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## Lisa B. Richman

December 14, 1984

Dr. James Graaskamp 1155 Observatory Drive Madison, WI 53706

Dear Dr. Graaskamp:
Enclosed is the appraisal report that you requested on the property known as the J. C. Penney Building, 1 East Main Street, City of Madison, County of Dane, Wisconsin.

In your letter authorizing this work, you indicated that the conclusion would serve as a benchmark for listing and negotiating the sale of the subject property.

The enclosed report concludes that fair market value of the property on September 8, 1984 is

SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS $(\$ 700,000)$
cash to the seller. This value represents the central tendency of cash sales derived using the market comparison approach and may be used for assessment value appeal.

Given Northwestern Mutual's favorable bargaining position, they do not seem likely to accept a sales price below fair market value. Therefore, most probable selling price of the property on September 8,1984 has been determined equal to fair market value. The probable transaction zone, a function of external circumstances introducing error, is from $\$ 700,000$ to $\$ 720,000$, depending on terms. Municipal financing in the form of Industrial Revenue Bonds at 9.75\% interest might achieve the upper limit of $\$ 720,000$.

Value conclusions are sensitive to the estimated costs of renovation, particularly efforts directed to improve the aesthetic quality of the interior. In addition, investment is sensitive to forecasts of market demand for retail and office space.

According to your dictates, no funds for architectural, legal or engineering investigation were spent, and so the feasibility of the most probable use assumption, which is critical to a value estimate, must be regarded as only preliminary. However, these and other relevant factors were extensively analyzed, and I believe that the conclusions are reasonable

Dr. James Graaskamp
December 14, 1984
Page
and well-documented. Please note the assumptions, limiting conditions, and controls on use that are included in Section $v$ of this report.
I trust you will find the details of the narrative appraisal relevant to your decision, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Sincerely,


Lisa B. Richman

LBR/jms
Enclosure

## TABLE OP CONTENTS

Page
LIST OF EXHIBITS ..... iv
DIGEST OF FACTS, ASSUMPTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS ..... vi
Section
I. PROBLEM ASSIGNMENT. ..... 1
A. The Appraisal Issue
B. Legal Interest to Be Appraised
C. Value Definition
D. Implicit Assumptions
E. Application to Subject
II. PROPERTY ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE ALTERNATIVE ..... 6
USES
A. Physical Attributes
B. Legal Constraints
C. Linkage
D. Dynamic Attributes
E. Existing Improvements
III. MOST PROBABLE USE ..... 42
A. General Market Characteristics
B. Alternative Uses
C. Economic Ranking of Alternatives
D. Risk Ranking of Alternatives
E. Political Compatibility of Alternatives
F. Conclusions
IV. PREDICTION OF PRICE FROM MARKET SALES ..... 59
A. Most Probable Buyer
B. Most Probable Price
C. Market Comparison Approach to Probable Price
D. External Influence on Most Probable Price
E. Test of Preliminary Most Probable PriceDetermination
V. APPRAISAL CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS ..... 88
A. Value Conclusion
B. Certification of Independent Appraisal Judgment
C. Statement of Limiting Conditions
APPENDICES. ..... 93

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

No. Page

1. Estimated One-Year Holding Costs for Subject Property. ..... 2
2. Plat Map of Subject Property. ..... 7
3. Schematic of Subject Property ..... 8
4. Utility Specifications ..... 10
5. City of Madison C-4 Zoning Ordinance. ..... 12
6. Mall Special Assessment for Subject Property. ..... 16
7. Traffic Counts on the Square ..... 20
8. Bicycle Counts on the Square. ..... 21
9. Traffic Flow on the Square. ..... 22
10. Location of Ramps in Downtown Area. ..... 23
11. Block 89 Existing Use Map ..... 25
12. Pedestrian Counts on the Square ..... 27
13. Gross Footage of the Subject Property ..... 31
14. Description of Improvements ..... 33
15. Current Photos of Subject ..... 34
16. Capitol Fire Zone Requirements ..... 40
17. Retail Information for Downtown Madison ..... 44
18. Downtown Office Vacancy Rates by Floor Area ..... 47
19. 1984 Apartment Rental Analysis for Central Madison ..... 48
20. Basic Logic for Ranking Alternative Program Scenarios by Justified Purchase Budget ..... 52
21. Summary of Budgets for Alternative Use Scenarios. ..... 53
22. Summary Matrix of Feasibility of Alternative Uses. ..... 57
23. Comparable Sales Description. ..... 61

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

(Continued)
No.
Page
24. Location of Comparable Sales. ..... 62
25. Comparable Sale \#l. ..... 63
26. Comparable Sale \#2. ..... 65
27. Comparable Sale \#3. ..... 67
28. Comparable Sale \#4 ..... 69
29. Comparable Sale \#5. ..... 70
30. Schedule of Adjustments ..... 72
31. Elimination of Transactions of Comparable Properties ..... 75
32. Adjusted Sales Price per Unit of Comparison ..... 76
33. Correlation Coefficients and $R^{2}$ of Sales Price ..... 77
34. Graph of Least Squares Line for Comparable Sales ..... 78
35. Scale for Scoring Comparables on Important Investor Considerations for Office-Retail Space in Madison C-4 Zone ..... 79
36. Weighted Matrix for Comparable Properties ..... 81
37. Calculation of Most Probable Price Using Mean Price per Point Equation Method ..... 82
38. Cash Flow Projection for Most Probable Price. ..... 87

## dIGEST OF FACTS, ASSUMPTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Property: A vacant three-story department store known as the J.C. Penney Building at l East Main Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Type of Estate: Fee simple, encumbered by building code restrictions.

Present Owner: Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company.
Age of Building: 25 years (too young for Investment Tax credit renovation).
City Description: Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin; State Capital, County Seat, Site of University of Wisconsin, and second largest city in Wisconsin (population 170,616).

Neighborhood: The original plat of Capitol Square, the Central Business District, and facing the State Capitol Building.

Lot Size: Southwest 90 feet of Lots 1 and 10 and Southwest 90 feet of Northwest 12 feet of Lot 9 , Block 89 of original plat, $90^{\prime} \times 144^{\prime}, 12,960$ square feet.

Improvements: Three-story building plus basement with approximately 51,840 square feet of gross floor area. Constructed of reinforced concrete with brick walls. Building was designed and built for use by J.C. Penney Department Store and has had no major renovations.

Legal Constraints: Zoning C-4, Capitol Preservation View District, Capitol Fire Zone District, Capitol Concourse Plan District (special assessment and conditional use approvals), Building Code Violations (requires occupancy permit).

Most Probable Use: Renovation to office-retail space consisting of 8,252 square feet of open-air retail space and 31,451 square feet of office space.

Most Probable Buyer: A local developer/investor partnership that will renovate and redirect the marketing of subject property.

Probable Terms of Sale: Cash to seller.
Market Transaction Inference: Comparable sales, ranked with a weighted point score procedure, predict central tendency of sales price of $\$ 700,000$ with a range of $\$ 670,000$ to $\$ 720,000$.

## DIGEST OF FACTS, ASSUMPTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

 (Continued)Most Probable Selling Price: As of September 8, 1984, the seller might obtain a price of $\$ 700,000$ for an all cash sale. This price could range as low as $\$ 700,000$; more favorable financing terms, in the form of taxexempt Industrial Revenue Bonds at $9.75 \%$ interest, might achieve the upper limit of $\$ 720,000$.

1984 Assessed Value: Land $\$ 430,000$

| B | 451,000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total | \$881,000 |

1983 Taxes $\$ 11,654.23$
Payment made to City 1/31/84 5,827.12

Balance due
by $7 / 31 / 84$
\$5,827.12


## I. PROBLEM ASSIGNMENT

Content of an appraisal report is determined by the decision for which it will serve as a benchmark and the limiting assumptions inherent in the property, data base, or other factors in the decision context. This appraisal is made to assist the owner and his broker in the sale of the subject property in terms of both listing price and expectations regarding a negotiated sales price.

## A. The Appraisal Issue

The real estate market for the subject property is in a state of transition. J. C. Penney's vacated the building on December 30, 1983, before its lease expired. Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company (NML) has not attempted to lease the space because of uncertainty regarding assemblage and future development of Block 89. Consequently, the space has been vacant since J. C. Penney's left. The City of Madison hired Real Estate Research Corporation (RERC) to do a market analysis of the Capitol Square area retail potential. In addition, Jacobs, Visconsi, Jacobs (JVJ), a Cleveland-based developer, is preparing a report on the development potential of the subject block. Both reports are expected to be complete this fall, and the City will then be better able to decide possible land uses for block 89.

Holding costs include utilities, insurance, maintenance, and real estate taxes. Information in Exhibit $l$ is provided
by Louis J. Cunningham, property manager of the building for Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company.

## EXHIBIT 1

Estimated One-Year Holding Costs for Subject Property.

| Cost | Amount |
| :--- | ---: |
| Utilities | $\$ 4,800$ |
| Insurance | 7,500 |
| Maintenance | 5,000 |
| Real Estate Tax | $\frac{28,000}{}$ |
| $\quad$ Total | $\$ 45,300$ |

This appraisal is made to assist Northwestern Mutual Life, present owner, in estimating fair market value of fee simple ownership of the property at 1 East Main Street as of September 8,1984 for tax assessment purposes. The second issue addressed is probable cash sales price to measure opportunity costs and holding costs to evaluate a hold or sell strategy.
B. Legal Interest to Be Appraised

The legal description for the subject property, 1
East Main Street, is as follows:
Southwest 90 feet of Lots 1 and 10 and
Southwest 90 feet of Northwest 12 feet of Lot 9, Block 89 original plat of Madison, County of Dane, in the State of Wisconsin.

The fee is presently unemcumbered, but an occupancy permit is required to reopen the building if it remains closed for at least one year prior to sale.

This appraisal includes neither fixtures nor personalty. Only the land and building are considered in the estimate of value.
C. Value Definition

The definition of fair market value and its implicit assumptions are outlined in Appendix A. However, for the purpose of this appraisal the most appropriate definition of value is that of "most probable selling price," as defined by Professor Richard U. Ratcliff:

The most probable selling price is that selling price which is most likely to emerge from a transaction involving the subject property if it were exposed for sale in the current market for a reasonable time at terms of sale, which are currently predominant for properties of the subject type. ${ }^{1}$
D. Implicit Assumptions

The Ratcliff definition recognizes that prediction of a future sales transaction price is a business forecast under uncertain conditions. It is therefore appropriate
${ }^{1}$ Unpublished quotation of R. U. Ratcliff speaking on his book, Valuation for Real Estate Decisions (Santa Cruz, CA: Democrat Press, 1972).
to state the value conclusions as a central tendency within a range of alternative price outcomes that reflect the imperfections of the real estate market and the negotiation postures of the buyer and seller. A range of sales prices is more useful to the decision maker than the traditional point estimate of fair market value because it provides the necessary dimensions for establishing listing and bargaining strategy and anticipating probable buyer expectations and market-determined attitudes. The method requires the appraiser to determine the most probable use of the property and then to infer a probable transaction price from recent transactions of similar properties. In the absence of market sales or as a test of value conclusions based on sales data, the appraiser may simulate the buyer calculus in making an offer to purchase.
E. Application to Subject

Sales transactions in the area of the subject property have generally been cash to seller. Seller financing on buildings requiring redevelopment must be subordinated and this would probably be unacceptable to the present owner. Northwestern Mutual Life would prefer a cash sale if the price were acceptable.

The former tenant took full responsibility for operations, and its records are unavailable. Therefore, no valid history of operating expenses was reviewed. No major renovations have been made to the subject property.

The building meets fire code requirements set forth by the Madison Building Department. However, minor deficiencies in structural condition must be corrected before issuing an occupancy permit. Therefore, key dollar estimates and projections must be based on preliminary cost-to-cure assumptions of the appraiser and recognized as limitations on the reliability of the most probable price estimate.

## II. PROPERTY ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE ALTERNATIVE USES

The first step in the identification of the most probable use of a property is to take inventory of its attributes and to analyze those that appear significant. These attributes include physical characteristics of the site and improvement therein, legal constraints on the nature and timing of the use, the relationship (linkages) of the site to various environmental aspects that might attract or repel users, and the preestablished perceptions of the site that citizens tend to have (e.g., prestige or anxiety).

## A. Physical Attributes

Located at 1 East Main Street, the subject site is rectangular with $90^{\circ}$ of frontage on East Main Street and 144' of frontage on Monona Avenue for a total:gross area of 12,960 square feet (Exhibit 2). The back of the site is bordered by a $20^{\circ}$ public alleyway that provides access between Monona Avenue and South Pinckney Street. The site has a 2.3 percent slope, sloping from $73.4^{\prime}$ on its northwest side to $70.1^{\prime}$ on its southeast side. These elevations are given in reference to the city datum ( 0.00 ) which has been established at 845.6' above sea level. Exhibit 3 provides a schematic of the subject property and indicates maximum allowable building height. Site elevation is taken from a topographical map prepared by the City of Madison for redevelopment of the Square. The front of the site has

EAST MAIN ST.
$\cdot\llcorner$

SOUTH PINCKNEY ST.

EXHIBIT 3
SCHEMATIC OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

a northwest exposure on East Main Street while the side of the building has a southwest exposure on Monona Avenue. As indicated in the Soil Survey of Dane County, Wisconsin, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, the soil of the subject property is Dodge Silt Loam. The Dodge Series consists of deep, well-drained, gently sloping soils on glaciated uplands. These soils formed under mixed harwoods in 26 to 36 inches of loess over sandy loam glacial till. Dodge series soils have high fertility, high water capacity, and moderate permeability. Seasonal water table is at a depth of more than five feet. Percolation is $45-60$ minutes per inch and the depth of bedrock is $5^{\prime}-10^{\prime}$ from the surface. Having been removed many years ago, soils are not a concern for the site. Geological studies have shown that sand and gravel extend to a depth of $80^{\circ}$ beneath the surface. Clay, sandstone gravel, and white sandrock are present to a depth of 760', with white quartz, clay, and mixed rock beyond. Lack of settling cracks in the building's foundation dismisses doubt of a strong, dry support for the J. C. Penney improvements.

Utilities required to service the site are in place and pose no problem for future development. Service specifications are outlined in Exhibit 4.

## EXHIBIT 4

## UTILITY SPECIFICATIONS

Electric: Madison Gas and Electric provides 4,000-5,000 amp service. Transformer vault located on west side of building.

Gas: A ten-inch Madison Gas and Electric line passes under the side along Monona Avenue.

Storm Sewer: A catch basin is located in alleyway near southwest corner of subject property. A 12" to $15^{\prime \prime}$ pipe leads from the catch basin to a pipe located and running under Monona Avenue.

Sanitary Sewer: Two hookups located at southwest middle and corner of subject property. Empties into Madison Metropolitan Line running perpendicular to John Nolen Drive.

Water: An eight-inch main enters site off of Monona Avenue from the public alleyway. Sufficient capacity for sprinkler system in building.

## B. Legal Constraints

## 1. Zoning

Zoning governing use of the site is City of Madison C-4, which provides broad authority for retail, office, and residential uses (Exhibit 5). The basic goal of C-4 zoning is to encourage professional and governmental offices, prime and specialized retailing, cultural, recreational, and educational activities of citywide significance. C-4 represents the Central Business District where no off-street parking is required-a generous option compared with other commercial zones in Madison where parking space for every 300 square feet of commercial area is required. As stressed in the code, virtually any use is conditional.

Although liberal in appearance, the broad general provisions of this zone are deceptive. Any major alteration of a building must conform to remodeling and new construction guidelines established by the City Planning Commission. The municipal administration has an expressed goal of concentrating activities in efficient, functional districts to optimize movement between residential, shopping, employment, and recreation areas. Furthermore, strongly favored on the first floor of all buildings contiguous to the Square are pedestrian generators, such as retail and restaurants. Office space is discouraged on the first level.

Demolition of existing structures is vigorously

## EXBIBIT 5

## C-4 ZONING ORDINANCE

C-4 Central Commercial District
(a) Statement of Purpose. The $C-4$ Central Commercial district is established to accommodate those uses which are of City-wide, regional or state significance. Within this district, which is located in close proximity to the State Capitol Building and State Street, and which is readily accessible by public transportation from all parts of the City, are permitted the retail, service and office uses characteristic of a central business district. In addition to commercial activities, residential use above the ground floor is permitted and encouraged. No accessory off-street parking is required in this district, and any off-street parking which is provided is controlled as to the location, type and size of such facility so as to reduce congestion on streets within or leading to this district. All new buildings and any major alteration of an exterior building face must be approved by the Plan Commission because of the community's objective to maintain the aesthetic qualities of the district. (Am. by Ord. 6052, 11-29-77.)
(b) General Regulations. Uses permitted in the $C-4$ district are subject to the following conditions:

1. All business, servicing or processing, except for off-street parking, off-street loading, automobile service station operation, drive-in banks and outdoor eating areas of restaurants approved as a conditional use by the Plan Commission, shall be conducted within completely enclosed buildings. (Am. by Ord. 4304, 8-29-73.)
2. Establishments of the drive-in type are not permitted, except automobile service stations and drive-in banks.
3. Any major alteration of the exterior face of a building shall conform to the remodeling and new construction guidelines for State Street and the Capitol Square adopted as administrative guidelines by the City Plan Commission on September 23, 1968 and as modified on December 7,1970 and shall be permitted only after the written approval of the City Department of Planning and Development, provided that any action by the department may be appealed to the City Plan Commission by the applicant. (Am. by Ord. 6568, 3-22-79.)
4. To insure a variety of housing types in the central area, the following point values are established.

## EXHIBIT 5

(Continued)
Type of Dwelling Unit for Lodging Room Point Value Lodging Room ..... 0
Efficiency Unit
1
1
One Bedroom Unit
2
2
Two Bedroom Unit
Two Bedroom Unit
3
3
Three or More Bedroom Unit
Three or More Bedroom Unit ..... all
In any building, the average point value forless than l.5. (Cr. by Ord. 6052, 11-29-77.)
5. All new buildings and any major alteration of an exterior building face shall be considered by the Urban Design Commission and their recommendations regarding design and appearance shall be submitted to the City Plan Commission. (Cr. by Ord. 8107, 9-19-83.)

Source: City of Madison, General Ordinance, § 28.09(5).

opposed to prevent the creation of parking lots or the avoidance of cash responsibilities for returning a structure to its full use. If a wrecking permit is granted, the previously approved proposal must be initiated immediately upon clearing the site.

Renovation of existing structures is also limited by pragmatic zoning ordinances regarding fire provisions, height, and frontage for buildings in the Square area. Madison Building Code $29.37(4)$ restricts building materials to fire-resistant Types 1 or 2, prohibits reconstruction when the casualty loss exceeds 50 percent of assessed valuation, and prevents new use and occupancy until nonconforming fire provisions are corrected. Madison Zoning Code 28.04(14) states that no part of any building within a mile of the State Capitol can exceed the elevation of the base of the capitol dome columns (187.21). Since the elevation of the J.C. Penney site is $46^{\prime}$, construction is limited to 141'. Madison Zoning ordinances 28.04(6)(b) and $28.04(9)(a)$ require that parcels created by subdivision each have a minimum of $50^{\prime}$ frontage on the principal street and 6,000 square feet of gross area. Because frontage on the principal street, Monona Avenue, is 144', subdivision is technically possible, although highly unlikely.
2. Special Assessment District

During the past several years construction has progressed to implement the downtown-redevelopment proposal
known as the Capitol/State Street Mall. Project goals focus on improving commercial and retail viability while capitalizing on the positive attributes of the City, Capitol, and University. Minimization of vehicular traffic has been of prime importance to past city administrations. Success on the Square was believed to depend on a conducive environment for pedestrians and employees of the Central Business District. To achieve this goal, sidewalks were widened, street furniture provided, and landscaping improved. Narrowing the street encircling the Capitol reduced vehicular traffic. One lane each has been allotted for parking, automobiles, and public transportation. All traffic proceeds in a counterclockwise direction.

Missing from the mall is an attempt to improve present parking in relationship to the downtown commercial area. All major parking is provided at least one block away from shopping areas with no protected or enclosed pedestrian circulation between stores and parking. In the area of the Capitol Concourse a major one-way traffic loop separates existing parking facilities from the shopping square. No attempt has been made to provide accessible, ample, free parking as is provided in competitive suburban centers.

To perform the described renovations, properties facing directly on the mall received capital assessments. In 1978 the J. C. Penney property was taxed $\$ 21,814.36$ for
street improvements, and \$1,242.00 for alley repairs. A maintenance assessment is levied annually. This year's net assessment was $\$ 638.18$ ( $\$ 725.36$ less a rebate of \$87.18). Exhibit 6 presents the assessment for the subject property, as currently estimated by city engineers.

## EXHIBIT 6

MALL SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FOR SUBJECT PROPERTY

| Date of <br> Asessment | Purpose | Amount <br> and Terms | Amortized <br> Payment | Presently <br> Owe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1978 | Street | $\$ 21,814.36$ <br> $(10 \mathrm{yr} .6 \%)$ | $\$ 2,704.97$ | $\$ 8,725.72$ |
| 1978 | Alley | $\$ 1,242.00$ | $\$ 178.83$ | $\$ 310.50$ |
| Typical Annual Payment: | $\$ 2,883.80$ |  |  |  |

3. Political Constraints

The Madison City Council has had a reputation with the private sector of being antibusiness, antigrowth, and antidevelopment. Recent significant occurrences, such as departure of some of the Square's major retailers and deferral or cancellation of several redevelopment proposals for the Square, led the current administration to alter some of its restrictive attitudes. The mayor's office has initiated new programs to improve Madison's reputation in the private business sector, particularly with small businesses. To assist the city in its efforts, Downtown Madison Inc. was
established to enhance the economic base and human environment of the central city through a partnership between private and public sectors.l

Further evidence of the city's attempt to upgrade the Square is the newly developed Olin Place proposal, a $\$ 90$ million redevelopment plan for the nine blocks south and southeast of the Capitol Square, including the J. C. Penney property. The proposal, prepared by John Urich of the Madison Planning and Development Department and approved in 1982, identifies development opportunities for the downtown area. A 15- to 20-year phase joint public-private sector development, Olin Place is to support objectives adopted for downtown by the Common Council in May, 1981 as part of Madison's Master Plan. The Olin Place proposal for Block 89, where the J. C. Penney building is located, initially envisioned the redevelopment of the block to a specialty shopping mall anchored by Penney's and a new department store, a new hotel, an office complex, and a parking facility. However, since the closing of J. C. Penney's, Urich recommended razing the entire block This is a rather extreme recommendation given the economics of downtown Madison.

Concurrently, Jacobs, Visconsi and Jacobs, a Cleveland development firm, is examining the feasibility of putting a hotel-office complex on Block 89. Jacobs, Visconsi and Jacobs undertook the study on the condition

[^0]that the city assist no other developers in planning projects on the same block. Another firm, Real Estate Research Corporation, conducted a study indicating that students, downtown employees, and shoppers at outlying centers desire specialty shops in downtown Madison.

Because city planners are anxious to realize their goals for the Capitol/State Street Mall, proposals in accordance with City goals are likely to be accepted. An important consideration is that most of the subject property block is owned by Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company. In addition to granting variances for zoning requirements, cooperation in the form of Industrial Revenue Bonds and Tax Incremental Financing is also possible. The strong political necessity of reviving the Square and attracting new business could provide an investor on the subject site considerable negotiation leverage on fire and zoning codes by City Hall. C. Linkage

Linkage attributes are the relationships of the site to its immediate environs, activity centers, and hinterland. Any measurement of these relationships must consider transportation costs, convenience, time requirements and personal values. ${ }^{1}$

[^1]Traffic patterns and parking limitations have impacted negatively on the Square. Counts taken by the Department of Transportation for vehicle and bicycle traffic in the downtown area are illustrated in Exhibits 7 and 8. Eight access points to the Square exist, yet only one lane is provided for private vehicles. Restriction of flow to one direction is a source of irritation to drivers entering and exiting the Concourse (Exhibit 9). An inner lane is designated for public transportation, including shuttle buses circulating around the Square and traveling toward the University of Wisconsin campus. Access to the front of the subject property is possible via East Main Street or Monona Avenue. Parking is limited along the Capitol border to one-hour zoned spaces and vehicles with permits, and to 15,30 , and 60 minute metered stalls along diagonal and perpendicular arteries. Consequently, primary travel around the Concourse is pedestrian originating from bus loading points on the Square and metered parking ramps on the periphery (Exhibit 10). Meters requiring repeated deposits of money are another source of friction.

Parking ramps in close proximity to the subject property are the Doty Street and Dane County Ramps. The Doty Street Ramp has 468 monthly rental spaces and is in high demand with 100 percent occupancy. Alternatively, the Dane County Ramp has $2 \frac{1}{2}, 4$, and 10 hour restricted parking, along with monthly rentals. Occupancy rates are approximately

## EXHIBIT 7

TRAFFIC COUNTS ON THE SQUARE


Source: City of Madison, Nisconsin
Department of Transportation
Division of Traffic Engineers
1982 Traffic Counts

## EXHIBIT 8

## BICYCLE COUNTS ON THE SQUARE



Source: City of Madison, Wisconsin
Department of mransportation
Division of Traffic Engineers
1982 Bicycle Counts


EXHIBIT 10

## LOCATION OF RAMPS IN DOWNTOWN AREA



50 percent for the short term and monthly stalls. Demand for the 10 hour parking spaces is low with. a reported usage of only 25 percent. These statistics are indicative of the city's success in promoting public transportation usage.

Regarding the subject property, ten permit spaces are located in front of the building on East Main Street, and 25 metered spaces are on Monona Avenue adjacent to the southwest side of J.C. Penney's. The existing 20' alley is adequate for delivery of goods. This alley is one of the most heavily traveled in the downtown area, providing a route between State office buildings and the Courthouse.

Current tenant mix on the J.C. Penney block on East Main Street encourages minimal consumer activity. The block presently contains 13 ownership parcels, nine first-floor retail and/or service entities, and one major office structure (Exhibit ll). With the closing of J.C. Penney's, the block has four major vacancies and several buildings that are underutilized. The block is characterized as in transitional retail/office mixed use. Because of the recent sluggish economy, weak anchor commitment, mixed ownership and uncertainty regarding future City plans for the area, little vitality is displayed on the block.

The block face of $0-100$ East Main Street facing the southeast side of the State Capitol has historically been used for retail purposes, and is presently occupied

MAIN STREET


by Rennebohm-Walgreens Pharmacy. Rundells Inc. and S. S. Kresge Company, whose lease expires in 1987. Currently, the Capitol City Bank Building storefronts (17-21 East Main Street), and the J. C. Penney building (l East Main Street) are vacant.

Pedestrian traffic on the Square is greatest on the southeast blocks fronting East Main Street (Exhibit 12). The M \& I Bank of Madison and Anchor Savings and Loan on the block southwest of the subject property provide strong drawing power. North of the subject property, on the northeast side of the Square, are the Tenney Building and First Wisconsin Bank, providing a strong contribution to employment and pedestrian traffic. Located between these heavily traveled areas, the subject property has a substantially higher pedestrian traffic flow than does the rest of the Square. Focusing on the north and west sides of the Square, East Mifflin Street-with the Emporium, Manchester's, and Wool-worth's-and North Pinckney Street are equally weak in drawing power.

Several redevelopment proposals are either under construction or planned for sites in the downtown area. The Tenney Building located at 110 East Main Street is constructing a five-level parking garage in conjunction with the First Wisconsin Bank. The structure will include two levels of underground parking attached to the First Wisconsin Bank and three stories of parking ( 320 stalls) accessed to the Tenney Building. The Manchester Building, located at the

## EXHIBIT 12

## PEDESTRIAN COUNTS ON THE SQUARE


corner of East Mifflin and Wisconsin Avenue, is currently owned by local developer, Glen Hovde, who proposed demolishing it and building a mixed use project comprised of 65,000 square feet of office space, 60,000 square feet of retail space, and five floors of condominium units. The triangular, two-story building currently under renovation at 102 North Hamilton Street is the old Montgomery Ward building owned by Gary Divall. Another project in the planning stage is the addition of office space to the American Exchange Bank located at 1 North Pinckney. The resulting impact of these projects on the subject property is uncertain at this time.

Numerous advantages to the location of J. C. Penney's are apparent. The building is within walking distance of significant employment and activity centers. Directly across the street is the State Capitol and within two blocks are financial institutions, a federal office, GEF 1-2-3, and state, county and local government employment centers. The three levels of government provide the Square with approximately 9,000 daytime employees as potential customers. Proximity to a major hotel is a source of potential demand or competition for a succeeding use on the subject site. Visitors to Madison are attracted to the Square, given its closeness to Lakes Mendota and Monona and the University campus. Successful redevelopment of the Square would create a synergism with the State Street Mall. Madison is proud of its accomplishment in creating a specialty shopping area catering to the retail, commercial, and recreational needs of
the University of Wisconsin students and faculty. Decorative fountains, pedestrian rest areas, and the Madison Civic Center are examples of the Mall redevelopment.

## D. Dynamic Attributes

Dynamic attributes are the perceptions and emotional responses of individuals to a property and its location. Given their impact on decision making, such attributes as related to the subject property must be considered.

The subject site has a southwest exposure from its broadside. This sunny broadside is highly visible to oneway traffic on Main Street, Doty Street, and Monona Avenue. Converting the building would suggest placing the main office entrance on Monona Avenue.

While the building faces well-maintained Capitol grounds, the surrounding area is dominated by offices and vacant storefronts, and suffers with respect to security. Activities associated with the nearby redlight district, loitering panhandlers, and abusive individuals around the Square create anxiety for many of the Square's users and potential users. Despite efforts made by police to control this activity, the problem still exists in the minds of potential visitors.

Although the Capitol Square area is presently undergoing transition, it lacks both a clear image and direction. This poorly-defined tenant mix is a primary cause of this lack of clarity. Furthermore, limited parking on the Square
heightens anxiety and is a primary reason for the Square's failure to thrive.

## E. Existing Improvements

1. Background and Classification

The subject property was built on a sale leaseback in 1958 to house the J. C. Penney retail store. Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, the present owner, has financially supported Penney's since the building was erected. No significant alterations were made over the life of the building.

The building dimensions convert to an estimated gross square footage area of 51,840 square feet excluding the penthouse area (Exhibit 13). Since the volume of this building exceeds 50,000 cubic feet, all remodeling work must be done by licensed engineers or architects and approved by the State of Wisconsin Industrial Commission [Wisconsin Administration Code 50.07(2)(a)]. However, the square footage of floor space is significantly above the legal standard of 20,000 square feet which requires a full-service elevator and other interior circulation features for the handicapped (Wisconsin Administration Code 52.04, register, December 1976 , No. 252). Floors used entirely for storage or mechanical purposes need not be included in determining gross area.

## , EXHIBIT 13

gross footage of the subject property

| LEVEL | TOTAL SQUARE FEET | CEILING HEIGHTS | ESTIMATED CUBIC FEET |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basement | 12,960 | $x$ | 13 | 168,480 |
| First Floor | 12,960 | $x$ | 17 | 220,320 |
| Second Floor | 12,960 | $x$ | 14 | 181,440 |
| Third Floor | $\underline{12,960}$ | $x$ | 13 | $\underline{168,480}$ |
| TOTAL | $\underline{51,840}$ |  |  |  |

## 2. Type of Construction

A general description of the structure is summarized in Exhibit 14 and photographs are provided in Exhibit 15. The subject property is a steel-framed building comprised of precast concrete floors with block and brick curtain walls on l'4" thick poured concrete foundation walls. Abovegrade walls are $l^{\prime}$ thick and are block with brick fascia. Six bays with $24^{\prime}$ spacing are situated in the Monona Avenue direction while four bays with $22^{\prime}$ spacing are situated in the Main Street direction. The roof is five ply built up with a gravel surface over $l \frac{1}{2} "$ of rigid insulation.

Floor loadbearing capacity is 100 pounds per square foot, and will adequately accommodate office or residential use. The floors are supported by $12^{\prime \prime}$ deep concrete floor joists covered by a $2 \frac{1}{2} "$ wire mesh reinforced concrete slab. Running parallel to Main Street, the joists sit on $2^{\prime}$ deep, wide flange steel beams. A $12^{\prime \prime}$ steel beam at the end of each bay runs parallel with the concrete joists.
3. Structural Condition and Code Conformity

The City of Madison Building Inspection Department requires a new occupancy permit to reopen a building that has been closed at least one year prior to sale. This occupancy permit is conditional upon formal inspection of the building. Property manager Louis Cunningham indicated that all fire code requirements for the J. C. Penney building conform to standard codes (Exhibit 16). Sprinkler heads (110)

EXHIBIT 14

## DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS

## NUMBER OF STORIES:

AGE :
ROOMS:
Basement
First Floor
Second Floor
Third Floor
Penthouse

EXTERIOR:
Foundation
Walls
Roof
Store front
CONSTRUCTION:
Floor
Walls
BASEMENT:
HEATING:

AIR CONDITIONING
AND VENTILATION:

UTILITIES:

Three stories (without penthouse)
Approximately 25 years

One large retail area
One large retail area
One large retail area
Storage rooms and office Utilities

Concrete and steel
Block with brick fascia Flat, three-ply tar and rock Block with brick facia and glass

Precast concrete with steel rod, tile and carpet surface covering Putty coat plaster

Fully finished retail area
Cleaver Brooks 12-pound low pressure steam heat, forced air with coil

Two 50-ton Trane coolers to service basement, first, and second floor, and one 25-ton Trane cooler to service third floor. Air blown through wall vents.

2" municipal water service; 6" municipal sewer service; 4,000 to 5,000 amp electrical service.

EXHIBIT 15

## CURRENT PHOTOS OF SUBJECT



East view of subject property


North view of subject property

## EXHIBIT 15

(Continued)


Northeast view of rear alleyway

EXHIBIT 15
(Continued)


First floor retail area and escalator


Main street entrance and retail area

EXHIBIT 15
(Continued)


First floor elevators and retail area


Monona Avenue entrance and retail area

EXHIBIT 15
(Continued)


Typical hallway


Third floor storage room

## EXHIBIT 15

(Continued)


Utility room


Exterior view of utility room and roof

## EXHIBIT 16

## CAPITOL FIRE ZONE REQUIREMENTS

## General Requirements.

Every building or portion of a building except private residences, within such Capitol Fire Zone hereafter altered, remodeled or repaired to an extent of more than fifty percent (50\%) of the building's assessed value shall be of fire resistive construction, as specified in Ind. 51.03 Type 1 or 2.

All roof repair or replacement shall be of Class A rated material or equal.

All new buildings and additions to existing buildings hereafter constructed in the Capitol Fire zone shall be of fire resistive construction as specified in Ind. 51.03 Type 1 or 2 .

Note: Residences within the Capitol Fire Zone are subject to the limitations prescribed in Section 29.37 (2) (a) relating to construction and repair of buildings within fire limits.

Rooms or groups of rooms used for the housing of heating equipment, fuel storage, storage of oils, waste paper or volatile inflammable liquid, or similar use shall be separated from the rest of the building by permanent, fire-rated walls and ceiling complying with Wis. Admin. Code Ind. 51.03, with openings protected by means of approved standard fire windows and doors, complying with Wis. Admin. Code Ind. 5l.04(7).
(Sec. 29.37(4)(b) Am. by Ord. 7683, 4-2-82.)
are situated on each floor, and stairwells are also sprinklered. The system has capacity to pour out 1,000 gallons of water per minute.

The structural system is stable. By contemporary standards the walls are very thick and provide sound insulation from street noise. The only apparent repairs necessary to meet code are widening the entrance of the Main Street building entrance at an estimated cost of $\$ 3,000$; the, installation of restroom facilities on the first floor, and renovation of existing restroom facilities to accommodate handicapped persons, at an estimated cost of $\$ 27,500$.
4. Interior Finishes

Only the basement and first two floors of the threestory structure have been used for retail purposes; the third floor has been used for storage and office space, and the penthouse for utilities (Exhibit 15). Floors have tile and carpet surface covering, and walls are putty coat plaster. Present ceiling heights are adequate to allow for drop ceilings. General building maintenance is adequate, and no major interior renovation is necessary at present.

## 5. Renovation Problems

The J. C. Penney building has a minimal amount of deferred maintenance. The only significant item needing replacement is the cooling tower, at an estimated cost of $\$ 12,000$. Regraveling of the roof is recommended, although it is not of immediate concern.

## III. MOST PROBABLE USE

Having completed an inventory of positive and negative attributes of the property, significant limitations on future use, and immediate linkages of the location, the appraiser must identify possible uses. Each use must exploit marketable attributes of the property, neutralize its negative characteristics, and operate within limits of justified, prudent investment.

## A. General Market Characteristics

The search for a use should begin with the possibility of extending the past use of the structure as a retail store. However, continuous decline of the retail market on the Square has caused many major downtown retailers to close down. The Manchester, Wolff Kubly, and J. C. Penney buildings, each offering large retail space, are presently vacant. The Manchester site's next use (redevelopment to mixed office, retail and residential) further supports the belief that large retail space on the Square is undesirable. J. C. Penney's declined a renewal option on their lease at below-market rates, strongly suggesting that the downtown area is unable to attract the clientele necessary to meet department store needs. Regional shopping centers such as South Towne and West Towne have strong drawing power and are sources of competition for large retail stores in downtown Madison. Furthermore, City Council President Ann Monks indicated that, if a retail store were brought to the Square it would be
successful if located on the north side of the Square, where residential use is more prevalent. However, present plans for this side of Capitol Square include no retail department stores. In response to downtown retail market information, the possibility of extending the subject property's past use as a retail department store is unlikely.

Attitudes and perceptions of present and potential downtown shoppers is a further consideration in projecting retail success on the Square. A survey conducted by Real Estate Research Corporation (RERC) indicated that students, downtown employees, and shoppers at outlying centers desire specialty shops in downtown Madison. This expresed interest coincides with city goals. Consequently, future retail activity will be determined by the extent to which city goals to create a downtown specialty shopping center are realized. Rental information is provided in Exhibit 17.

Office space is another potential use for the
J. C. Penney building. The subject property presently offers no on-site parking and unless a joint venture on a ramp is possible with Mutual Benefit, the option of Class A is eliminated. However, the current market for Class A space is strong. The American Exchange Bank (l North Pinckney), 100 North Hamilton, and 44 On The Square have targeted their products for the Class A user. These buildings are in accordance with the Urban Land Institute Standards for Class A space; they are constructed with high quality materials, have good locations and access, and maintain high quality

## EXHIBIT 17

RETAIL INFORHATION FOR DOWNTOWN MADISON


tenants and professional management. ${ }^{1}$ Although Class B and $C$ office space markets have been soft, present conversion of the Tenney Building from Class B to Class A space is expected to impact both markets.

According to the October 1984 Downtown Madison Office Space Inventory prepared by Downtown Madison Partners, Inc., total vacancy of private speculative and nonspeculative office space on the eight blocks surrounding the Capi.tol is 5 percent. An August 1984 feasibility study by Ross Luedke and Kris Sivertson indicates that the vacancy rate for Class B and C space in downtown Madison as of June 1984 is 11.8 percent-an improvement over the November 1982 Class $B$ and $C$ vacancy rate of 23.4 percent. ${ }^{2}$

In terms of demand, downtown Madison appears to have little potential for attracting large major office users other than the type which currently occupy offices in the area. A recent publication, Block 89 Building Reuse Study, prepared by Stockham and Vandewalle, suggests a continuing market for small professional offices, trade and professional

[^2]associations, and some government uses. Net leasable area per floor of the subject property can accommodate such uses. Moreover, downtown office vacancy rates by floor area are low for uses requiring $10,000-14,999$ square feet. The subject property falls into this range, with approximately 11,000 square feet per floor (Exhibit 18). Furthermore, the State may be considered a prospective office space user, due to upcoming expiration of its current leases (Appendix B).

Another potential use for the subject property is residential. The residential market in downtown Madison can be divided into apartment rental and condominium markets. A September 1982 survey by the Madison Apartment Association shows a vacancy rate of 5.4 percent for furnished apartments in the downtown area. Moreover, a phone survey conducted by Ross Luedke and Kris Sivertson in August 1984 indicates occupancy rates in downtown Madison range from 87 percent to 100 percent. Verification of current rental rates was gathered in a phone survey by the author of this report. Results show that monthly rents for an efficiency apartment range from $\$ 270-\$ 285$; one-bedroom apartments range from \$325-\$465; two-bedroom apartments range from $\$ 450-\$ 525$; and three- to four-bedroom apartments range as high as $\$ 645$ (Exhibit 19). Although located in the Capitol Square vicinity, apartments included in these surveys may not indicate actual rent levels for a successful apartment project on the subject property block. East Main Street is likely to attract

## EXBIBIT 18

## DOWNTOWN OFFICE VACANCY RATES BY FLOOR AREA

| Net <br> Leasable <br> Sq. Ft. <br> Per Floor | Net Leasable Square Feet | Vacant Square Feet | Percent of Space Vacant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4,999 | 143,060 | 32,758 | 22.9\% |
| 5,000-9,999 | 598,100 | 60,890 | 10.2\% |
| 10,000-14,999 | 338,224 | 10,144 | 3.0\% |
| 15,000-19,999 | 105,000 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 20,000-24,999 | 60,000 | 28,000 | 46.7\% |
| 25,000+ | 283,641 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Total | 1,528,025 | 131,792 | 8.6\% |

Each building is categorized by the net leasable square feet of its largest floor.

Source: Telephone survey with building owners and leasing agents, conducted by Ross Luedke, Kris Sivertson, and Dale Mussatti.

## EXBIBIT 19

## 1984 APARTMENT RENTAL ANALYSIS FOR CENTRAL MADISON

| Name of Complex | Rental Rates | Locational Attributes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Capitol Centre }}{344 \text { West Dayton }}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & \mathrm{BR}=\$ 355-\$ 390 \\ 1 & \mathrm{BR} \quad \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{Den}=\$ 430- \\ & \\ 2 & \mathrm{BR}=\$ 465-\$ 525 \end{array}$ | 31/2 blocks from Square |
| $\frac{126 \text { South Franklin }}{126 \text { South Franklin }}$ | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Eff} & =\$ 285 \\ 1 \mathrm{BR} & =\$ 325\end{aligned}$ | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ blocks from Square |
| Baskerville Apartments 121 South Hamilton | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Studio }=\$ 290 \\ & 1 \mathrm{BR}=\$ 330-\$ 385 \\ & 2 \mathrm{BR}=\$ 450 \\ & 4 \mathrm{BR}=\$ 645 \end{aligned}$ | I/2 block from Square |
| Sumner Apartments 17 South Hancock | $2 \mathrm{BR}=\$ 465$ | 31/2 blocks from Square |
| $\frac{121 \text { South Hancock }}{121 \text { South Hancock }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E f f=\$ 280 \\ & 1 B R=\$ 350 \end{aligned}$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}$ blocks from Square |
| $\frac{\text { Kennedy Manor }}{\text { a }} \text { Langdon Street }$ | $\begin{aligned} & E f f .=\$ 270-\$ 275 \\ & 1 B R=\$ 370-\$ 405 \\ & 2 B R=\$ 475-\$ 515 \end{aligned}$ | Across street from Edgewater Hotel \& Lake Mendota, 31/2 blocks from Square |

professionals as well as students. Therefore, if substantial redevelopment occurs on the Square, the strong locational attributes of the subject site could command rent levels exceeding those of the apartments surveyed.

## B. Alternative Uses for J. C. Penney Property

A combination of the physical characteristics of the property and the general demand characteristics on the Square suggests the following alternative scenarios for use of the subject property (Appendix C):

Scenario \#l: The present structure is retained and modified to create office and retail space. Interior walls are constructed on all floors and HVAC is upgraded to service individual space-users. Basement, 2 nd and 3 rd floors are converted to office space, with lst floor containing fully enclosed retail space. Capital outlays are substantial due to interior wall construction.

Scenario \#2: The present structure is retained and modified to create a combined retail-office-apartment complex. Interior walls are constructed on all floors and HVAC is upgraded to service individual space-users. Basement and 2nd floor house office space; retail and apartments are located on lst and 3rd floors, respectively. Capital outlays are substantial due to extensive interior renovation necessary to provide individual space units.

Scenario \#3: The present structure is retained and modified to create office and retail space. Basement, 2nd, and 3rd floors are remodeled and equipped with drop ceilings, carpeting, partitions, and fixtures necessary to accommodate Class B office space. First floor requires little renovation for its purported use as retail space with unenclosed units (hereafter referred to as open-air retail space). Capital outlays are minimal as proposed renovations are cosmetic in nature.

Scenario \#4: The building is demolished and a new four-story retail-office-apartment complex, including parking facilities for residential tenants, is constructed. First floor includes eight fully enclosed retail units, totaling 9,072 square feet. Second and 3rd floors contain 22,032 square feet of office space. Ten rental apartment units, ranging in size from 900 to 1,100 square feet, are located on the 4 th floor. Capital outlays are highest for this scenario because of required demolition and construction costs.

The first three scenarios require removal of the existing escalator and replacement with an atrium. Existing precast floor panels make such replacement feasible. Salvage value of the escalator is assumed equal to removal costs, therefore, no capital outlays are included.

## C. Economic Ranking of Alternatives

Alternative uses that might be plausible for the subject property can first be ranked in terms of the general budget parameters inherent in revenues and expenses for each scenario. The best financial alternatives must then be screened for effective demand, political acceptability, and risk. To reveal the general range of justified investment in the existing property, the appraiser developed a logic of converting rents generated in Scenario \#1, \#2, \#3 and \#4 into justified investment by determining a market rent for each use and assuming an acceptable cash breakeven point ${ }^{l}$ for financial planning and budgeting. This process capitalizes funds available for debt service or cash dividends into amounts of justified investment. The back-door residual approach does not measure economic value of an alternative use because it ignores resale and tax shelter. This approach can be misleading if there are small errors in the cash-flow forecast, but if estimating bias is consistent when applied to the alternative uses, it does rank the alternative in terms of their ability to pay for the subject property as is. The logic of this process is provided in Exhibit 20; cost assumptions and calculations are provided in Appendix $C$. A summary of these calculations from the Appendix is provided in Exhibit 21. Preliminary ranking based on a cash justified investment (Line 3, Exhibit 21), without regard to future

[^3]BASIC LOGIC FOR RANKING ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM SCENARIOS BY JUSTIFIED PURCHASE BUDGET


## EXHIBIT 21 <br> SUMMARY OF BUDGETS FOR ALTERNATIVE USE SCENARIOS

|  | Budget Item |  | cenario \#1 | Sc | nario \#2 |  | Scenario ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | Sc | nario 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Renovation or Construction Costs | -\$2 | $2,129,060$ | -\$2 | 103,140 | -\$ | 897,860 | -\$3 | 249.739 |
| 2 | Justified <br> Investment for <br> Property as Is |  | 1,587,771 | $1,473,885$ |  | 1,301,956 |  | $2,380,150$ |  |
| 3 | Total Justified Investment in Subject Property As Is | -\$ | 541,289 | -\$ | 629,255 | \$ | 404.096 | -\$ | 869.589 |

reversion value, demonstrates that Scenario \#3 is the preferable use of the structure.

## D. Risk Ranking of Alternatives

A further screening method is consideration of the alternatives in light of financial and renovation risks. Risk in this discussion is defined as variance from a forecasted event, whether that event be the amount of a cash payment or the outcome of a political process.

Risk inherent in renovation increases with the expected cash expenditures, the likelihood of cost overruns, and possibility of unanticipated delays due to strikes or technical problems. Scenarios \#l and \#2 will require a substantial amount of renovation, while Scenario \#3 will concentrate on the structural modifications and cosmetic repairs necessary to meet the needs of incoming space users. All four scenarios are dependent on return of the small retailer to the Square and on increased demand for Class B office space. Rents achievable in Scenarios \#l, \#2, and \#4 are unlikely to be commensurate with the high capital outlays associated with each scenario. Externalities resulting from a lack of vitality on the J.C. Penney block and uncertainty regarding future city plans of the area could be a deterrent to any major capital investment. Therefore, Scenario \#3, which requires below-market rents, faces the least amount of financial risk.
E. Political Compatibility of Alternatives

Scenarios \#l, \#2, and \#3 would be politically acceptable as each provides first floor retail space fronting the Square, consistent with Planning Commission dictum that first floor space contiguous to the Square generate pedestrian traffic. Scenario \#4 is consistent with the city's goal of providing additional housing in the downtown area, and is likely to produce more evening traffic on the Square. However, demolition of the subject property might meet with resistance from City Hall because of the current Olin Place proposal and future downtown redevelopment proposals.

Uncertainty associated with land use on the Square, along with the pending Jacobs, Visconsi, and Jacobs study indicates that a transitional use for the subject property is appropriate at present. Such a use places no significant constraints on potential development of downtown Madison. Therefore, Scenario \#3 would be the most politically acceptable use.
F. Conclusions

Renovation risk is significant in Scenarios \#l and \#2, yet due to the addition of residential units, Scenario \#2 would be more politically acceptable. Favorable risk attributes for Scenario \#3, as well as higher justified purchase price, indicate that Scenario \#3 is more attractive and lucrative overall. A review of the summary feasibility
data in Exhibit 22 supports the conclusion that the most probable use of the subject property, in the opinion of this appraiser, is Scenario \#3.

```
The most probable use of the subject property is for conversion to office-retail space consisting of 8,252 square feet of open-air retail space and 31,451 square feet of office space.
```


## EXHIBIT 22

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVE USES

| Feasibility Factor | Scenario \#1 | Scenario \#2 | Scenario | Scenario 管4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Total Renovation Office/Retail | Total Renovation to Retail/Office/ <br> Apartment | Minimum Renovation to Office/Retail | Demolition and Construction of Retail/Office/ Apartment |
| $\frac{\text { Justified Investment in Subject }}{\text { Remodeling Risks }}$ | $t$ Negative | Negative | 404,096 | Negative |
|  | Significant: <br> -interior walls added -HVAC for individual space users -risk of unknown obstacles | Significant: <br> -interior walls added <br> -HVAC for individual space users -risk of unknown obstacles | Minimal: <br> -primarily cosmetic | None |
| Effective Market Demands | Office-Soft Retail-Soft | Office-Soft <br> Retail-Soft <br> Residential - <br> Strong. Depends on redevelopment progress | Office-Soft Retail-Soft | Office-Soft <br> Retail-Soft <br> Residential- <br> Strong. Depends on redevelopment progress |

EXHIBIT 22

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVE USES
(Continued)

| Feasibility Factor | Scenario | Scenario \#2 | Scenario \#3 | Scenario 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Political Acceptability | Acceptable | More Acceptable | Most Acceptable | Mixed |
| Financial Risk | Depends on return of small retailer to square and on increased demand for Class $B$ office space. Both are plausible. | Depends on return of small retailer to square and on increased demand for Class: B office space. Both are plausible. Also depends on demand for limited number of apartments which is affected by people's expectations of the redevelopment of the square. | Same as \#1 | Same as \#2 Also depends on quality and uniqueness of product |

## IV. PREDICTION OF PRICE FROM MARKET SALES

Recent market sales in a given area are the most reliable predictors of the most probable buyer and what he might be willing to pay for another property in that area. This section will discuss the market comparison approach to most probable price and will provide final tests of this price.
A. Most Probable Buyer

A review of the comparable sales in Madison central business district reveals that purchases of downtown properties have been by local businessmen seeking a new location for business, professional real estate investors willing and able to execute extensive renovation and re-lease or resale, or the City of Madison attempting to upgrade downtown and increase the tax revenue base.

Since government entities are considered captive buyers, comparable sales by the City of Madison are omitted from this appraisal. The City of Madison has been an active member in the downtown real estate market, purchasing distressed properties and reselling them at below market prices to local developers. City buydowns are typically financed with Tax Incremental Financing (TIF). This option is unlikely for the subject property. Jerry Tucker, Madison Planning Commission member, indicated that due to the length of the review process a $\$ 2$ million property value increase is the minimum project size. The most probable
use development project for the subject property is expected to increase the value by less than $\$ 2$ million, and is therefore unlikely to receive TIF assistance.

Exhibit 23 contains a brief summary of the comparable sales that were used and Exhibit 24 shows their location in downtown Madison. Each building is located on the Square and contains a mixture of retail and office space. Purchasing terms of the comparable sales, detailed in Exhibits 2.5 through 29, included cash to seller, land contract, and seller financing. Comparables one through three were adjusted for terms of sale (Exhibit 30).

Since the seller in this appraisal wishes to sell for cash, seller financing is highly unlikely. A local real estate developer/investor partnership will probably purchase the building with cash to seller. Due to the City's favorable attitude to renovation of downtown, financial assistance in the form of Industrial Revenue Bonds is a strong possibility. These tax exempt bonds can be obtained at 9.75 percent interest, and might support a sales price toward the upper end of the transaction zone.

Therefore, the most probable buyer is a local developer/investor partnership that will renovate the building to a mixed use of Class $B$ offices and open-air retail space.

## EXHIBIT 23

## COMPARABLE SALES DESCRIPTION

## Comparable Property \#l

Location:
Price:
Gross Building Area:
Date of Sale:

## Comparable Property \#2

Location:
Price:
Gross Building Area:
Date of Sale:

Comparable Property \#3

## Location: <br> Price: <br> Gross Building Area: <br> Date of Sale: <br> Comparable Property \#4

Location:
Price:
Gross Building Area:
Date of Sale:
Comparable Property \#5
Location:
Price:
Gross Building Area:
Date of Sale:

30 North Carroll Street
\$625,000 (cash)
41,000 square feet
December 1978

50 East Mifflin Street \$697,000 (Terms: See full disclosure) 42,500 square feet April 30, 1978

## 2 West Mifflin Street

 $\$ 662,000$ (Terms: See full discllosure) 38,640 square feet July 31, 1978110 East Main Street
\$1,350,000 (cash)
105,600 square feet
February 29, 1984

5-7 North Pinckney Street
$\$ 240,000$ (cash)
26,000 square feet
December 31, 1977

LOCATION OF COMPARABLE SALES
(

CAPITOL SQUARE


## EXHIBIT 25

## COMPARABLE SALE \#1



30 North Carroll Street

Date of Sale: July 17, 1980
Sale Price: \$625,000
Sale Document: Warranty Deed
Terms of Sale: Cash; sale to captive buyer
Grantor: Carley Capital Group
Grantee: State of Wisconsin
Use at Time of Sale: Vacant
Tax Parcel Number: 0709-231-0905-7
Assessed Value: Unavailable
Sale Price as Percent of Assessed Value: Unavailable Building Location: One block from State Street Mall; four blocks from City-County Building; four blocks from GEF I; five blocks from GEF II and III.
Frontage: 65.5 feet on Carroll Street, 132 feet on Fairchild Street
Zoning: C-4
Gross Building Area: 41,000 square feet First Floor Rentable Area: 32,000 square feet
Type of Construction: Four-story plus basement reinforced concrete, brick and block building; two passenger elevators and one freight elevator; light brick veneer exterior.

## COMPARABLE SALE \#l

 (Continued)Present Use: Under major renovation for use as State of Wisconsin Historical Society Museum.
Age: 31 years.

## EXHIBIT 26

## COMPARABLE SALE \#2



50 East Mifflin Street

Date of Sale: April 30, 1978
Sale Price: \$697,000
Sale Document: Sale leaseback
Recorded: Volume 942, p. 115.
Terms of Sale: $\$ 654,064,5.25$ percent long term mortgage assumed. Seller took back 10 year note for $\$ 65,936.23$ at 8 percent interest.
Grantor: J. Jesse Hyman, Jr. and Alan R. Hyman, copartners d.b.a. Emporium Company

Grantee: Carley Capital Group
Tax Parcel Number: 0709-144-2411-7
Assessed Value: Land \$258,700

(1978 Assessed Value)
Sale Price as Percent of Assessed Value: 82 percent
Building Location: Two blocks from State Street Mall; four blocks from City-County Building; three blocks from GEF-I; four blocks from GEF-II and III; corner lot.
Frontage: 70 feet on East Mifflin Street.
Lot Size: 132 feet X 70 feet
Zoning: C-4

## COMPARABLE SALE \#2

(Continued)

Gross Building Area: 49,755 square feet First Floor Gross Area: 8,500 square feet Net Rentable Area: 38,500 square feet Type of Construction: Four-story masonry and concrete building; two elevators; freight facilities in rear parking lot; structure can carry additional floors.
Present Use: Retail lst floor; extensive remodeling of three upper floors for office space.

EXHIBIT 27

## COMPARABLE SALE \#3



2 West Mifflin Street

Date of Sale: July 31, 1978
Sale Price: $\$ 662,000$
Sale Document: Warranty Deed
Recorded: Volume 980, p. 318.
Terms of Sale: Subject to July 15, 1977 mortgage, undivided;
90 percent interest in and to partnership.
Grantor: Thirty-on-The Square Associates
Grantee: Mifflin Associates
Use as Time of Sale: Retail and Office
Tax Parcel Number: 0709-144-2509-0
Assessed Value: Land \$371,300

(1978 Assessed Value)
Sale Price as Percent of Assessed Value: 104 percent
Building Location: Five blocks from City-County Building;
three blocks from GEF-I; corner lot.
Frontage: 91 feet on West Mifflin Street; 136 feet on Wisconsin Avenue.
Lot Size: 12,376 square feet
Zoning: C-4

## COMPARABLE SALE *3 (continued)

Gross Building Area: 38,640 square feet First Floor and Mezzanine Gross Area: 13,880 square feet Net Rentable Area: Approximately 24,000 square feet Type of Construction: Two-story, masonry bearing walls; concrete slab flooring; elevator.
Present Uses: Retail, lst, mezzanine, and basement: office, 2nd floor.

## COMPARABLE SALE 4



110 East Main Street
Date of Sale: February 1984
Sale Price: \$1,350,000
Sale Document: Warranty Deed
Recorded: Vol. 5402, p. 96
Terms of Sale: Cash to Seller
Grantor: George Maloof
Grantee: Tenney Plaza Associates
Use at Time of Sale: Retail and Office
Tax Parcel Number: 0709-133-2901-1
Assessed Value: Land
\$ 610,000
Improvements Total

620,000
$\$ 1,230,000$ (1984 Assessed Value)
Sale Price as Percent of Assessed Value: 110 percent Building Location: Two blocks from City-County Building; one block from GEF-I, two blocks from GEF II and III; corner lot.
Frontage: 154 feet on East Main Street
Lot Size: 174 feet X 132 feet
Zoning: C-4
Gross Building Area: 105,600 square feet
Net Rentable Area: 72,500 square feet
Type of Construction: Ten-story concrete
Present Uses: Retail and Office
Age: Part 51 years; part 54 years

## EXBIBIT 29

## COMPARABLE SALE 䒤5



## 5-7 North Pinckney Street a.k.a. "Center 7"

Date of Sale: December 31, 1977
Sale Price: \$240,000
Sale Document: Testimentary Trust by Company Trustees
Recorded: Volume l001, p. 272.
Terms of Sale: Cash to seller
Grantor: Baskin Robbins
Grantee: Rifken and Campbell associates, a Wisconsin Partnership.
Use at Time of Sale: Commercial
Tax Parcel Number: 0709-133-3002-6
Assessed Value: Land \$140,000
Improvements $\quad \begin{array}{r}97,600 \\ \text { Total }\end{array} \quad \$ 237,600$
Sale Price as Percent of Assessed Value: 101 Percent
Building Location: Three blocks from City-County Building; two blocks from GEF-I, three blocks from GEF II and III; mid-block.
Lot Size: 8,712 square feet including 12 foot easement.
Zoning: C-4
Gross Building Area: 26,000 square feet

## COMPARABLE SALE \#5 (Continued)

Net Leasable Area: 20,500 square feet Type of Construction: Two-story wood frame Present Use: Retail first floor; office on upper two floors.

EXHIBIT 30
SCHEDULE OF ADJUSTMENTS

|  | Comparable \#l <br> Wolff Kubly <br> 30 N. Carroll | Comparable \#2 <br> Emporium <br> 50 E. Mifflin | Comparable \#3 Woolworth's 2 W. Mifflin | Comparable \#4 Tenney Bldg. <br> 110 E. Main | Comparable 5 Center 7 <br> 5-7 N. Pinckney |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal Sale Price | \$735,000 | \$850,000 | \$596,200 | \$1,350,000 | \$240.000 |
| Date of Sale | 12/78 | 4/30/78 | 7/31/78 | 2/29/84 | 12/31/77 |
| Terms of Sale | Cash to seller | Cash to seller | Subject to 7/77 mortgage 90\% in and to partnership | Cash to seller | Cash to seller |
| Amount to Adjustment ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (110,000) | $(153,000)$ | 65,800 | -0- | -0- |
| Adjusted <br> Sales <br> Price | \$625,000 | \$697,000 | \$662,000 | \$1,350,000 | \$240,000 |

[^4]
## B. Most Probable Price

Although the comparable sale properties are predominantly mixed use retail/office buildings on Capitol Square, significant differences exist among them. In choosing adjustment attributes, the appraiser must select the salient characteristics that are price-sensitive, such as degree of renovation required, planned occupancy at time of sale, accessibility to the subject property, potential for expansion of existing improvements, and other salient factors. It is therefore necessary to reduce the differences to a common denominator or unit within which price comparison and patterns can be identified. Each property will be scored on a point system weighted for priorities of the investor developers in the current market. The total point score for each comparable sale and the subject property can then be related to one another by means of a simple linear regression line, which is a form of averaging differences by a means of a least squares fit. This simple linear regression is a statistical process for translating supply characteristics and price histories demand into a prediction of price-per-unit behavior in the central Madison market large commercial properties. In addition to providing a predicted price per unit as a central tendency for the subject property, this process provides a means for estimating the reliability for sale/price predictions through statistical calculation of the standard error of the estimate.
C. Market Comparison Approach to Probable Price

The first step of market inference was the collection of recent comparable sales. Comparable sales considerations were:

- Location on Capitol Square in the C-4 Zone
- Used for retail purposes at the first floor level
- Location offering maximum visibility and traffic flow
- Little or no on-site parking provided
. Purchased for rehabilitation.

Originally 13 comparables were considered, but the list was narrowed to five after a closer inspection. Exhibit 31 provides brief explanations of the elimination of other transactions as comparables.

The next step was to adjust the sales prices of the comparables for time and financing. This adjusted price is then divided by the unit of comparison to determine the adjusted sales price per unit of comparison (Exhibit 32). This unit of comparison was derived by testing various units of measurement to calculate their correlation ( $R^{2}$ ) with price. As shown in Exhibit 33, building gross square footage has the highest correlation coefficient $\left(R^{2}\right)$ at 93.9 percent. Exhibit 34 shows a plotting of the least squares line for the comparable sales.

Next, a decision was made as to the price-sensitive attributes deemed important by a potential buyer and the relative significance applied to each (Exhibit 35). Using

## EXHIBIT 31

ELIMINATION OF TRANSACTIONS OF COMPARABLE PROPERTIES

| Property | Eliminating Characteristics |
| :---: | :--- |
| 435 West Washington |  |
| Avenue | Commercial location in primarily <br> residential neighborhood. |
| 905 University Avenue | Substantial dis, <br> locational attributes and market <br> area potential. |
| 16 North Carroll Street | No retail on first floor/not <br> purchased for rehabilitation. |
| 126 Langdon Street | Residential location along lake <br> in a primarily residential area. |
| 137 East Wilson Street | Locatedin marginal commercial/ <br> industrial area. |
| 149 East Wilson Street | Located in marginal commercial/ <br> industrial area. |
| 212 East Washington | No retail on first floor. |

## EXHIBIT 32

## ADJUSTED SALES PRICE PER UNIT OF COMPARISON

## CPNFFAEE SAGE FFSCE ALUETENTE



|  | Comparatle Number 1 | Comparable Number 2 | Cocparable Number 3 | Comparatle <br> Number 4 | Comparabie Number 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominai sale price | \＄735，000 | \＄$\$ 250,090$ | 10t2，000 | \＄1，350，000 | \＄240，000 |
| Saies price ájusted for terms | \＄625，000 | \＄697，000 | \＄662，000 | \＄1，350，000 | \＄240，000 |
| Sales price adjusted for tiaE | \＄0 | \＄ | $\$ 0$ | \＄0 | $\$ 1$ |
| Adjusted saie price | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 25,000 \\ == & ======== \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 697,000$ <br> ェッニニニニニニニニシ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 6 E 2,000 \\ ========== \end{gathered}$ | $11,350,000$ $==-==2==2=$ | $\$ 240,000$ <br>  |
| Structure－ $84 . \mathrm{ft}$ ． | 4，000 | 47.75 | 3E，640 | 105，600 | 26,000 |
| Frice per s7．ft． | \＄5．24 | \＄14．0． | \＄17．13 | \＄12．78 | \＄9．23 |

## EXHIBIT 33

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ OF SALES PRICE

| Space Unit | Correlation (R) | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Square Footage | . 906 | 82.1\% |
| Building Gross Square Footage | . 969 | 93.9\% |
| Building Net Square Footage | . 947 | 89.7\% |
| Number of Floors Excluding Basement | . 925 | 85.6\% |
| Net Square Footage : Gross Square Footage | -. 398 | 15.8\% |
| (Net Square Footage ; Gross Square Footage)* Number of Floors Excluding Basement | . 900 | 81.0\% |
| Gross Square Footage ; Lot Area | . 482 | 23.2\% |
| (Net Square Footage : Gross Square Footage) ; Lot Area | -. 817 | 66.7\% |

## EXBIBIT 34

GRAPH OF LEAST SQUARES LINE FOR COMPARABLE SALES

MTE PPLOTC1 C3


MTE $>$

## EXHIBIT 35

SCALE FOR SCORING COMPARABLES ON IMPORTANT INVESTOR CONSIDERATIONS FOR OFFICE-RETAIL SPACE IN MADISON C-4 ZONE

| Degree of Renovation (40\%) | ```26 = none or minimal 20 = superficial, no major structural adjustments 15 = moderate modification to interior layout 13 = considerable modification to interior layout 10 = major modification to. interior layout``` |
| :---: | :---: |
| Planned Occupancy (15\%) | 26 = fully leased upon purchase by owner/user <br> 20 = major tenant ground floor <br> 15 = less than one-third vacancy <br> 13 = greater than one-third vacancy <br> 10 = completely vacant |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Accessibility } \\ (5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26= \text { accessible by one or more } \\ & \text { two-way streets } \\ & 20 \text { accessible by four or more } \\ & \text { one-way streets } \\ & 15= \text { accessible by three one-way } \\ & \text { streets } \\ & 13= \text { accessible by two one-way } \\ & \text { streets } \\ & 10= \text { accessible by one one-way } \\ & \text { street } \end{aligned}$ |
| Potential for Expansion (40\%) | 26 = capacity for major vertical, horizontal and interior modification <br> 20 = capacity for internal modification and major vertical or major horizontal modifications, but not both <br> 15 = restricted to internal modifications and limited exterior modifications <br> 13 = modest potential for internal modifications, little or no external modification capacity <br> 10 = minimal potential for both internal and external modifications |

the designated point system, each comparable property was assigned a total point score (Exhibit 36). Because of the soft real estate market, and little appreciation during the recent recession, and the unsound logic of allocating value to land as if vacant, no adjustment was made for time or land. It was determined that Comparable \#l through Comparable \#3 warranted adjustment for financing terms. These sales had favorable financing terms so an adjustment was made to incorporate this increment in value attributable to the financing (Appendix D).

The adjusted selling price per unit of comparison is then divided by the weighted point score resulting in the central tendency for most probable price and the range of possible transactions (Exhibit 37).

To further elaborate on the point score system, four attributes were selected as the most price sensitive characteristics of the comparables and subject property. Attributes deemed relevant were: degree of renovation required, planned occupancy at time of sale, accessibility to the subject property, and potential for expansion of the existing improvements. As indicated in Exhibit 35, each attribute was further subdivided into five categories that were assigned a point score. This method was derived by Gene Dilmore and is as follows:

| Excellent | 26 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Good | 20 |
| Average | 15 |
| Fair | 13 |
| Poor | 10. |

## EXHIBIT 36 <br> WEIGHTED MATRIX FOR COMPARABLE PROPERTIES



EXHIBIT 37
CALCULATION OF MOST PROBABLE PRICE USING MEAN PRICE PER POINT EQUATION METHOD

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ：－ana sasert． &  & \(n \leq:-t \leq s\)
E：
E： & Frize per g- \\
\hline \(\because\) & \＄：5．2\％ & ：－7： & \＄0．E 6 \\
\hline 2 &  & 20.2 & \＄0．9 \\
\hline － & \％：7． & 26．95 & \＄1． 32 \\
\hline \(\div\) & き：ご： & 15．：5 & \＄0．84 \\
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These numbers were chosen to provide a curvilinear relationship between excellent and poor, and have been tested by Dilmore and found to be extremely consistent.

Comparable properties and the subject were scored using Dilmore's point system (Exhibit 36). The subject property requires no major structural adjustments for its purported use as office retail space. Because required renovation is cosmetic in nature, the subject property received a 20 for degree of renovation required. At present, the Penney building is completely vacant. Because there are no plans to lease the space, the subject property was given a low score of 10 for planned occupancy. The subject property is accessible by two one-way streets and received a 13 for the consideration of accessibility. Finally, because modifications to the Penney's improvements are restricted to internal modifications and limited exterior modifications, the subject property was given a 15 for potential for expansion. After multiplying the respective scores of the different characteristics by the weight of importance for each attribute, the subject property obtained an average weighted score of 16.15 .

The market comparable approach is sensitive to the appraiser's ability to predict buyer perceptions in a constantly changing market. The limited number of comparable properties and available information scored in the weighted matrix attempts to capture these perceptions. Consequently, this calculated value is only the initial step in determining
the final price estimate. This initial transaction zone must be adjusted in light of certain external factors, and then tested to determine if the most probable selling price estimate would provide an acceptable yield from income when related to the most probable use, total cost to most probable buyer and typical financing.

## D. External Influences on Most Probable Price

Renovation of a vacant retail store into a viable economic enterprise carries certain risks. The price an investor is willing to pay for the property is dependent on his perception of these risks. Recently, the City has made public its Olin Place proposal, and news has spread about the Jacobs, Visconsi, and Jacobs feasibility study of Block 89. Such publicity may stimulate the speculative nature of a potential buyer.

Lender opinion on risk associated with most probable use could also impact sales price (e.g.: willingness of the City to finance the sale would support the higher end of the transaction zone). Analysis of the proposed use is dependent on an accepted default ratio of . 85 and current market financing terms.

Additional external influences include placement of open-air retail on the first floor of the subject building that will increase pedestrian traffic on Capitol Concourse, and the ability of management to capture an adequate segment of the Class B office market. Possible assemblage, or a

The cash flow program was run using different price, financing, and rate of appreciation assumptions to determine if the aforementioned Most Probable Price is supported by basic yields and risk ratios determined in the investor calculus (Appendix E).

Under the Most Probable Price scenario, it is assumed that an investor would purchase the subject property and invest $\$ 900,000$ in capital improvements, for a total investment of $\$ 1,600,000$. Income and expense projections are grown at a 2 percent inflation rate because of the persistent stagnant real estate market in Madison. Assuming an 80 percent loan-to-value ratio, a mortgage principal of $\$ 1,280,000$ could be obtained. Current financing conditions are a 30 -year loan at 13.5 percent interest. A seven-year holding period is assumed. The detail provided in Exhibit 38 reproduces the computer input and output components.

The significant conclusion is that the after-tax yield under these assumptions is 16 percent-an acceptable yield when compared with other real estate investments of a similar nature. The average debt-cover ratio of 1.15 is acceptable to potential lenders. Therefore, the most probable price of $\$ 700,000$ passes the minimum test of a risk investment for capital gains in a seven-year holding period.
joint venture with Mutual Benefit are externalities that could also affect sales price. Furthermore, revenues and expenses provided in this apprisal are estimates. Any disagreement by the buyer will be reflected in his purchase offer.

Having considered the probability of external influences, the appraiser estimates the central tendency of $\$ 700,000$ as the most probable price.
E. Test of Preliminary Most Probable Price Determination

Since actual market sales were used for the valuation approach, it is useful to test the probable price based on the marketplace for compatibility with investment valuation in terms of basic yields and risk ratios.

A real estate investment of this proposed magnitude is always affected by federal income tax. Assuming that the probable investor or members of the investment syndicate have a marginal income tax rate of 50 percent, it is useful to test the possible investment scenarios with an after-tax cash flow model designed for appraisers. The selected model is known as CASHFLOW and was designed by Brian Furlong, a graduate student in Real Estate at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. CASHFLOW provides appraisers with a ten-year cash flow projection including before-tax and after-tax Internal Rate of Return (IRR) for assumed sale in years three, five, seven, and ten.

| CASh flow anal rsis rim 1 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YERR } \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YEAR } \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YEAA } \\ 3 \end{array}$ | VEAR | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YEAR } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | VEAR | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YEAR } \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YEAR } \\ 8 \end{array}$ | YEAR | $\begin{aligned} \text { YeAR } \\ \text { IO } \end{aligned}$ |  | 1709,009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1307,242 | 1313,387 | 1319,655 | 1326,048 | 1332,569 | 1339,220 | 1346,904 | heconsirucilom <br> = IDIA COSI | $\begin{gathered} 1700,9 y p \\ 11,600,000 \end{gathered}$ |
| GFOSS POIENIIAL RENI | $1289,521$ |  |  | 3307,242 5 | 1313,581 | -5x | 52 | 52 | 52 | 51 |  |  |
| vacancy rate vacancy loss |  | 123,625 | 115,061 | 115,362 | 115,669 | 815,983 | 116, 302 | $316,628$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116,961 \\ & \hline 109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 117,300 \\ 3328.704 \end{array}$ | IMflallow | 2.014 |
| vacancy loss <br> - EffECIIVE RENI | $1260,569$ | 1211,681 | 1286,157 | 1291,880 | 1297, 717 | 1303,672 | 1309,745 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 838,359 | 139,126 | 139,909 | 340,701 | 341,521 | tat rait of livesior |  |
| - operating elfenses | 134,143 | 135,438 | [36, 141 |  | 851,516 | 158,666 | 159,810 | 161,031 | 862,251 | 363,502 |  |  |
| - peal estaie taxes | 153,136 | 151,199 8182,050 | $\begin{aligned} & 855,283 \\ & 1191,127 \end{aligned}$ | 1198,622 | 1202,591 | 1206,646 | 1210, 719 | 1214,995 | 1219,295 | 1223,681 | MORIGAGE PRINCIFAL 11 | \$1,280,000 |
| - NEI INCOME | 1172,690 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 155,990 | IEAR In rears | 1, 36 |
| - oefrtciallon | 165,000 | 165,000 | 165,000 | 365,000 |  | $365,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & 165,000 \\ & 1168,296 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 865,000 \\ 1167,154 \end{gathered}$ | \$165,851 | 1164,385 | yearty imierest rait | 13.50\% |
| INIEKESI | 1112,800 | 1172,266 | 1171,659 $(141,932)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1770,911 \\ & 1831,3491 \end{aligned}$ | $(132,595)$ | 3169,303 1127,6561 | 1122,511) | 1817,159) | 1311,5621 | (15, 7051 |  | 10.00: |
| - iaiable income | 1365,110) | 1155,216) | (341,932) | 1331,3841 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CAP RAIE FOR MOI | 10.0.: |
| - DEPR | 165,009 | 165,000 | 165,003 | 165,090 | 165,000 | 365,000 | 365,000 | 865,000 |  |  | Af IER TAI ENJIT |  |
| - princifal faymenis | 13,950 | 14,193 | 15,098 | 65, 788 | 16,569 | 11,436 | 134,021 |  |  | 146,922 | Hiscoum raie | 20.007 |
| - CASH IHROU-OFF | (119,068) | 85,292 | 111,969 | 121,869 | ,036 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$1,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 81,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 1,000 10 | DEPRECIABLE ASJEIS | 1430,090 |
| - RESEPVES <br> - incone tailes | $10$ | 10 |  | 10 | 19 | 10 | 19 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| - incone taits <br> = CASH PROM OPERAIIONS | $(115,068)$ | 14,292 | 116,969 | 120,064 | \$24,836 | 129,888 | 333,021 | 331,237 |  | , |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$13,828 | 111,258 | 88,579 | 15,781 | 12,852 |  |  |
| - tat savings on other imcome | 632,555 | 127,608 131,900 | 120,966 137,935 | $139,538$ | $111,134$ | 142,116 | 114,219 | 145,816 | 147,318 | 148,715 | BIIRP, SALE AFIER YEAR 3 | $22 x$ |
| - sfendame chsh after tax | 127,487 | 131,900 | 331,935 |  |  |  |  | nnthrint |  |  |  |  |
|  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AIIRR, SAEE ENO OF MEAR S | 162 |
| hatelet value usimg |  |  |  |  |  | 12,066,463 | \$2,107,193 | \$2,149,948 | 32,192,947 | 12,236,806 | OIIRR, SALE M IEF YEIA 5 | 182 |
| Capliallied vol | 11,726,899 | 11,020,499 | 11,947,215 | 11,906,220 | 12,025,984 | 2,066, | -1,01,10 |  |  |  | PR, SME EMO OF YEAT | 162 |
| - RESAIE COSI 122 Of MAPYEI VALUE | 1103,614 | 1109,230 | 1114,836 | [119,173 | 1121,551 | 1123,988 | 1126,468 $81,238,178$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1128,997 \\ \$ 1,229,511 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1131,517 \\ 81,211,870 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1138,2 n 8 \\ 11,205,298 \end{array}$ | IIIRR, SME AFIER IEMM 1 | 162 |
| - loan bal ahce | 81,276,012 | 11,211,549 | 11,266,150 | 11,260,662 | 11,254,094 | 11,246,630 | 11,238,176 |  |  |  |  |  |
| = B/4 TAI MEI MORIH | [311,243 | 1439,120 | 1563,989 | 3606,384 | 3650,294 | 1675,831 | 1743,149 | 8192,380 | 3813,700 | 1897,300 | blikr, sme afier vehr 10 | $152$ |
|  |  |  |  | 1191,109 | \$211,878 | 1232,195 | 1253, 265 | \$214, 190 | 1295,274 | 1316,529 |  |  |
| - capilal gain tax <br> - afier taz met morih | $1243,506$ | $1305,166$ | $1392,900$ | $1414,975$ | $1138,117$ | 3163, 342 | 1489,884 | (1518,190 |  | (1)+1500,7\%1 |  |  |
|  | UH!H! | (1)HOH | (1) 1 IIt | (1)بH? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | [13n+eror | Hounstr | $11 / 101$ | 1181 | H1611t | 1 H (1) | 11311 | 1811 | , |  |  |
| depl cover ralio | 0.98 | 1.03 | 1.10 | 1.12 | 1.15 | 31.17 | 1.1 | 1.22 | 1.2 | 1.21 |  |  |
|  | urnounto |  | 1townot | (1) 1111 | (1)1H11 | (1)1H14 | 118 | 181 | Hinio | 11 |  |  |

## V. APPRAISAL CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

A. Value Conclusion

An appropriate benchmark for the listing and negotiation of the subject property can be derived from Ratcliff's "most probable selling price" definition of value:

The most probable selling price is that selling price which is most likely to emerge from a transaction involving the subject property if it were exposed for sale in the current market for a reasonable time at terms of sale which are currently predominant for properties of the subject type.

To comply with this definition, I have determined that sales of commercial buildings with first-floor retail space bought by local developer-investors have been either for cash or seller financing in the form of land contract or a second mortgage. However, given Northwestern's favorable bargaining position, seller financing is an unlikely alternative and a cash transaction is anticipated. Most probable selling price is likely to converge at the central tendency of $\$ 700,000$. The upper limit, $\$ 720,000$, represents the maximum transaction price the subject property can achieve, and likely would result from externalities such as municipal financing.

I therefore conclude that the most probable selling price on September 8, 1984 of the subject property at 1 East Main Street, known as the J. C. Penney Building, is $\$ 700,000$ with an upper limit of $\$ 720,000$
B. Certification of Independent Appraisal Judgment

I hereby certify that I have no interest, present or contemplated in the property and that neither the employment to make the appraisal nor the compensation is contingent on the value of the property. I certify that I have personally inspected the property and that according to my knowledge and belief, all statements and information in this report are true and correct, subject to the underlying assumptions and limiting conditions.

Based on the information contained in this report and on my general experience as an appraiser, my opinion is that the most probable price, as defined herein, of the subject property on September 8, 1984 is

SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS $(\$ 700,000)$
cash to seller.


Lisa B. Richman


## C. Statement of Limiting Conditions

This appraisal has been made subject to certain conditions, caveats, and stipulations, either expressed or implied in the prose as well as the following:

1. Contributions of Other Professionals

- Because the budget did not provide for a consulting engineer or architect, the appraiser applied limited structural analysis to the problem, and cost estimates must be considered nonprofessional.
- Because no professional surveying services were made available, the appraiser assumes no responsibility for matters concerning the exact size and location of the site.
. No accounting records were available of monthly operating costs or repair investments. Therefore, expenses are estimated to be appropriate for skillful management of the property, but are not represented to be historically based.
- Because no legal advice was available, the appraiser assumes no responsibility for legal matters. The appraiser has assumed that any existing code nonconformities will prevent occupancy of building by a new owner.

2. Facts and Forecasting Under Conditions of Uncertainty - Information furnished by other students in this report, while believed to be reliable, is in no sense guaranteed by this appraiser.

- This appraisal was done as a class exercise with minimal opportunity to confirm sales or inspect other properties.
- All information furnished regarding property for sale, rental, financing, or projections of income and expense is from sources deemed reliable. No warranty or representation is made as to the accuracy thereof, and it is submitted subject to errors, omissions, change of price, rental or other conditions, prior sale, lease, financing, or withdrawal without notice. . Forecasts of effective demand of retail, office, and apartment space are based on the best available data concerning the Isthmus and Madison markets.

3. Controls of Use of Appraisal

- Values for various components of the subject parcel and improvements as contained within the report are valid only when making a summation and are not to be used independently for any purpose and must be considered invalid if so used.
- Possession of this report or any copy thereof carries with it no right of publication, nor may the same be used for any other purpose by anyone without the previous written consent of the appraiser or the applicant, and in any event, only in its entirety.
- Neither all nor any part of the contents of the report shall be conveyed to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or other media without
the written consent and approval of the author, particularly regarding the valuation conclusions and the identity of the appraiser, of the firm with which he is connected, or any of his associates.

As defined by the Society of Real Estate Appraisers, fair market value is:

The most probable price in cash, terms equivalent to cash, or in other precisely revealed terms, for which the appraised property will sell in a competitive market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, with the buyer and seller each acting prudently, knowledgeably, and for selfinterest, and assuming that neither is under undue duress.

Fundamental assumptions and conditions presumed in this definition are:

1. Buyer and seller are motivated by self-interest.
2. Buyer and seller are well informed and are acting prudently.
3. The property is exposed for a reasonable time on the open market.
4. Payment is made in cash, its equivalent, or in specified financing terms.
5. Specified financing, if any, may be the financing actually in place or on terms generally available for the property type in its locale on the effective appraisal date.
6. The effect, if any, on the amount of market value of atypical financing, services, or fees shall be clearly and precisely revealed in the appraisal report.
${ }^{1}$ American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers. The Appraisal of Real Estate, 8th edition (Chicago: American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, 1983), p. 33.

## APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION LEASE TABULATION


## DCPARTHENT OT m Mismistantion cocation thmintson explanien 1o 1903

| Alds cily | Clly <br> Codo | Itata | Lase Ho. | Daparimant | adirene | Ler/Asgne | - Ple | Euplras | An. Poe the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Modisen | 189 | W1 | 550-518 | Prilic briander | 16 M carrull me cis Fr.* |  |  |  |  |
| Madisan | 189 | WI | 645-103 | Iualetal Council | es w Moln $8 t-7 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ FI | Comemereial Hoal Bervice Anchor Iavinge it Loan | 4.000 | 03-09-30 | Q,330.33 |
| Malleon | 189 | U1 | c6s-590 | Jualicial Como | 110 E Mata sila soe. | Temuer inda ca | 726 | W-10-H | 433.75 sEw. 64 |
| Madisan | 169 | U8 | 600-139 | Suprese Courl | 110 E Masta 81. | Temmar pide co | 410 | 03-10-31 | 435.04 |
| Matison | 169 | W1 | $680-305$ $800-467$ | Rupreas Court | 110 E Malm 81. | Trumer elda co | 0.401 | 03-10-31 | S.218.61 |
| Mudiecn | 189 | WI | $800-467$ $800-497$ | Euprraee Compl | 110 E Maln 11 | Jeanar ilids Co. | 8,943 | 83-10-3t | R,242.2e |
| Mallsen | 169 | W1 | 785-212 | Lentelature | 1118 Momund aymme 131 Wlicen $8 t^{-}$ | Mallonal Mutual lomefl | 6.763 | 00-06-20 | 8.036 .80 |
| Madisen | 169 | Wt | 765-345 | Lealitature | 110 E Malo Mtoo Mm. EON | Termer molldias Co | 816 | 04-66-30 | .477 .65 373.10 |



## demainewt af nommerimitrat Locariou manantion. <br> 

Enplras

| Madison | 169 | WI | 191-463 | + |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Modisen | 169 | WI | 105-181 | Regolation it Life |
| Iladison | 169 | WI | 178-063 | Savinge 8 laan |
| Inalison | 169 | WI | 105-171 | Sacurlilies |
| Modiaon | 169 | WI | 225-107 | Elus Coma laard |
| Madison | 169 | WI | 235-202 | Illsher Echue Alda m |
| Mudison | 169 | WI | 825-410 | Mllohar El Alde moard |
| Madison | 189 | 41. | 2ss-120 | Public fastructian |
| Misdigon | 169 | U! | 285-010 | Univerally of Whe |
| Midiscm | 189 | W | 205-059 | Univaral ly of Whe |
| Madison | 169 | U1 | 205-048 | Ualverally of Wis |
| Madison | 169 | WI | 205.065 | tiniverally of Wie |
| Madlson | 169 | WI | 205-074 | tualveral tr of Whe |
| lladison | 169 | WI | 2as-079 | Clinfumrality of WIs |
| Hadleon | 169 | U1 | 205-0as | Univerality of Whe |
| Madison | 169 | W1 | 205-007 | Itmineralty of Mino |
| Madison | 169 | WI | 205-094 | Univerally of WIa |
| Mastean | 169 | WI | 205.143 | Anilatrolitr of WIs |
| Medison | 169 | WI | E05-173 | University of Wis |



| V Vown M Mraser I Maley | 2,003 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Yaehionfon Eixuare naser | 27.771 |
| Jsmen Wilsen Assoclates | 2.750 |
| A.ll. E.ll. Carmentar | 8.700 |
| Gopart Corp | 9.760 |
| Blale Cap finpe 4 | 2,900 |
| Whiser-coot Parlonerahto | 25,852 |
| Momald M. Carison | 28.200 |
| Madiom Meire Brhool | 8.130 |
| WIIIon Properties | 12,000 |
| 4 of 4 Fommalion Acel | 8,199 |
| W.N. Fmondallon ncet | 8,983 |
| Apite Really Inc Iruotoe | 2,400 |
| Modlaon inatra grionil Dal | 741 |
| 4 or 4 roundetion | 1,26S |
| Soururily self Plarage | O41 |
| [ H8 E II Carpenter | 4.218 |
| bunlois pratidiue limials | 9.990 |


| 0s-05-31 | Fif.se\%.31 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 05-07-3i | 16.143.00 |
| 05-18-31 | 2.20.00 |
| 84-05-30 | 3,340.15 |
| 00-05-31 | 7.985 .59 |
| 04-11-30 | 1.14.67 |
| 50-10-31 | 19.184 .67 |
| 04-05-30 | 7.110 .00 |
| 05-12-31 | 3.746 .45 |
| 04-03-31 | 2,250.60 |
| 13-16-31 | 2.910 .16 |
| 04-06-30 | 1.409 .90 |
| 05-9p-91 | 1,200.00 |
| 05-12-31 | 542.50 |
| 03-11-30 | 769.84 |
| H -I-M | 180.09 |
| (6-08-20 | 375.00 |
| 03.00.30 | 7.000 .00 |
| 04-04-30 | 1.780.60 |

## APPENDIX C

## SCENARIO 1 <br> TOTAL RENOVATION TO OFFICE-RETAIL

1. PROGRAM:

Renovation of entire structure including basement for office and retail.use.
2. REVENUE UNITS:

Basement:
Office space ( $11,408 \mathrm{sq} . f t$.
lst Floor:
Retail space (7,281 sq. ft.)
2nd and 3rd Floors:
Office space ( $20,043 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
3. CAPITAL OUTLAYS:
a. Items required in Scenario l, excluding costs to rehabilitate and bring up to code: $\$ 12,000$
b. Costs to rehabilitate and bring up to code:

Basement (12,960 sq. ft. at $\$ 42 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) 544,320
lst Floor (12,960 sq. ft. at $\$ 35 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) 453,600 2nd and 3rd Floors ( $25,920 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. at \$42/sq.ft.)
Addition of lst floor bathrooms $(\$ 2,500$
per fixture $X$ ll fixtures)
27,500
Widening of store entrance for handicapped access

3,000
Total Capital Outlays:
\$ 2,129,060
4. POTENTIAL ANNUAL INCOME:

Retail Units $(7,281 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. NRA at
$\$ 8 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
Office Units (31,451 sq. ft. NRA at
$\$ 9.50 / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}_{\mathrm{t}}$ )
357,785
Potential Annual Income:
\$ 357,033
Vacancy Loss
1 month per year retail
1 month per year office
Total Vacancy Loss
24,899
) 29,753

## TOTAL RENOVATION TO OFFICE-RETAIL ( Continued)

5. PROJECTED ANNUAL EXPENSES:
a. Operating Expenses $(12 \%$ of gross rent; tenant pays insurance and utilities; includes Capitol Square assessment) \$ $\$ 42,844$
b. Real Estate Taxes ( $\$ .80 /$ sq. ft. retail plus \$1.10/sq. ft. office)
Total Annual Expenses: $\quad \$ 95,980$
6. TERMS OF PERMANENT FINANCING:
$13.5 \%, 30$ year, $M C=.1374494$

SCENARIO 1
TOTAL RENOVATION TO OFFICE-RETAIL


$\frac{\text { GI } 357,033}{x}$

| DP | Cash <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - |
|  | $\overline{O E}$ 42,844 |
|  | - |
|  | CR 17,852 |
|  | - |
|  | RET 53,136 |

=
CDS $\quad 189,646$
MC $\quad .1374494$
JM 1,379,751

| JPB | 1,587,771 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - |
| CO | 2,129,060 |
|  | = |
| BP | -541,289 |

## SCENARIO 2

TOTAL RENOVATION TO RETAIL-OFFICE-APARTMENTS

1. PROGRAM :

Renovation of entire structure, including basement, for retail, office, and apartment use.
2. REVENUE UNITS:

Basement:
Office space ( 11,408 sq. ft.)
lst Floor:
Retail space ( 7,281 sq. ft.)
2nd Floor:
Office space (ll, $314 \mathrm{sq} . f t$.
3rd Floor:
8 Rental apartment units ( 7,856 sq. ft.)
3. CAPITAL OUTLAYS:
a. Items required in Scenario 2, excluding $\$ 12,000$ costs to rehabilitate and bring up to code.
b. Costs to rehabilitate and bring up to code:
Basement ( 12,960 sq. ft. at $\$ 42 / s q$. ft.) 544,320 lst Floor ( 12,960 sq. ft. at $\$ 35 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) 453,600 2nd Floor ( $12,960 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. at $\$ 42 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) 544,320 3rd Floor ( $12,960 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. at $\$ 40 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) 518,400 Addition of list Floor bathrooms $\$ 2,500$
per fixture X ll fixtures)
27,500
Widening of store entrance for handicapped access

3,000
Total Capital Outlays:
\$2,103,140
4. POTENTIAL ANNUAL INCOME:

TOTAL RENOVATION TO RETAIL-OFFICE-APARTMENTS (Continued)
Vacancy Loss
1 month per year retail ..... \$ 4,854
1 month per year office ..... 17,988
1 month per year residential7,070
Total Vacancy Loss: ..... \$ 29,912
5. PROJECTED ANNUAL EXPENSES:
Operating Expenses -Retail and Office (12\% gross rent; tenant pays insurance and utilities; includes Capitol Square assessment) ..... $\$ 32,892$
Operating Expenses - Residential (35\% gross rent) ..... 29,696
Real Estate Taxes (\$.80/sq. ft. retail + \$1.10/sq. ft. office $+\$ 1.10 / s q . f t$. office $+14 \%$ gross rent residential) ..... 50,758
Total Annual Expenses: ..... $\$ 113,346$6. TERMS OF PERMANENT FINANCING:13.5\%, 30 year, $M C=.1374494$

## SCENARIO 2

TOTAL RENOVATION TO RETAIL-OFFICE-APARTMENTS


## SCENARIO 3

## MINIMUM RENOVATION TO OFFICE-RETAIL

1. PROGRAM :

Minimum renovation of entire structure, including basement, for office and retail use.
2. REVENUE UNITS:

Basement:
Office space ( $11,408 \mathrm{sq} . f t$.
lst Floor:
Open-air retail space ( $8,252 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
2 nd and 3 rd floors:
Office space ( 20,043 sq. ft.)
3. CAPITAL OUTLAYS:
a. Items required in Scenario 3, excluding costs to rehabilitate and bring up to code: $\$ 12,000$
b. Costs to rehabilitate and bring up to code:

Basement ( $12,960 \mathrm{sq} . f t$. at $\$ 17 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
220,320
lst Floor (12,960 sq. ft. at $\$ 15 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) 194,400
2nd and 3rd Floors ( 25,920 sq. ft. at \$17/sq. ft.)

440,640
Additions of lst floor bathrooms
( $\$ 2,500$ per fixture x 11 fixtures)
27,500
Widening of store entrance for handicapped access

3,000
Total Capital Outlays:
$\$ \quad 897,860$
4. POTENTIAL ANNUAL INCOME:

Retail units $(8,252 \mathrm{sq} . f t . N R A$ at
$\$ 6.50 / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}) \quad \$$.
Office units (31,45l sq. ft. NRA at $\$ 7.50 / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.

235,883
Potential Annual Income:
\$ 289,521
Vacancy Loss
1 month per year retail $\quad \$ \quad 4,470$
1 month per year office
19,657
Total Vacancy Loss:
\$ 24,127

## MINIMUM RENOVATION TO OFFICE-RETAIL (Continued)

## 5. PROJECTED ANNUAL EXPENSES:

Operating Expenses ( $12 \%$ gross rent; tenant
pays insurance and utilities; includes
Capitol Square assessment)

\$ 34,743

Real Estate Taxes ( $\$ .80 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft. retail + \$1.10/sq. ft. office)

53,136
Total Annual Expenses: $\quad \$ 87,879$
6. TERMS OF PERMANENT FINANCING:
$13.5 \%, 30$ year, $M C=.1374494$

## SCENARIO 3

MINIMUM RENOVATION TO OFFICE-RETAIL


## DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF RETAIL-OFFICE-APARTMENTS

1. PROGRAM:

Demolition of existing structure. Construction of four-story retail, office, apartment building, including underground parking for residential units.
2. REVENUE UNITS:
lst Floor:
Retail space ( $9,072 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.
2nd and 3rd Floors:
Office space ( 22,032 sq. ft.)
4th Floor:
10 rental apartment units ( $10,368 \mathrm{sq} . f t$. total)
3. CAPITAL OUTLAYS:

Demolition at \$.1l/cubic foot
12 parking stalls at $\$ 7,000 / s t a l l$
lst Floor ( $12.960 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. at $\$ 60 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft.)
2nd and 3rd Floors ( 25,920 sq. ft. at $\$ 60 / s q . f t$.
4 th floor ( 12,960 sq. ft. at $\$ 58 / s q$. ft.)
Total Capital Outlays:
$\$ 3,249,739$
4. POTENTIAL ANNUAL INCOME:

Retail units $(9,072 \mathrm{sq} . f t$. NRA at \$10/sq. ft.)
Office units $(22,032 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. NRA at \$15/sq. ft.)
Apartment rental units $(10,368$ sq. ft. NRA at $\$ 1 / s q . f t . / m o n t h)$

124,416
Potential Annual Income:
Vacancy Loss
1 month per year retail
1 month per year office
1 month per year residential
Total Vacancy Loss:
$\$ \quad 46,980$

## DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF RETAIL-OFFICE-APARTMENTS (Continued)

5. PROJECTED ANNUAL EXPENSES:

Operating Expenses - Retail and Office
(12\% gross rent; tenant pays insurance
and utilities; includes Capitol Square
assessment)

$\$ 50,544$

Operating Expenses - Residential
(35\% gross rent)
43,546
Real Estate Taxes ( $\$ .80 / \mathrm{sq}$. ft. retail + $\$ 1.10$ sq. ft. office $+14 \%$ gross rent residential)

56,298
Total Annual Expenses: $\quad \$ 150,388$
6. TERMS OF PERMANENT FINANCING:
$13.5 \%, 30$ year, MC $=.1374494$

## SCENARIO

DEHOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF RETAIL-OFFICE-APARTMENTS


## CASH EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATIONS

## Comparable \#l: Wolff Kubly 30 North Carroll Street

```
    Sale Price: $735,000
    (cash at closing)
- Gifts contributed
    to State Historical
    Society
= Appraised Value $625,000
(paid by State of
Wisconsin)
```

As recommended by Dr. James Graaskamp, $\$ 625,000$ was used as cash equivalency price.

Comparable \#2: Emporium 50 East Mifflin
Estimated annual payments on
original $\$ 940,000$ note $=\$ 65,200$
Present value of $\$ 65,200$ per year at 9\%
$(65,200)$ (PVIFA $20 \mathrm{yr} .14 \%)$
$=(65,200)(7.7861504) \quad \$ 507.657$
Premium Paid $=$ balance 654,000

$$
-507,657=146,343
$$

Seller note
$8 \%, 10$ year, semi-annual, $\$ 66,000$ interest payments $=\$ 2,640$ PVIFA 20 yr., $9 \%=13.007936$ $(2,640)(13.007936) \quad \$ 34,341$

Reversion
( 66,000 ) (PVIF)
$=(66,000)(0.4224108)$
$\$ \quad 27,880$
$\$ 569,878$
Lease Premium at $6 \%$
2,100
$\$ 571,978$
Premiums Paid
loan ..... \$146,343
10 year noteinterest $\quad 1,537$
Rev. ..... 2,691
Lease premium ..... 2,100
$\$ 152,671$
Say ..... \$152,700
$\$ 850,000-\$ 152,700=\$ 697,300$
Rounded to $\$ 697,000$ for cash equivalency.
Comparable \#3: Woolworth's 2 West Mifflin Street
$\frac{\text { Sales Price }}{.9}=$ cash equivalency
(due to partnership structure)
$\frac{\$ 596,200}{.9}=\$ 662,444$
Rounded to $\$ 662,000$ for cash equivalency.

| CASH FLOW AMAL YSIS ROM I | Yen 1 | YEAR | Vean $j$ |  |  | ${ }_{6} \mathrm{~V}$ M | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Yean } \\ 1 \end{array}$ | VEAR | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YEN } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | VEM | IMPUTS RUM I |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GROSS POIEMIIAL REMT vacancy raie | $\begin{gathered} 4289,521 \\ 102 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { O2 }}{3289,521}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3289,521 \\ 58 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3289,521 \\ & 52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 489,521 \\ 52 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3269,521 \\ 5 \ell \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3289,521 \\ 58 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3209,521 \\ 52 \end{gathered}$ | 1289,521 | $8289,521$ | Puncmase moum RECOWSTRUCIIOM - rote cosi | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 170,000 \\ & \$ 900,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| - vacamer loss | 128,952 | 123,162 | 114,476 | 114,476 | 114,476. | 314,476 | 314,416 | 314,476 | 814,476 | 814,476 |  | 1,30,000 |
| = Effective rewt | 1260,569 | \$266,359 | \$225,045 | 3275,045 | \$275,013 | 1215,005 | 3275,045 | 3275,015 | 3275,043 | \$215,005 | THFLATIOM | 0.002 |
| - OPERATIME EIPEESES | 334,743 | \$34,743 | 334,743 | 334,743 | 334,73 | 134,743 | 634,743 | 334,743 | 134,743 | 834,743 | tak rate of investon | 502 |
| - heal estaie taies | 353, 136 | 353,136 | 453,136 | 653,136 | 153,136 | 453,136 | 453,136 | 853,136 | 453,136 | 353,136 | max ante ar invesa |  |
| - MEI IWCOHE | \$172,690 | 1178, 180 | \$181,166 | 8187,166 | 1187,166 | 1187,166 | 3187,166 | 1187,166 | \$181,166 | 3187,166 | loan to cost matio | 002 |
| - depreciailom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | moribage plimipm | 11,256,000 |
| - ILIEREST | 1122,160 | \$121,680 | 363,333 8120,823 | 865,333 | 363,333 | 813, 333 | 363,333 | 863,333 | ${ }^{363} 333$ | 863,333 | IERH II TEASS | 30 |
| - taxamle incoie | (313,103) | (56,533) | 83,010 | -33,950 | 1118,831 14,982 | 16,114 | 1616,43 87,357 | 3115,112 68,721 | 313,615 310,217 | $\begin{gathered} 8111,972 \\ 811,860 \end{gathered}$ | YEAMY IMIEREST Rate | 1. 132 |
| - OEPPECLIATIOM | 363,333 | 363,333 | 363,333 | 663,333 | 863,333 | 363,333 | 463,333 | 963,333 | 863,333 |  | COP RATE FOR MOI | 10.002 |
| - primcipal paymenis | 18,005 | 86,785 | 199,642 | 310,582 | \$11,614 | 312,76 | 113,989 | -15,533 | \$16,050 | 18,493 | mfen tax emity |  |
| = CASH IHMOW-OFF | 842,273 | 348,015 | 356,701 | 656,701 | \$56,701 | 156,701 | 456,701 | 156,701 | 656,701 | 856,701 | oiscoum mate | 20.002 |
| - reserves | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |  | \$1,000 | 11,000 |  |  |
| - IMCOFF TAIES | 10 | 10 | 11,505 | 81,973 | 12,471 | 33,057 | 33,679 | 14,360 | 85,109 | 45,930 | EEPRELIAME ASSETS | \$130,000 |
| - CASH FROM OPERATIONS | 141,225 | 847,015 | 354,196 | 453,126 | 453,210 | 552,641 | 452,023 | *51,341 | 850,572 | 349,711 |  | NS, 0 O |
| - tar savimas on otmen incoue | 46,532 | 83,266 | 30 | 30 | $s$ | $\infty$ | 10 | 40 | so | 6 |  |  |
| - SPEMOAME CASH AFIER TAI <br>  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \$17,717 } \\ \text { וnscossosisis } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 150, } 202 \\ \cdots \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 853,210 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $851,341$ | 450,592 | $\text { M4, } 17$ |  |  |
| MARKEI VMLUE USIMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capitialize moi | 81,726,899 | 81,784,803 | 81,871,660 | 81,071,660 | 11,871,660 | 11,871,060 | 11,071,660 | 81,871,660 | 91,871,660 | \$1,871,60 |  |  |
| - resale cosi e bz of market vmue <br> - LOAm balance | $\begin{array}{r} 8103,414 \\ \$ 1,247,995 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8107,000 \\ 81,239,210 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8112,300 \\ \$ 1,229,568 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8112,300 \\ \$ 1,218,96 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1112,300 \\ 11,207,372 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8112,300 \\ \$ 1,191,626 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8112,300 \\ 81,100,637 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 112,300 \\ \$ 1,165,284 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3112,300 \\ 31,140,434 \end{array}$ | $\$ 112,300$ 129,911 |  |  |
| $=8 / 4$ TAI MEI WORTM | 1375,290 | 3188,505 | 8529,722 | 9540,374 | 1551,980 | 9561,734 | 5576,723 | 4584,076 | 8610,923 | \$627,4t9 |  |  |
| - capital gain tiar <br> = afien tar met morth | 1109,324 \$265,966 | 3132,076 3305,629 | $\mathbf{8 1 6 1 , 8 7 2}$ 8367,920 | 8174,539 3855,836 | 1107,205 3364,783 | \%137,072 | 8212,539 | 3225, 205 | \$237,072 | \$250,539 |  |  |
|  | siss, 1 | 130,6ous | -636\%,960 | ¢365, | \%968,763 | 836,062 | 3366,165 | 3360,871 | 8373,054 | 3377,800 |  |  |
| ATIRA, SMEE EWE Of YEAR 3 | 212 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BILRR, SALE MFTER YEAM 3 | 322 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AIIRR, SALE ENO OF YEAR 5 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bilir, sale nfier ream 5 | 252 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AItrr, smie ene of rema 1 | 182 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BItrr, SME AFIER YEAM 7 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AIIRR, SILE EW OF VEAR 10 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIIRR, SALE AFTER YEAR 10 | 202 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEDT COVER Ratlo | $1.32$ | $1.37$ | $1.43$ | $1.43$ | $1.13$ | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.43 |  |  |





| CASH FLOW AMAL YSIS ROM I | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yemen } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | rear 2 | Yean 3 | $\begin{array}{r}\text { rem } \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {rema }}$ |  |  | YEMM | ${ }_{10}$ | IWHIS mul |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GROSS POIEMIIM RENT vacamcr rate | 2269,521 | S298,207 | 4307,153 | 1316,367 | 8325,850 | [335,634 | 1345,703 | \$356,074 | 8366,757 | 8371,739 | PVRCHASE MOUTI meconstructiom | 3670,000 <br> \$900,000 |
| - vacamcr loss | 108,952 | 123, 857 | 58 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 32 | 4, 52 |  | - torme cosi | 11,570,000 |
| - effective rewt | 3260,569 | \$271,350 | \$291,795 | 15,818 | 816,293 | 316,782 | 311,205 | 817,004 | 111,338 | \$18,888 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 316,032 | \$328,418 | 8338,271 | 8368,419 | 8358,011 | IIFLATIOM | 3.002 |
| - dPERAIIME EIPENSES <br> - men estaie taics | 334,743 | 335,785 | 336,059 | 831,965 | 339,104 | \$40,277 | \$11,483 | \$42,730 | 841,011 | 815,332 |  |  |
| - Reml estaie taits | 353,136 | 354, 730 | 356, 372 | 850,063 | 459,803 | 361,599 | 363,417 | 365,351 | 367,311 | 369,330 | Tar mate fit invesion | 302 |
|  | 1172,690 | 1183,835 | 1179,561 | 8204,521 | 1210,657 | \$216,971 | \$223,486 | \$230,191 | \$237,096 | \$246,209 | LOM To cost matio | 007 |
| - DEPPECIATIOM | 363,333 | 363,333 | 863,333 | 363,333 |  |  |  |  |  |  | meatenee faimipm | 11,256,000 |
| - IMIERESI | 8178,980 | 3178,502 | 1177,951 | $9171,334$ | $1176,621$ | 1115,80영 |  | 865,133 613616 | \% 63,333 $\mathbf{1 7 2 , 6 0}$ | \$63,333 $\$ 171,217$ | TERH IT YEAMS | 130 |
| - thatame mede | (369,623) | 1158,0011 | 1842,7261 | $1836,146)$ | $(529,299)$ | $(1322,165)$ | $(B 14,726)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 173,816 \\ & (18,95) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4172,603 \\ \$ 1,160 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 111,217 \\ \$ 9,659 \end{gathered}$ | Yeamly imienest mate | 14.258 |
|  | 83,351 | $33,029$ | $34,374$ | 14,991 | 45,710 | $46,523$ | $81,453$ | $\begin{gathered} 63,333 \\ 88,515 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36,333 \\ & 69,122 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 363,333 \\ & 311,114 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| - cash inio-Gf | (199,611) | 11,504 | 116,233 | 322,140 | 128,326 | 434,646 | 341,155 | \$47,860 | 554,765 | \$61,078 | Discoumt rate | 20.001 |
| - RESENVES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - TMCOMf taris |  |  |  | $50$ | 10 | $81,00$ | $\begin{array}{r} 81,000 \\ 80 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 81,000 \\ 80 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,000 \\ 85800 \end{array}$ | 81,000 | - mmoum or |  |
| - cash from openatiows | (1310,611) | 4504 | 315,233 | 321,140 | 127,326 | 333,466 | 30,153 |  | 353, 185 | 84,039 856,049 | erpmectane assets | 433,000 |
| - the savimes on omer theone <br> - Spendame cash after thi | $\begin{array}{ll} 331,012 \\ 121,17 \end{array}$ | 329,001 | 327, 363 | \$18,073 | 814,649 | 811,042 | 87,363 | 83,480 | \$0 | * |  |  |
|  | -60106006 |  | \%36,516 | 351,263 | 311,975 | 841, 718 | 841,518 | 450, 339 | ${ }^{553}$, 185 | 456,049 |  |  |
| markei vilue usime |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPITALIEE WI | 11,726,094 | 31,038,317 | 11,905,844 | \$2,045,213 | 12,106,569 | \$2,169,164 | \$2,234,059 | 32,301,905 | 22,370,962 | \$2,442,091 |  |  |
| - resale cost e az of market ymue <br> - Loan balance | $\begin{array}{r} 1103,614 \\ 81,252,649 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3110,301 \\ \$ 1,248,820 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8119,139 \\ \$ 1,249,446 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1122,713 \\ \$ 1,239,419 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8126,349 \\ 11,233,740 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1130,106 \\ 91,221,216 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3134,092 \\ \mathbf{1 1 , 2 1 9 , 7 6 9} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1138,111 \\ 31,211,249 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3142,290 \\ \$ 1,201,521 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 144,525 \\ 11.19 .107 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| - B/4 tax mit morth | 3370,636 | 3479,226 | 8622,059 | 4683,051 | 8746,436 | 9812,364 | 5801,004 | 9952,512 | \$1,027,103 | 81,105,159 |  |  |
| - capital gaily tar <br> = afier tar Met morth | \$109,329 | 9142,943 | \$163,301 | 3207,167 | \$231,360 | \$235,916 | \$200,920 | 1306,091 | \$331,711 | 8357,700 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 261,312 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 8336,263 | 8138,798 | \$473,884 | 4315,067 | 7536,448 | 4600, 184 | \$616,450 | 3695,413 | 1747,379 |  |  |
| ATIRR, SME ENT OF YEAM 3 | 202 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BILR, SALE MTER YEAR 3 | 268 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| atimr, sate ene of tear 5 | 197 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BIIRR, SALE MFIER YEAR 5 | 211 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ATIRR, SALE EW Of VEM 7 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CIIRR, SALE MFIER YEAA 1 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MItrr, SME EMO Of MEAR 10 | 181 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HIRR, SALE AFIER YEAR 10 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





| FLow mmarys new I | $\mathrm{rem}_{1}$ | Venh | Ven | Vtwn | Yemat | rem |  | ${ }^{\text {EMM }}$ | VEM | ${ }_{10}^{\mathrm{rem}}$ | IMruis mem 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| genss potenim mewt vacaicy rate | $\{318,473$ | 3324,842 | $3331,339$ | 3357,96 | 4341,735 | 8351,620 | \$350,652 | 8365,823 | 8313,142 | 1300,605 | FURCMSE MUUNT necowsinucitom | 3770,000 \$900,000 |  |
| - nacainer loss |  |  |  | -51 | - 58 | ${ }^{38}$ | 51 | 52 | 52 | 52 | - totm cosi | 81,620,009 |  |
| - Effective ment | \$286,626 | $\text { s2m, } 859$ | $\begin{array}{r} 916,567 \\ 3314,712 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{8 1 6 , 8 9 9} \\ & \mathbf{3 3 2 1 , 0 6 8} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{8 1 7 , 2 3 6} \\ 8321,489 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 317,581 \\ & 3334,039 \end{aligned}$ | $817,933$ $3340,720$ | $18,291$ | $918,657$ | $19,030$ |  |  |  |
| - mperaitus erpewes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 935,483 | 3361,574 | Twintion | 2.002 |  |
| - mem estate tares | 838,217 | \$38,941 | 339,761 | 340,536 | 841,361 | 242,193 | 943,039 | 103,899 | 344,771 | 245,673 | tat mate of investon | 502 |  |
| - Mel imione | (193,273 | 358,197 | 455,263 | 456, 380 | 451,516 | 959,666 | 157,840 | 361,037 | 962,257 | 363,502 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 221,74 | \$324,123 | \$229,606 | 1233,178 | 6337,841 | \$242,590 | 3247,450 | \$252,389 | loam to cost maito | 008 |  |
| - depreciatiom <br> - imienest | 366,111 | 866,111 | *66,111 | 16, 111 | 366,111 | 966,111 | 166,111 | 866,111 | 36,111 | 366,111 | morignge pricipre tema il vemas | 11,276,090 | 0 |
| - Imierest <br> - maxame Incotie | $\mathbf{8 1 7 4 , 9 6 0}$ $(845,796$ | 9174,419 | 3113,803 | 9113, 108 | 8172, 317 | \$171, 119 | \$170,400 | 8169,243 | \$167,930 | 3166,410 | Yemir Imierest mate |  | H |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 101,352 | 81,330 | 37,244 | \$13,409 | 319,848 |  |  |  |
| - EPPRECLATIOM <br> - primi ipm payments | 366,111 | 366,111 | 365,111 | 36, 171 | 366,111 | 166,111 | 966,111 | 366,111 | 366,111 | 366,111 | Cop nate fow mol | 10.002 | 8 |
| - casn rmen-off | \$14,000 | 84,509 | 85,163 | 75, 860 | 36,651 | 11,549 | 58,560 | 89,725 | 111,037 | 812,527 | Miter tax emity |  |  |
|  | 116,305 | 326,707 | \$40,761 | 315,156 | 349,630 | 851,210 | 158, 814 | \$63,630 | 860, 412 | 373,431 | biscoum rare | 20.002 | 5 |
| - RESERVES | 14,000 | \$1,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - incole maies <br> - casm from dperatioms |  |  |  | 50 | 80 |  | 1665 | 33,622 | 36,704 | 13,924 | VEPRELIAME ASSETS | 9130,000 | (10) |
|  | 315,305 | 323,707 | 834,761 | 344,156 | 848,630 | 953,210 | 851,200 | 959,009 | 360,778 | 362,500 |  | 030,000 | (1) |
|  |  |  | \$10,044 | 17,548 | 4,911 | 32,176 | \$0 | 30 | 80 | 50 |  |  | © |
| - spemanale cash mren inl | $\begin{array}{r} 350,201 \end{array}$ | $443,135$ | 349,855 | 951,703 | 653,549 | 955,366 | 157,200 | 459,009 | 660.770 | 362,509 |  |  |  |
| market vilue usime |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ |
| CAPITALILES MoI | 81,952,727 | 12,056,750 | 22,197,287 | 32,241,233 | 32,206,057 | \$2,331,76 | 32,371,414 | \$2,425,902 | \$2,474,502 | \$2,523,942 |  |  |  |
| - RESALE cost e 62 of market valie <br> - loan balance | $\begin{array}{r} 1117,164 \\ 81,291,992 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8123,405 \\ 31,247,443 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8131,837 \\ 81,282,281 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8136,479 \\ 31,276,421 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}137,163 \\ 81,269,770\end{array}$ | 3137,907 ,262,221 | \$112,705 | \$145,559 | \$148,470 | 3151,440 |  |  | $\omega$ |
| - i/t mar mer morth | 4513,571 | 3615,902 | \$763,169 | \$830,330 | 8879,124 | 3927,651 | 1992,056 | 36,493 | 1,003, 111 | 52,169 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3236,241 | 1257,090 | 8279,708 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{+}{\square}$ |
| - AFTER TAK MEI worth | $8401,236$ | 8470,788 | $9568,412$ | 4594,097 | 8621,234 | *649,943 | 3600, 359 | 13112,632 | 3366,206 | 8368,733 9783,456 |  |  | 0 |
| atimit, suce emo of vema 3 | 322 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + |
| BIIRR, SALE MFIER YEM 3 | 408 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| atirr, sale ems of vear s | 238 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O |
| BIIR, SALE MFIER TEAM 5 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AIIRR, SME EwT OF YEAM 7 | 228 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |
| MIIRR, SALE MFIER YEAM 1 | 241 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| atirn, sme eme of reme 10 | 218 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| DIIR, SALE MTEE YEAM 10 | 212 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> CEBT COVER RAIIO <br> $\begin{array}{llll}1.09 & 1.15 & 1.23 & 1.25\end{array}$ <br> $23 \quad 1.28$ <br> 1.30 <br> 1.33 <br> 1. 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





## APPENDIX F

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

```
MTB >READ C1-C5
IATA>662:000,12376,38640,24000,2
UATA\1 350000,22968,105600,74000,10
IATA>240000,8712,26000,20500,2
DATA>625000,8646,41000,32500,4
DATA>697000,9240,49755,38500,4
DATADFRINT C1-CS
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrr} 
& 5 & ROWS READ & & & & \\
ROW & C1 & C2 & \(C 3\) & \(C 4\) & \(C 5\) \\
& & & & & \\
1 & 662000 & 12376 & 38640 & 24000 & 2 \\
2 & 1350000 & 22968 & 105600 & 74000 & 10 \\
3 & 240000 & 8712 & 26000 & 20500 & 2 \\
4 & 625000 & 8646 & 41000 & 32500 & 4 \\
5 & 697000 & 9240 & 49755 & 38500 & 4
\end{tabular}
MTE PDIV.C4C3 C6
MTB >MULT C6 C5 C7
MTB >DIUC3 C2 C8
MTB ンLIUCC C2 C9
MTE \(\supset\) COFR C1 C? \(\backslash\) I-C9
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & C1 & C2 & C3 & C4 & C5 & C6 & C7 & C8 \\
\hline C 2 & 0.906 & & & & & & & \\
\hline C3 & 0.969 & 0.937 & & & & & & \\
\hline C. 4 & 0.947 & 0.889 & 0.991 & & & & & \\
\hline C5 & 0.925 & 0.882 & 0.980 & 0.993 & & & & \\
\hline C6 & -0.398 & -0.496 & -0.264 & -0.138 & -0.088 & & & \\
\hline C7 & 0.900 & 0.835 & 0.960 & 0.985 & 0.996 & 0.000 & & \\
\hline C8 & 0.482 & 0.113 & 0.447 & 0.533 & 0.506 & 0.388 & 0.563 & \\
\hline r.9 & -0.817 & -0.918 & -0.777 & -0.687 & -0.655 & 0.798 & -0.583 & 0.074 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

MTB >


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Downtown Madison Inc. Mission Statement.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Richard Ratcliff, Valuation for Real Estate Decisions (Santa Cruz, CA: Democrat Press, 1972), p. 58.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Downtown Development Handbook (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Land Institute, 1980), p. 44.
    ${ }^{2}$ Market survey conducted by Landmark Research, Inc., Madison, WI, November 1983.

[^3]:    ${ }^{l_{\text {The }}}$ ratio of cash expenses, real estate taxes, and debt services to gross potential rents.

[^4]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ See Appendix D.

