominiums, the results are similar, as shown in the table below. The estimated RLV per unit is negative for all prototypes under the current, pipeline, interim requirements (Base and SDB), and the in-lieu fee case. Only one of the hypothetical 100% market rate prototypes—the 85’ mid-rise prototype—shows a positive RLV per unit. At \$60,000 in RLV per unit, it indicates borderline feasibility – with no inclusionary requirement.

<i>Condominiums</i>	<i>Residual Land Value per Unit (g)</i>				
<i>Case</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>
<i>Building Type (Base Program)</i>	<i>Lowrise</i>	<i>Midrise</i>	<i>Highrise</i>	<i>Highrise</i>	<i>Lowrise</i>
1.) Base - Current Projects (a)	(\$164,000)	(\$42,000)	(\$184,000)	(\$269,000)	(\$249,000)
2.) Base - Pipeline Projects (b)	(\$145,000)	(\$5,000)	(\$144,000)	(\$229,000)	(\$249,000)
3.) Base - Interim Projects (c)	(\$168,000)	(\$25,000)	(\$158,000)	(\$245,000)	(\$249,000)
4.) State Density Bonus - Interim Projects (d)	(\$62,000)	(\$154,000)	(\$164,000)	(\$254,000)	(\$220,000)
5.) Base - In-Lieu Fee (e)	(\$168,000)	(\$8,000)	(\$147,000)	(\$239,000)	(\$256,000)
6.) Hypothetical 100% Market Rate (f)	(\$100,000)	\$60,000	(\$80,000)	(\$170,000)	(\$201,000)

The table below compares the RLV per unit estimated in the current 2026 analysis with the findings from the 2023 study, for the hypothetical 100% market rate scenario for each prototype. Although feasibility was already quite limited in the prior study, there has been further reduction in the estimated RLV per unit, for each Base prototype, since then.

Project Type	Type	Prototype	RLV per unit: 100% Market Rate, 2026	Change Since 2023
Apartments	Base	A - Lowrise	-\$131,000	-\$107,000
Apartments	Base	B - Midrise	-\$96,000	-\$104,000
Apartments	Base	C - Highrise	-\$144,000	-\$48,000
Apartments	Base	D - Highrise	-\$236,000	-\$42,000
Apartments	Base	E - Lowrise	-\$308,000	-\$264,000
Condominiums	Base	A - Lowrise	-\$100,000	-\$240,000

Condominiums	Base	B - Midrise	\$60,000	-\$83,000
Condominiums	Base	C - Highrise	-\$80,000	-\$146,000
Condominiums	Base	D - Highrise	-\$170,000	-\$153,000
Condominiums	Base	E - Lowrise	-\$201,000	-\$114,000

In general, as the data in the appendix shows, the underlying causes for this weaker feasibility outlook are that construction costs—including labor, materials, and financing costs—have continued to grow faster than market rents and condominium sale prices.

Recommendations

In the final TAC meeting, Controller’s Office staff noted that, based on the consultants’ analysis, the maximum economically-feasible inclusionary requirement was 0%. While such a level could never maximize inclusionary housing production, staff stated that requirements significantly above 0% would further threaten feasibility, and would not create additional affordable housing.

For its part, the TAC stressed throughout the process that the limited feasibility of market-rate housing in the current market highlighted the need to provide alternative sources of funding for affordable housing. The TAC unanimously agreed to the following recommendations:

1. Based on the feasibility analysis, onsite inclusionary housing requirements should be set at 5% if a consensus measure establishing a long-term, recurring affordable housing funding source is placed on the November 2026 ballot by July 2026. If not, requirements should be set at 10%.
2. The TAC recommended having identical inclusionary onsite percentage and in-lieu fee percentage requirements for apartment and condominium projects, noting that the analysis did not support a higher rate for condominium projects.
3. Inclusionary requirements for apartment projects currently require on-site inclusionary units to be affordable to households at three income tiers: 55% of Area Median Income (AMI), 80% of AMI, and 110% of AMI. Under the temporary reductions for pipeline and interim projects, 67% of the on-site units must be affordable to the lowest 55% AMI tier. The TAC recommended eliminating the top 110% tier, and requiring that 70% of the inclusionary units be affordable to the households at the lowest 55% AMI tier.
4. Inclusionary requirements for condominium projects currently require on-site inclusionary units to be affordable to households at three income tiers: 80% of AMI, 105% of AMI, and 130% of AMI. Under the temporary reductions for pipeline and interim projects, 67% of the on-site units must be affordable to the lowest 80% AMI tier. The TAC recommended eliminating the top 130% tier, and requiring that 70% of the inclusionary units be affordable to the households at the lowest 80% AMI tier.
5. Currently projects with fewer than 10 units are not subject to inclusionary requirements, while projects with 10-24 units are subject to lower requirements than larger projects.

The TAC recommended eliminating inclusionary requirements for projects with 10-24 units.

6. When setting the in-lieu fee percentage, which developers may pay instead of providing on-site inclusionary housing, the TAC recommended the fee be set so as to encourage the provision of on-site inclusionary housing, in line with current practice.
7. The TAC recommended that the City not impose an in-lieu fee on incremental units enabled by the State Density Bonus.
8. The TAC recommended a 67% reduction in non-inclusionary development impact fees applied to new housing development.
9. After some discussion, the TAC recommended keeping the current 3-year cadence for the Controller's feasibility analysis.

Appendix

The City’s inclusionary requirements as of 2026, prototype programs, hard cost estimates, and scenario underwriting assumptions are summarized in the tables below.

Inclusionary Requirements as of 2026

2026 Citywide Inclusionary Requirements for Rental Housing						
	Existing Requirements		Pipeline Projects (Temporary Reduction)		Interim Projects (Temporary Reduction)	
	Onsite	Offsite	Onsite	Offsite	Onsite	Offsite
10-24 Unit Projects						
55% AMI	15.00%	20.00%	12.00%	16.40%	15.00%	20.00%
25+ Unit Projects						
55% AMI	12.00%	18.00%	8.00%	9.40%	10.00%	11.50%
80% AMI	5.75%	6.00%	2.00%	4.00%	2.50%	5.00%
110% AMI	<u>5.75%</u>	<u>6.00%</u>	<u>2.00%</u>	<u>3.00%</u>	<u>2.50%</u>	<u>4.00%</u>
Total	23.50%	30.00%	12.00%	16.40%	15.00%	20.50%
Fee Percentage						
10-24 Unit Projects	20.00%		16.40%		20.00%	
25+ Unit Projects	30.00%		16.40%		20.50%	

2026 Citywide Inclusionary Requirements for Ownership Housing						
	Existing Requirements		Pipeline Projects (Temporary Reduction)		Interim Projects (Temporary Reduction)	
	Onsite	Offsite	Onsite	Offsite	Onsite	Offsite
10-24 Unit Projects						
80% AMI	15.00%	20.00%	12.00%	16.40%	15.00%	20.00%
25+ Unit Projects						
80% AMI	12.00%	18.00%	8.00%	9.40%	10.00%	11.50%
105% AMI	6.75%	8.00%	2.00%	4.00%	2.50%	5.00%
130% AMI	<u>6.75%</u>	<u>7.00%</u>	<u>2.00%</u>	<u>3.00%</u>	<u>2.50%</u>	<u>4.00%</u>
Total	25.50%	33.00%	12.00%	16.40%	15.00%	20.50%
Fee Percentage						
10-24 Unit Projects	20.00%		16.40%		20.00%	
25+ Unit Projects	33.00%		16.40%		20.50%	

** Reflects percentage of total project residential unit square footage on which in-lieu fee payment amount is to be calculated.*

Prototype Programs

Product Type	For-Rent Apartments – Base Program				
Case	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Building Type	Lowrise	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Lowrise
Construction Type	Type V	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Height	55 Feet	85 Feet	135 Feet	245 Feet	45 Feet
Building Stories	5 Stories	8 Stories	13 Stories	24 Stories	4 Stories
Building Units	45 Units	130 Units	227 Units	341 Units	13 Units
Affordable Units (%)	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	14.5%
Average Unit Size	825 NSF	825 NSF	825 NSF	825 NSF	852 NSF
Parking Ratio	0.25:1	0.25:1	0.25:1	0.25:1	0.77:1

Product Type	For-Rent Apartments – State Density Bonus Program				
Case	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Building Type	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Highrise	Midrise
Construction Type	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type III
Building Height	75 Feet	125 Feet	185 Feet	345 Feet	65 Feet
Building Stories	7 Stories	12 Stories	18 Stories	34 Stories	6 Stories
Building Units	62 Units	180 Units	315 Units	473 Units	20 Units
Affordable Units (%)	8.6%	8.6%	8.6%	8.6%	9.7%
Average Unit Size	825 NSF	825 NSF	825 NSF	825 NSF	831 NSF
Parking Ratio	0.25:1	0.25:1	0.25:1	0.25:1	0.65:1

Product Type	For-Sale Condominiums – Base Program				
Case	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Building Type	Lowrise	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Lowrise
Construction Type	Type V	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Height	55 Feet	85 Feet	135 Feet	245 Feet	45 Feet
Building Stories	5 Stories	8 Stories	13 Stories	24 Stories	4 Stories
Building Units	37 Units	107 Units	188 Units	281 Units	13 Units
Affordable Units (%)	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	14.5%
Average Unit Size	1,000 NSF	1,000 NSF	1,000 NSF	1,000 NSF	852 NSF
Parking Ratio	0.50:1	0.50:1	0.50:1	0.50:1	0.77:1

Product Type	For-Sale Condominiums – State Density Bonus Program				
Case	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Building Type	Lowrise	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Lowrise
Construction Type	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Height	75 Feet	105 Feet	165 Feet	295 Feet	55 Feet
Building Stories	7 Stories	10 Stories	16 Stories	29 Stories	5 Stories
Building Units	46 Units	132 Units	231 Units	346 Units	17 Units
Affordable Units (%)	9.8%	9.8%	9.8%	9.8%	11.4%
Average Unit Size	1,000 NSF	1,000 NSF	1,000 NSF	1,000 NSF	838 NSF
Parking Ratio	0.50:1	0.50:1	0.50:1	0.50:1	0.76:1

Hard Cost Estimates

For-Rent Apartments: Hard Costs per GSF

Product Type	For-Rent Apartments – Base Programs				
Case	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Construction Type	Type V	Modified Type III	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Stories	5 Stories	8 Stories	13 Stories	24 Stories	4 Stories
Total Project \$/GSF	\$481	\$498	\$581	\$620	\$479
Residential \$/GSF	\$509	\$519	\$615	\$652	\$554
Parking Location	At Grade	Below Grade	Below Grade	Below Grade	At Grade
Parking \$/GSF	\$259	\$356	\$341	\$360	\$267
Retail Shell \$/GSF	\$328	\$301	\$276	\$290	\$337

* Hard cost estimates prepared by TBD Consultants.

For-Sale Condominiums: Hard Costs per GSF

Product Type	For-Sale Condominiums – Base Programs				
Case	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D	Case E
Construction Type	Type V	Modified Type III	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Stories	5 Stories	8 Stories	13 Stories	24 Stories	4 Stories
Total Project \$/GSF	\$468	\$486	\$569	\$606	\$483
Residential \$/GSF	\$510	\$517	\$614	\$651	\$559
Parking Location	At Grade	Below Grade	Below Grade	Below Grade	At Grade
Parking \$/GSF	\$245	\$322	\$353	\$357	\$267
Retail Shell \$/GSF	\$330	\$303	\$277	\$292	\$338

* Hard cost estimates prepared by TBD Consultants.

Underwriting Assumptions

For-Rent Apartments – Base Non-Density Bonus Program Typology

<i>Apartments</i>	<i>Underwriting Assumptions - Base Programs</i>				
Case	A	B	C	D	E
Construction Type	Type V	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Type	Lowrise	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Lowrise
1.) Building Stories	5 Stories	8 Stories	13 Stories	24 Stories	4 Stories
2.) Building Height	55 Feet	85 Feet	135 Feet	245 Feet	45 Feet
3.) Gross Square Feet	53,031	151,438	265,469	402,807	18,613
4.) Efficiency Factor	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	78.0%	80.0%
5.) Apartment Unit Count	45	130	227	341	13
6.) Wtd. Average Market Rent	\$4,349 / \$5.22	\$4,658 / \$5.65	\$5,203 / \$6.31	\$5,053 / \$6.12	\$4,115 / \$5.33
7.) Wtd. Average BMR Rent	\$1,974 / \$2.54	\$2,036 / \$2.46	\$2,014 / \$2.43	\$2,037 / \$2.47	\$1,677 / \$1.86
8.) Hard Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$27.0M / \$600,200	\$79.7M / \$613,200	\$162.7M / \$716,800	\$263.1M / \$771,500	\$9.4M / \$724,700
9.) Soft Cost - Impact Fees (Total / Unit) (b)	\$0.8M / \$18,800	\$2.4M / \$18,300	\$4.2M / \$18,600	\$6.4M / \$18,800	\$0.4M / \$27,800
10.) Other Soft Costs (Total / Unit)	\$5.3M / \$117,200	\$14.5M / \$111,900	\$29.9M / \$131,500	\$47.9M / \$140,600	\$2.3M / \$177,300
11.) Total Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$33.1M / \$736,200	\$96.6M / \$743,400	\$196.8M / \$866,900	\$317.5M / \$930,900	\$12.1M / \$929,800
12.) Total Hard & Soft Costs / GSF (a)	\$625	\$638	\$741	\$788	\$649
13.) Untrended Annual NOI	\$1,513,100	\$4,604,300	\$8,886,600	\$13,396,000	\$458,900
14.) Untrended Return-on-Cost (c)	5.25%	5.25%	5.25%	5.25%	5.25%

For-Rent Apartments – State Density Bonus Program Typology

<i>Apartments</i>	<i>Underwriting Assumptions - State Density Bonus Programs</i>				
Case	A	B	C	D	E
Construction Type	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type III
Building Type	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Highrise	Midrise
1.) Building Stories	7 Stories	11 Stories	18 Stories	32 Stories	6 Stories
2.) Building Height	75 Feet	115 Feet	185 Feet	325 Feet	65 Feet
3.) Gross Square Feet	69,644	199,232	348,710	531,192	27,381
4.) Efficiency Factor	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	78.0%	80.0%
5.) Apartment Unit Count	60	172	301	452	20
6.) Wtd. Average Market Rent	\$4,657 / \$5.64	\$5,223 / \$6.31	\$5,205 / \$6.31	\$5,057 / \$6.12	\$4,602 / \$5.67
7.) Wtd. Average BMR Rent	\$1,974 / \$2.54	\$2,036 / \$2.46	\$2,014 / \$2.43	\$2,037 / \$2.47	\$1,677 / \$1.86
8.) Hard Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$36.6M / \$610,700	\$116.4M / \$676,500	\$214.6M / \$712,800	\$347.8M / \$769,400	\$13.8M / \$690,500
9.) Soft Cost - Impact Fees (Total / Unit) (b)	\$1.1M / \$18,600	\$3.2M / \$18,500	\$5.7M / \$18,900	\$8.7M / \$19,200	\$0.5M / \$25,300
10.) Other Soft Costs (Total / Unit)	\$7.9M / \$131,900	\$24.4M / \$142,100	\$46.5M / \$154,600	\$74.3M / \$164,500	\$3.6M / \$178,600
11.) Total Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$45.7M / \$761,100	\$144.0M / \$837,100	\$266.8M / \$886,400	\$430.8M / \$953,000	\$13.5M / \$675,000
12.) Total Hard & Soft Costs / GSF (a)	\$656	\$723	\$765	\$811	\$653
13.) Untrended Annual NOI	\$2,176,300	\$6,865,700	\$12,021,900	\$18,141,500	\$764,100
14.) Untrended Return-on-Cost (c)	5.25%	5.25%	5.25%	5.25%	5.25%

For-Sale Condominiums – Base Non-Density Bonus Program Typology

<i>Condominiums</i>	<i>Underwriting Assumptions - Base Programs</i>				
Case	A	B	C	D	E
Construction Type	Type V	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Type	Lowrise	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Low Rise
1.) Building Stories	5 Stories	8 Stories	13 Stories	24 Stories	4 Stories
2.) Building Height	55 Feet	85 Feet	135 Feet	245 Feet	45 Feet
3.) Gross Square Feet	55,875	159,000	280,250	423,484	20,958
4.) Efficiency Factor	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	78.0%	80.0%
5.) Condominium Unit Count	37	107	188	281	13
6.) Wtd. Average Market Sales Price	\$1,046,000 / \$1,068	\$1,310,000 / \$1,315	\$1,346,000 / \$1,345	\$1,356,000 / \$1,354	\$1,081,000 / \$1,070
7.) Wtd. Average BMR Sales Price	\$482,000	\$454,000	\$450,000	\$456,000	\$374,000
8.) Hard Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$27.7M / \$748,200	\$81.5M / \$762,000	\$168.3M / \$895,300	\$270.3M / \$961,900	\$11.2M / \$862,500
9.) Soft Costs - Impact Fees (Total / Unit) (b)	\$0.8M / \$21,400	\$2.2M / \$20,200	\$3.9M / \$20,700	\$5.8M / \$20,700	\$0.3M / \$26,700
10.) Other Soft Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$5.9M / \$158,500	\$17.3M / \$161,700	\$35.1M / \$187,000	\$57.6M / \$205,000	\$2.5M / \$196,000
11.) Total Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$34.3M / \$928,100	\$101.0M / \$943,900	\$207.3M / \$1,102,900	\$333.7M / \$1,187,600	\$14.1M / \$1,085,200
12.) Total Hard & Soft Costs / GSF (a)	\$615	\$635	\$740	\$788	\$673
13.) Profit as % of Revenue (c)	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%

For-Sale Condominiums – State Density Bonus Program Typology

<i>Condominiums</i>	<i>Underwriting Assumptions - State Density Bonus Programs</i>				
Case	A	B	C	D	E
Construction Type	Type III	Type I	Type I	Type I	Type V
Building Type	Midrise	Highrise	Highrise	Highrise	Low Rise
1.) Building Stories	6 Stories	11 Stories	18 Stories	29 Stories	5 Stories
2.) Building Height	65 Feet	115 Feet	185 Feet	295 Feet	55 Feet
3.) Gross Square Feet	66,021	188,335	335,063	505,939	26,271
4.) Efficiency Factor	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	78.0%	80.0%
5.) Condominium Unit Count	44	128	226	337	17
6.) Wtd. Average Market Sales Price	\$1,290,000 / \$1,305	\$1,335,000 / \$1,345	\$1,347,000 / \$1,345	\$1,354,000 / \$1,353	\$1,051,000 / \$1,068
7.) Wtd. Average BMR Sales Price	\$482,000	\$454,000	\$450,000	\$456,000	\$374,000
8.) Hard Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$33.8M / \$768,900	\$113.5M / \$886,600	\$201.7M / \$892,400	\$323.4M / \$959,600	\$14.1M / \$829,500
9.) Soft Costs - Impact Fees (Total / Unit) (b)	\$0.9M / \$21,100	\$2.6M / \$20,100	\$4.7M / \$20,900	\$7.1M / \$20,900	\$0.4M / \$24,500
10.) Other Soft Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$8.5M / \$192,700	\$24.4M / \$190,700	\$47.2M / \$208,800	\$77.4M / \$229,700	\$3.4M / \$197,800
11.) Total Costs (Total / Unit) (a)	\$43.2M / \$982,600	\$140.5M / \$1,097,400	\$253.6M / \$1,122,100	\$407.8M / \$1,210,200	\$17.9M / \$1,051,800
12.) Total Hard & Soft Costs / GSF (a)	\$655	\$746	\$757	\$806	\$681
13.) Profit as % of Revenue (c)	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%