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## Section I Introduction

This report provides an independent financial analysis of alternative office space solutions currently being considered for the Anchorage offices of the Alaska State Legislature (the "Legislature").

The report was prepared for the Alaska Legislative Council. The Council requested a financial evaluation of three alternative scenarios available to the State for the provision of space for the Legislature in Anchorage:

Scenario 1: Continue in the existing lease at the Legislative Office Building at 716 W $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue

Scenario 2: Purchase the Legislative Office Building
Scenario 3: Relocate to the Atwood Building at 550 W $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue

The report is organized in the following sections:
Section II provides a brief background and context
Section III discusses the approach used to conduct the analysis
Section IV presents our findings and recommendations
Section V provides a summary of the assumptions used in each scenario
Section VI presents descriptive exhibits for each scenario's financial model and supporting documentation

## Section II Background

The Legislature is the legislative branch of the Alaska State government ("State") and is responsible for the enacting of State laws and the appropriation of the funds necessary to operate the government. The Legislature comprises 40 members in the House of Representatives and 20 members in the Senate.
Currently, office space for the members of the Legislature and their staff is provided in leased premises at 716 W 4th Street in Anchorage (the "Legislative Office Building", or "LOB"). This property was expanded and renovated in 2012-2014 and has a gross building area of approximately 60,000 square feet over 8 levels, as follows:

- The first floor contains the Legislative Information Office ("LIO"), auditorium and viewing room, conference space and storage/ancillary spaces.
- The second through sixth floors contain individual office suites for senators and representatives. Each level contains between 10-12 office suites and 1-2 conference rooms, and is provisioned with building amenities such as restrooms, kitchen area and janitor closet.
- The basement level includes storage space, utility rooms and other ancillary space.
- The rooftop penthouse area contains a mechanical room and telecommunications tower.
- Dedicated parking is provided in an adjacent two-level parking garage. The lower level is dedicated to the LOB. The upper level, at-grade, is used by the LOB during business hours and made available to the public during the evening weekday hours and full time Saturdays and Sundays.

The LOB is occupied under a lease agreement between 716 West Fourth Avenue LLC, as Lessor and the Legislative Affairs Agency ("LAA") as Lessee. The original lease was entered into April 6, 2004, and was then extended September 19, 2013 for an additional 10 year term, expiring May 23, 2024, with an option to extend for up to an additional 10 years. The terms of the lease amendment, prior to the renovation and expansion, identified the area of the leased premises at $22,834 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{ft}$, with a base monthly rent of $\$ 56,836.05$. Upon completion of the renovations, the building area was defined in the lease as up to approximately 64,000 gross Sq.ft, and the base monthly rent was set at $\$ 281,638$ per month. ${ }^{1}$

The renovation involved construction costs of approximately $\$ 30$ Million, of which amount the State contributed \$7.5 Million in tenant improvements. ${ }^{2}$

This report presents a financial analysis of the current LOB lease in comparison to alternative arrangements, specifically the State's purchase of the LOB and the relocation of the legislative offices to the State owned Atwood Building.

[^0]Section III Approach

## Analysis Methodology

The analysis in this report is based on a conventional approach to real estate financial analysis, as used by private and public entities to evaluate the lease and purchase of real estate. Specifically, it employs a discounted cash flow methodology, under which the periodic net cash flows associated with each scenario are discounted to arrive at a present value.

Each scenario produces a different combination of one-off capital budget investments and ongoing annual expenditures that will require State funding. The act of discounting these cash flows allows the differences in both dollar values and timing to be compared on an equivalent basis, and takes into consideration the time value of money, in that a dollar received today is worth more than a dollar received in the future.

## Opportunity Cost

The costs for Scenarios 1 and 2 are relatively straightforward to compare. Many of the required values, such as the lease payments, the purchase price and the operating costs are known. Others, such as growth rates in operating costs, bond financing rates and the growth in value of the building, can be estimated within a tight range.
The costs associated with Scenario 3 are more complex to analyze on a basis that is comparable to Scenarios 1 and 2. The operating expenses for the Atwood Building and Linny Pacillo parking garage ("LPPG") are known and can be apportioned to the space that would be occupied by the Legislature. However, a fully comparable analysis should consider the full costs and benefits of ownership of these existing buildings, which cannot be directly measured. The Atwood Building and LPPG were purchased several years ago; debt service ends in 2017 for the Atwood Building and 2036 for the LPPG. Occupancy costs associated with these buildings are charged to the tenant agencies based on their pro-rata share of usable floor space. Vacant space is charged to the Department of Administration's general fund.
To address this issue, our analysis of Scenario 3 adopts an opportunity cost approach. This approach recognizes that from a whole government point of view the costs of the Atwood Building and LPPG exist and will continue whether or not the Legislature or some other agency occupies the space that is available at the Atwood Building. Therefore the opportunity cost of the Legislature occupying the Atwood Building space can be measured as the cost savings that could be achieved in an alternative situation, where a different agency that currently leases space and pays rent relocates to the Atwood building instead of the Legislature, and thus achieves cost savings through ending its rent payments. By relocating to the Atwood Building, the Legislature prevents the other agency from the opportunity to achieve these rent savings.

Several executive agencies currently lease space from private landlords in the Anchorage market, with monthly rent rates that generally range between $\$ 1.50$ and $\$ 3.30$ per square foot. ${ }^{3}$ Rather than attempt to identify which of these leases would be an alternative occupant

[^1]for the Atwood Building, for the purposes of this analysis we use the current Anchorage average office rent to measure the opportunity cost. ${ }^{4}$

## Size Differential

A further complication in this analysis is the size differential between the space available in the LOB and the space required at the Atwood Building. The LAA has indicated that the amount of space required at the Atwood Building is less than the amount of space existing at the LOB, and that the State is currently paying rent for ancillary rooms and storage space that is not needed.

Consequently, the amount of usable floor space requested at the Atwood Building is based on the measured amount of Office Area currently provided in the LOB. This area includes the office spaces, LIO, conference rooms and auditorium, and according to measurements provided by RIM Architects, amounts to 34,102 Sq.ft. ${ }^{5}$

In order to address this issue, our analysis also presents costs on a "per usable square foot" basis, which recognizes that the costs associated with the Atwood Building are reflective of a smaller amount of space provided in that scenario. ${ }^{6}$ For this analysis, the floor area measure we adopt for the LOB is based on the RIM Architects' measurement of 42,014 Sq. ft of Floor Usable Area. (See Exhibit 7).

[^2]
## Section IV Findings and Recommendations

## Analysis Results

Table 1 presents the total and average annual cost of each option over 20 years, on a discounted present value basis. ${ }^{7}$

- Scenario 1 is the most costly option, reflecting lease payments and operating costs under the existing lease that have a present value of $\$ 61.8$ Million in total, or an average of $\$ 3.09$ Million per year.
- Scenario 2 results in total costs with a present value of $\$ 31.7$ Million if the State purchases the LOB, which is a savings of approximately $\$ 30$ Million, or 50 percent, over the current lease. On an average annual basis the present value is $\$ 1.58$ Million
- The present value of total costs for Scenario 3 is $\$ 24.2$ Million, or an average annual present value of $\$ 1.21$ Million, if the State relocates to the Atwood Building. This is a savings of approximately $\$ 37.7$ Million, or 60 percent, over the existing lease.
Thus, Scenarios 2 and 3 each represent substantial savings over the existing lease arrangement. Scenario 3 is the least costly option, being $\$ 7.5$ Million less expensive than Scenario 2.

When assessed on a "per usable square foot" basis, Scenario 3 is also the least-cost option, at $\$ 2.95$ per Sq.ft. However, Scenario 2, at $\$ 3.08$ per Sq.ft, is only 4 percent more expensive than Scenario 3. Therefore, the majority of the cost difference between Scenarios 2 and 3 is attributable to the difference in the amount of usable space provided at each building. If the Council determines that the additional usable space at the LOB is not required, then Scenario 3 is clearly the least-cost option. If the Council does value the additional usable space at the LOB, the cost difference between Scenarios 2 and 3 is of less significance, and the Council's decision should have greater regard to the merits, risks and other considerations of each option, some of which are briefly discussed below.
Table 1

|  | Scenario 1: <br> Continue to Lease <br> LOB | Scenario 2: <br> Purchase LOB | Scenario 3: <br> Relocate to <br> Atwood Building |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Usable Square Feet | 42,914 | 42,914 | 34,102 |
| Present Value of Costs <br> over 20 Years | $\$ 61.8$ Million | $\$ 31.7$ Million | $\$ 24.2$ Million |
| Present Value of Costs: <br> Average Annual | $\$ 3.09$ Million | \$1.58 Million | $\$ 1.21$ Million |
| Present Value per <br> Usable Sq.ft per Month | $\$ 6.00$ per Sq.ft | $\$ 3.08$ per Sq.ft | $\$ 2.95$ per Sq.ft |

[^3]
## Other Considerations

While the above analysis finds that Scenario 3 is the lowest cost alternative on both a total dollar present value and an equivalent per usable square foot basis, there are further considerations, that are beyond the scope of this report, but are noted here for consideration by the Council in making its decision.
First, the LOB has physical benefits in that it was built to suit the needs of the Legislature and is a single tenant building, providing the Legislature with exclusive use of the lobby and other common areas. While these spaces may be under-used currently, ownership of the building would give the State control over the space and the ability to make better use of some of the ancillary and storage space.

Second, Scenario 3 requires the non-appropriation of funds and the termination of the LOB lease. The Council will need to consider the wider financial and legal implications of these actions, which may include litigation by the Lessor and degraded relationships between the State and the business community. ${ }^{8}$
Third, Scenario 3 would entail physical disruption and inconvenience of moving from the LOB to the Atwood Building, as well as the risk that the financial costs assumed with moving, leasing temporary space and tenant improvements may increase due to unforeseen circumstances.

Fourth, Scenario 2 requires the securing of financing for the purchase of the LOB. In the present fiscal circumstances, the Council should seek to confirm at regular intervals the availability of tax-exempt financing at the rates assumed in our analysis, which are based on an existing "offer to sell" of \$37 Million.

[^4]
## Section V Assumptions used in the Analysis

Each scenario is based on monthly cash flows, modeled over a period of 20 years. This timeline aligns both with the LOB lease (10 years with an option to extend an additional 10 years), and an appropriate time period for bond financing. A 3.2 percent discount rate is used to convert the periodic cash flows to a present value. ${ }^{9}$
The specific assumptions for each scenario are detailed below.

## Scenario 1: Continue to lease the Legislative Office Building

## Description

The Legislature currently occupies the LOB under an Extension of Lease and Lease Amendment, dated September 9, 2013. Under this agreement, the existing lease, which expired May 31, 2014, was extended for 10 years to May 31, 2024. The lease extension agreement contained an option to extend the lease for an additional period of up to 10 years.
The lease is described in the lease amendment as a "modified triple net lease", under which the responsibility for the LOB's operational costs are shared between the Lessor and Lessee as defined by the lease. In short, the Lessee has responsibility for the majority of the routine operations and maintenance costs, while the Lessor has responsibility for costs associated with the building systems, fittings, fixtures and structure.

## Costs

The lease stipulated that upon occupancy of the renovated building, monthly net rent payments would be set at $\$ 281,638$. This amount would be a flat rate that would remain the same throughout the term of the lease. Extension of the lease in 2024 is subject to AS 36.30.083, which requires the rent to be at least 10 percent below the market rental value at the time of the extension. It is not possible to determine today what that rate will be, therefore our assumption is a continuation of the in-place rent throughout the extension period.
Lessee operating expense is based on the actual operating expense for calendar year 2015, and is subject to annual escalation estimated at 3 percent.
Income for car parking is estimated at $\$ 700$ per stall per year, for 47 stalls, with annual escalation at 2.4 percent, in line with historic market rent growth.

Scenario 1 model assumptions are detailed in Exhibit 1 and annual cash flows in Exhibit 2.

[^5]
## Scenario 2: Purchase the Legislative Office Building

## Description

In October 2015 the Lessor offered to sell the LOB to the State for \$37,000,000. Further, in January 2016 the Lessor offered to reduce the monthly rent by five percent up until the time at which the purchase would close. These offers were subject to achieving approval and entering escrow by certain dates, which have now passed. ${ }^{10}$ However, the Lessor has indicated that the same terms are available should this course of action be chosen. ${ }^{11}$

## Costs

Closing of the purchase is assumed to occur in April 2017. From the current date until that point, lease payments are reduced by five percent and operating expenses are incurred consistent with Scenario 1.
The State has a number of options to finance the LOB purchase. These include an appropriation of the full purchase price or financing with tax-exempt bonds or certificates of participation. Bond financing can be arranged through State agencies such as AHFC or AIDEA, or through the State Bond Committee. ${ }^{12}$ Discussions with officers at these agencies indicate tax exempt bond financing as an appropriate financing method for this purchase. Our analysis employs tax exempt bond financing rates provided by AHFC as of March 7, 2016, which were 3.10 percent for 20 years. ${ }^{13}$ The amount to be financed includes the purchase price of $\$ 37,000,000$, the bond cost of issuance $(\$ 760,000)$ and administration fee (\$190,000).
As owner, the State would pay the LOB's annual operating expenses. This amount includes the operating expenses currently paid by the State as Lessee, plus the operating, repair and maintenance expenses that are currently the Lessor's responsibility under the lease. Excluded from this amount are property taxes and insurance. Thus, total operating expense for 2015 is estimated at approximately $\$ 483,000$ (See Exhibit 8). The State would receive income from the rooftop telecommunications tower and the public car parking. Operating income and expenses are assumed to escalate by 3 percent per annum.
The cash flow analysis also includes an estimate of reversionary value at the end of the 20year period. This value represents the market value of the building owned by the State. This value is based on the appraised value of the LOB without the benefit of the existing lease (See, Appraisal Report, Legislative Affairs Building, Kidder Mathews, July 8, 2015), escalated by the estimated future annual rate of growth in market rent, which is based on average rent growth in the Anchorage office market between 2010 and 2015. ${ }^{14}$

Scenario 2 model assumptions are detailed in Exhibit 3 and annual cash flows in Exhibit 4.

[^6]
## Scenario 3: Relocate to the Atwood Building

## Description

In Scenario 3, the Legislature would relocate from the LOB to the Atwood office building (the "Atwood Building"). This is a 20 -level office building located at the intersection of W $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and F Street. The Atwood Building currently houses several State government departments, including Natural Resources, Administration, Revenue, Community \& Economic Development and the Governor's Office.

Parking for occupants of the Atwood Building is provided in the adjacent State-owned Linny Pacillo parking garage. Parking for executives is provided in a smaller parking garage under the Atwood Building. In addition, the State also owns other nearby surface parking lots.

Currently, the Atwood Building has approximately 26,600 Sq.ft of vacant space, including the whole of level 2 and parts of levels 1 and 19. It is intended that the Department of Natural Resources ("DNR") will consolidate its space in the building over the next 12 months to provide an additional vacant level for potential use by the Legislature.
Our analysis assumes that following the DNR consolidation, tenant improvements would be completed for the Legislature, with occupancy commencing January 1, 2018. The LAA has indicated that the Legislature would move to temporary office space until the Atwood Building is ready.

## Costs

The Atwood Building is part of the Public Building Fund administered by the Alaska Division of General Services ("DGS"). As such, the DGS requires agencies that occupy the building to pay an annual amount that comprises a pro-rata share (based on usable square feet) of (i) building maintenance and operations cost, (ii) estimated annual depreciation (to cover future capital improvements), and (iii) indirect facilities administration costs. For FY 2016, these costs amount to $\$ 1.5355$ per Sq.ft per month. The costs of the LPPG are similarly charged, with the pro-rata amounts based on the share of space occupied by each department in the Atwood Building. For FY 2016, LPPG costs total $\$ 0.3099$ per Sq.ft. Thus the combined cost for office and parking space would be $\$ 1.84$ per Sq.ft per month.
As discussed in Section III, the cost analysis for Scenario 3 also includes the opportunity cost of the Legislature taking space at the Atwood Building that could otherwise be occupied by another agency that currently occupies leased space and pays rent.

If the Legislature did not move to the vacant space at the Atwood Building, another State agency that is currently leasing space could relocate there instead. The other agency, in switching from a market rent to the DGS cost-based charge, would realize savings (i.e., \$2.43-\$1.84 = \$0.59). In Scenario 3, we include $\$ 0.59$ per Sq.ft per month as the opportunity cost of the Legislature taking the space instead of another agency.
Other costs in Scenario 3 include the cost of temporary office space until the Atwood Building is ready, for which we have assumed 34,000 Sq.ft at a full service rent of $\$ 1.84$ per Sq.ft. This rent is based on quoted rates for $733 \mathrm{~W} 4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. If $34,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{ft}$ is not available in this building, we have assumed that additional space in a similar building would be leased at an equivalent cost. Costs of moving, first from the LOB to the temporary space and then from the temporary space to the Atwood Building, are assumed at $\$ 100,000$ in
total. The costs of tenant improvements at the Atwood Building are assumed to be $\$ 3,500,000$, which is a sufficient amount to provide a good quality standard of fit-out, and is consistent with that currently provided at the LOB.
Inherent in relocation to the Atwood building is the non-appropriation and termination of the LOB lease. No costs or delays that may arise as a result of these actions are included in this Scenario.

Scenario 3 model assumptions are detailed in Exhibit 5 and annual cash flows in Exhibit 6.

## Section VI Exhibits

## Alaska Legislative Counci

Scenario 1 Assumption Inputs

## Exhibit 1

| Assumptions |  |  | Source | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Start Date |  | 4/1/2016 |  |  |
| Term Period (months) |  | 240 |  | Aligns with financing term of acquisition and existing lease with extension |
| Lease Expiration Date |  | Mar-36 |  | 20 years from start of analysis |
| Lease/Opex Commencement |  | 4/1/2016 |  | Start of analysis |
| Discount Rate |  | 3.20\% | OMB Circular A-94 Appendix C | Government discount rate for cost-effectiveness and lease purchase |
| Market Rent Escalation |  | 2.26\% | Costar | Annual Average \% change between 2010-2015 |
| Market Car Park/Stall/Year | \$ | 700 |  |  |
| 716 W. 4th Ave |  |  |  |  |
| Usable sq.ft. |  | 42,914 | BOMA | Usable Area |
| Total Parking Spaces |  | 86 | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | Total parking available |
| Revenue Generating Parking Spaces |  | 47 | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | On-grade parking spaces (Parking Contract) |
| Year 1: Rental Rate/sq.ft./month | \$ | 6.56 | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | Escalated price |
| Rental Rate Escalation |  | 0\% | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | Included in lease price (assumes no further escalation on extension) |
| Year 1: Leasing Opex | \$ | 634,339 | 2015 actual Opex | \$634,338 for ALIO 2015 calendar year |
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## Alaska Legislative Council

Scenario 2 Assumption Inputs

## Exhibit 3

| Assumptions |  |  | Source | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Start Date |  | 4/1/2016 |  |  |
| Term Period (months) |  | 240 |  | Aligns with financing term of acquisition |
| Lease Expiration Date |  | Mar-36 |  | 20 years from start of analysis |
| Purchase Delay (months) |  | 12 |  | 12 months from start of analysis |
| Lease/Opex Commencement |  | 4/1/2016 |  | Start of analysis |
| Purchase Price | \$ | 37,000,000 | 716 W Fourth Avenue LLC Proposal 1.29.16 | Purchase price excludes \$950,000 pre-payment penalty |
| Appraisal Price | \$ | 20,000,000 | Kidder Mathews, July 8, 2015 |  |
| Reversion Price | \$ | 31,271,288 | Kidder Mathews, July 8, 2015 \& Costar | Appraisal price escalated at 2.26\% (market growth) |
| Discount Rate |  | 3.20\% | OMB Circular A-94 Appendix C | Government discount rate for cost-effectiveness and lease purchase |
| Market Rent Escalation |  | 2.26\% | Costar | Annual Average \% change between 2010-2015 |
| Market Car Park/Stall/Year | \$ | 700 |  |  |
| 716 W. 4th Ave |  |  |  |  |
| Usable sq.ft. |  | 42,914 | BOMA | Usable Area |
| Total Parking Spaces |  | 86 | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | Total parking available |
| Revenue Generating Parking Spaces |  | 47 | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | On-grade parking spaces (Parking Contract) |
| Year 1: Rental Rate/sq.ft./month | \$ | 6.56 | 9/9/2013 Lease Extension | Escalated price |
| Year 1: Roof Lease/Annum | \$ | 25,000 | LL 2015 Budget | Existing Verizon lease |
| Rental Rate Escalation |  | 0\% | 2014 Lease Extension | Included in lease price (assumes no further escalation on extension) |
| Year 1: Renting Opex | \$ | 634,339 | 2015 actual Opex | \$634,338 for ALIO 2015 calendar year |
| Year 1: Owned Opex | \$ | 482,877 | 2015 actual, LL budget | 2015 actual opex less property tax and insurance, plus LL costs |
| Opex Escalation |  | 3\% |  |  |
| Lease Discount if Purchased |  | 5\% | 13. 716 W Fourth Avenue LLC Proposal 1.29.16 | Option period has expired, but landlord stated reduction still viable |
| Financing |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Maturity (months) |  | 228 | FW LIO Building Lease Bond Debt Service | Analysis term less initial lease period (Amortized over 19 years) |
| Bond Fixed Rate |  | 3.10\% | FW LIO Building Lease Bond Debt Service | Rate on 20-year term |
| Bond Cost of Issuance and Admin | \$ | 950,000 |  | \$760,000 cost of issuance and \$190,000 administration fee |

## Alaska Legislative Council

Scenario 2 Annual Cash Flow Analysis
Exhibit 4

|  |  |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquisition/Disposition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase Price | \$ | $(37,000,000)$ | \$ | - |  | $(37,000,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Capitalized Sale |  | 31,271,288 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Net Sales Proceeds/(Costs) | \$ | $(5,728,712)$ | \$ | - |  | $(37,000,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Lease and Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Expense | \$ | $(3,210,675)$ | \$ | $(2,408,006)$ | \$ | $(802,669)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Car Parking \& Roof Lease Revenue | \$ | 1,300,045 | \$ | 24,675 | \$ | 52,394 | \$ | 59,404 | \$ | 60,181 | \$ | 60,977 | \$ | 61,790 | \$ | 62,621 | \$ | 63,471 |
| Operating Expenses |  | $(13,220,249)$ |  | $(475,754)$ |  | $(531,607)$ |  | $(512,285)$ |  | $(527,653)$ |  | $(543,483)$ |  | $(559,787)$ |  | $(576,581)$ |  | $(593,878)$ |
| Tenant Improvements/Relocation |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Net Leasing Expenses | \$ | $(15,130,879)$ | \$ | $(2,859,085)$ | \$ | $(1,281,883)$ | \$ | $(452,881)$ | \$ | $(467,472)$ | \$ | $(482,506)$ | \$ | $(497,998)$ | \$ | $(513,960)$ | \$ | $(530,407)$ |
| Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution | \$ | 37,950,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 37,950,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Principal Repayment |  | $(37,950,000)$ |  | - |  | $(1,113,251)$ |  | $(1,525,121)$ |  | $(1,573,077)$ |  | $(1,622,542)$ |  | $(1,673,561)$ |  | $(1,726,185)$ |  | 1,780,464) |
| Debt Service Interest |  | $(12,314,728)$ |  | - |  | $(870,883)$ |  | $(1,120,391)$ |  | $(1,072,435)$ |  | $(1,022,970)$ |  | $(971,951)$ |  | $(919,327)$ |  | $(865,048)$ |
| Cost of Issuance |  | $(950,000)$ |  | - |  | $(950,000)$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Net Financing Cash Flows | \$ | $(13,264,728)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 35,015,866 | \$ | (2,645,512) | \$ | $(2,645,512)$ | \$ | $(2,645,512)$ | \$ | $(2,645,512)$ |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Flows | \$ | $(34,124,320)$ | \$ | $(2,859,085)$ | \$ | $(3,266,017)$ | \$ | $(3,098,393)$ | \$ | $(3,112,984)$ | \$ | $(3,128,018)$ | \$ | $(3,143,510)$ |  | (3,159,472) |  | $(3,175,919)$ |
| Average Annual Cost | \$ | $(1,706,216)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Monthly Outlay/sq.ft. | \$ | (3.31) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NPV @ 5\% <br> Average Annual NPV <br> Average Monthly NPV/sq.ft. | \$ | $(31,698,816)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | $(1,584,941)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | (3.08) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Alaska Legislative Council

Scenario 2 Annual Cash Flow Analysis
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|  |  | 2024 |  | $\underline{2025}$ |  | 2026 |  | 2027 |  | 2028 |  | 2029 |  | 2030 |  | 2031 |  | 2032 |  | 2033 |  | $\underline{2034}$ |  | 2035 |  | $\underline{2036}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition/Disposition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase Price | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Capitalized Sale |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,271,288 |
| Net Sales Proceeds/(Costs) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | 1,271,288 |
| Lease and Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Expense | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Car Parking \& Roof Lease Revenue | \$ | 64,341 | \$ | 65,230 | \$ | 66,139 | \$ | 67,069 | \$ | 68,020 | \$ | 68,992 | \$ | 69,986 | \$ | 71,003 | \$ | 72,042 | \$ | 73,105 | \$ | 74,193 | \$ | 75,304 | \$ | 19,110 |
| Operating Expenses |  | $(611,695)$ |  | $(630,045)$ |  | $(648,947)$ |  | $(668,415)$ |  | $(688,468)$ |  | $(709,122)$ |  | $(730,395)$ |  | $(752,307)$ |  | $(774,876)$ |  | $(798,123)$ |  | $(822,066)$ |  | $(846,728)$ |  | $(218,033)$ |
| Tenant Improvements/Relocation |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Net Leasing Expenses | \$ | $(547,354)$ | \$ | $(564,816)$ | \$ | $(582,808)$ | \$ | $(601,346)$ | \$ | $(620,448)$ | \$ | $(640,130)$ | \$ | $(660,409)$ | \$ | $(681,305)$ | \$ | $(702,834)$ | \$ | $(725,017)$ | \$ | $(747,874)$ | \$ | $(771,424)$ | \$ | $(198,922)$ |
| Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Principal Repayment |  | $(1,836,449)$ |  | $(1,894,195)$ |  | $(1,953,757)$ |  | $(2,015,191)$ |  | $(2,078,557)$ |  | $(2,143,916)$ |  | $(2,211,330)$ |  | $(2,280,864)$ |  | $(2,352,584)$ |  | $(2,426,559)$ |  | $(2,502,860)$ |  | $(2,581,561)$ |  | $(657,976)$ |
| Debt Service Interest |  | $(809,063)$ |  | $(751,317)$ |  | $(691,755)$ |  | $(630,321)$ |  | $(566,955)$ |  | $(501,596)$ |  | $(434,182)$ |  | $(364,648)$ |  | $(292,928)$ |  | $(218,953)$ |  | $(142,652)$ |  | $(63,951)$ |  | $(3,402)$ |
| Cost of Issuance |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Net Financing Cash Flows | \$ | $(2,645,512)$ |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) |  | $(2,645,512)$ |  | $(2,645,512)$ |  | $(2,645,512)$ |  | (2,645,512) |  | (2,645,512) | \$ | (661,378) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Flows | \$ | $(3,192,866)$ |  | (3,210,328) |  | $(3,228,320)$ |  | (3,246,858) |  | (3,265,960) |  | $(3,285,642)$ |  | (3,305,921) |  | $(3,326,817)$ |  | $(3,348,346)$ |  | $(3,370,529)$ |  | (3,393,386) |  | $(3,416,936)$ |  | 0,410,987 |

Average Monthly Outlay/sq.ft.

NPV @ 5\%
Average Annual NPV
Average Monthly NPV/sq.ft.
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Scenario 3 Assumption Inputs

## Exhibit 5

| Assumptions |  |  | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Start Date |  | 4/1/2016 |  |
| Term Period (months) |  | 240 |  |
| Lease Expiration Date |  | Mar-36 |  |
| Lease/Opex Commencement |  | 4/1/2016 |  |
| Discount Rate |  | 3.20\% | OMB Circular A-94 Appendix C |
| Market Rent |  | \$2.43 | Costar |
| Market Rent Escalation |  | 2.26\% | Costar |
| Office Area Load Factor |  | 1.10 |  |
| Atwood Building |  |  |  |
| Usable sq.ft. |  | 34,102 |  |
| Parking Spaces |  | 84 |  |
| Year 1: Rental Rate/sq.ft./month | \$ | 1.8475 | FY16 PBF Rate by Building |
| Rental/Opex Rate Escalation |  | 3\% |  |
| TI \& Relocation Costs | \$ | 3,500,000 |  |
| TI Months |  | 21 |  |
| 733 W 4th Ave (temporary space) |  |  |  |
| Usable sq.ft. |  | 34,102 | Wiley Brooks |
| Year 1: Rental Rate/sq.ft./month | \$ | 1.84 | Wiley Brooks |
| Rental Rate Escalation |  | 0\% |  |
| Year 1: Renting Opex | \$ | - |  |
| TI \& Relocation Costs | \$ | 100,000 |  |

Aligns with financing term of acquisition
20 years from start of analysis
Start of analysis

Government discount rate for cost-effectiveness and lease purchase 2015 Average Anchorage Office Rental Rate (Gross) per sq.ft./month Annual Average \% change between 2010-2015
Usable area adjusted for common area and amenity (ranges 8\%-15\%)

Net Usable Area
Prorata spaces based on 45,371 sq.ft.
2016 Prorata Expense (\$1.5375 office and \$0.3091 parking)

Email from Tanci Mintz to Pamela Varni, dated December 16, 2015

14,555 sq.ft. at 733 W. 4th Ave, need to source additional 19,547 sq.ft. Blended gross asking rent at 733 W. 4th Ave.
Not applicable: Assumed 1 year occupation
Not applicable: Assumed Gross Lease
Nominal moving costs to adjacent building
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|  |  |  | 2016 |  | $\underline{2017}$ |  | $\underline{2018}$ |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | $\underline{2023}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition/Disposition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase Price | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Capitalized Sale |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Net Sales Proceeds/(Costs) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Lease and Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease and Car Park Expense | \$ | $(20,460,743)$ | \$ | $(564,194)$ | \$ | $(774,826)$ | \$ | $(802,084)$ | \$ | $(826,147)$ | \$ | $(850,931)$ | \$ | $(876,459)$ | \$ | $(902,753)$ | \$ | $(929,835)$ |
| Car Parking Revenue |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Operating Expenses |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Tenant Improvements/Relocation |  | $(3,600,000)$ |  | $(1,500,000)$ |  | $(2,100,000)$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Opportunity Cost |  | $(8,513,135)$ |  | - |  | - |  | $(357,094)$ |  | $(367,807)$ |  | $(378,841)$ |  | $(390,206)$ |  | $(401,912)$ |  | $(413,970)$ |
| Net Leasing Expenses | \$ | $(32,573,878)$ | \$ | $(2,064,194)$ | \$ | $(2,874,826)$ | \$ | $(1,159,178)$ | \$ | $(1,193,954)$ | \$ | $(1,229,772)$ | \$ | $(1,266,665)$ |  | $(1,304,665)$ |  | (1,343,805) |
| Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Principal Repayment |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Debt Service Interest |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Cost of Issuance |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Net Financing Cash Flows | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Flows | \$ | $(32,573,878)$ | \$ | $(2,064,194)$ | \$ | $(2,874,826)$ | \$ | $(1,159,178)$ | \$ | $(1,193,954)$ | \$ | $(1,229,772)$ | \$ | $(1,266,665)$ |  | (1,304,665) |  | $\underline{(1,343,805)}$ |
| Average Annual Cost | \$ | $(1,628,694)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Monthly Outlay/sq.ft. | \$ | (3.98) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NPV @ 5\% | \$ | $(24,154,137)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Annual NPV | \$ | $(1,207,707)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Monthly NPV/sq.ft. | \$ | (2.95) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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\$ $(1,384,119) \$(1,425,643) \$(1,468,412) \$(1,512,465) \$(1,557,839) \$(1,604,574) \$(1,652,711) \$(1,702,292) \$(1,753,361) \$(1,805,962) \$(1,860,141) \$(1,915,945) \$(493,356)$ Average Monthly Outlay/sq

NPV @ 5\%
Average Annual NPV
Average Monthly NPV/sq.ft.
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## Exhibit 7: Legislative Office Building: Schedule of Floor Areas

BOMA Floor Areas, Square Feet

| Floor | Building Common |  |  | $\qquad$ | Floor Rentable Area $e=c+d$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Office Area <br> a | Area b | Floor Usable Area $c=a+b$ |  |  |
| B | 2,613 | 4,140 | 6,753 | 1,295 | 8,048 |
| 1 | 5,256 | 3,248 | 8,504 | 1,028 | 9,532 |
| 2 | 5,183 | 0 | 5,183 | 1,994 | 7,177 |
| 3 | 5,264 | 0 | 5,264 | 1,918 | 7,182 |
| 4 | 5,262 | 0 | 5,262 | 1,918 | 7,180 |
| 5 | 5,262 | 0 | 5,262 | 1,918 | 7,180 |
| 6 | 5,262 | 0 | 5,262 | 1,918 | 7,180 |
| P | 0 | 1,424 | 1,424 | 0 | 1,424 |
| Total | 34,102 | 8,812 | 42,914 | 11,989 | 54,903 |

Source:
RIM Architects: BOMA Floor Area Calculations for 716 W 4th Avenue, updated March 11, 2016

Alaska Legislative Council
Exhibit 8: Legislative Office Building: Estimateion of Operating Expenses under State Ownership

|  | Jan 1 - Dec 31 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Landlord Reported Operating Expenses ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| Security/Fire/Life Safety |  |  |
| Security Monitoring | \$ | 420 |
| DDC |  | 4,200 |
| Alarm/Inspection Repairs |  | 5,700 |
| Extinguisher Inspect/Repair |  | 1,050 |
| Monitoring Alarm/Phone/Spry |  | 4,080 |
| Alarm/Sprinkler Inspection |  | 1,570 |
| Emergency Lights |  | 600 |
| Total Security/Fire/Life Safety |  | 17,620 |
| HVAC |  |  |
| Contract Services | \$ | 12,780 |
| Non-Contract Services |  | 2,500 |
| Total HVAC | \$ | 15,280 |
| Building Maintenance |  |  |
| Generator | \$ | 2,722 |
| Elevator Expense |  | 19,080 |
| Keys/Locks/Hardware |  | 290 |
| Plumbing Repairs |  | 118 |
| Total Building Maintenance | \$ | 22,210 |
| Grounds Maintenance |  |  |
| Landscaping | \$ | 360 |
| Snow Removal/Sweeping |  | - |
| Total Grounds Maintenance | \$ | 360 |
| Utilities |  |  |
| Gas | \$ | 35,055 |
| Electric |  | 92,800 |
| Waste/Sewer |  | 1,920 |
| Refuse |  | 4,220 |
| Recycle |  | 923 |
| Total Utilities | \$ | 134,918 |
| Janitorial |  |  |
| Contract | \$ | 64,316 |
| Supplies \& Materials |  | 3,907 |
| Window Cleaning |  | 6,900 |
| Total Janitorial | \$ | 75,123 |
| Professional Fees |  |  |
| Management Fees | \$ | 32,004 |
| Total Professional Fees | \$ | 32,004 |

Alaska Legislative Council
Exhibit 8: Legislative Office Building: Estimateion of Operating Expenses under State Ownership


| Quarter | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Inventory } \\ & \text { Bldgs } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Inventory } \\ \text { SF } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Occupancy } \\ & \text { SF } \end{aligned}$ | Occupancy Percent | Office Gross Rent Direct | Office Gross Rent Sublet | Office Gross Rent Overall | Office Base Rent Direct | Office Base Rent Sublet | Office Base Rent Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gross } \\ \text { Rent/Month } \end{gathered}$ | Base Rent/Month | Monthly \% Change in Gross Rent | Annual \% Change in Gross Rent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 Q4 | 574 | 13,329,759 | 12,523,890 | 94.00\% | \$29.39 | \$32.51 | \$29.49 | \$27.80 | \$31.95 | \$27.99 | \$2.46 | \$2.33 | 1.51\% | 0.82\% |
| 2015 Q3 | 574 | 13,329,759 | 12,520,779 | 93.90\% | \$28.87 | \$33.10 | \$29.05 | \$28.61 | \$32.63 | \$28.83 | \$2.42 | \$2.40 | -1.16\% |  |
| 2015 Q2 | 572 | 13,205,259 | 12,467,800 | 94.40\% | \$29.37 | \$30.59 | \$29.39 | \$29.06 | \$30.13 | \$29.12 | \$2.45 | \$2.43 | 2.83\% |  |
| 2015 Q1 | 571 | 13,202,398 | 12,518,989 | 94.80\% | \$28.57 | \$30.02 | \$28.58 | \$28.41 | \$30.50 | \$28.48 | \$2.38 | \$2.37 | -2.29\% |  |
| 2014 Q4 | 571 | 13,202,398 | 12,517,015 | 94.80\% | \$29.26 | \$28.02 | \$29.25 | \$29.08 | \$28.82 | \$29.10 | \$2.44 | \$2.43 | 3.72\% | 9.26\% |
| 2014 Q3 | 571 | 13,202,398 | 12,461,633 | 94.40\% | \$28.23 | \$28.56 | \$28.20 | \$28.96 | \$29.30 | \$28.95 | \$2.35 | \$2.41 | 1.18\% |  |
| 2014 Q2 | 570 | 13,102,398 | 12,463,931 | 95.10\% | \$27.90 | \$26.07 | \$27.87 | \$28.10 | \$26.07 | \$28.11 | \$2.32 | \$2.34 | 1.24\% |  |
| 2014 Q1 | 570 | 13,102,398 | 12,445,759 | 95.00\% | \$27.64 | \$23.52 | \$27.53 | \$27.29 | \$23.52 | \$27.26 | \$2.29 | \$2.27 | 2.84\% |  |
| 2013 Q4 | 570 | 13,102,398 | 12,437,780 | 94.90\% | \$26.90 | \$22.17 | \$26.77 | \$26.14 | \$22.17 | \$26.13 | \$2.23 | \$2.18 | 2.76\% | -0.45\% |
| 2013 Q3 | 570 | 13,102,398 | 12,507,080 | 95.50\% | \$26.18 | \$19.75 | \$26.05 | \$26.15 | \$19.75 | \$26.12 | \$2.17 | \$2.18 | -3.02\% |  |
| 2013 Q2 | 570 | 13,102,398 | 12,554,882 | 95.80\% | \$26.87 | \$21.50 | \$26.86 | \$26.35 | \$21.50 | \$26.43 | \$2.24 | \$2.20 | 3.75\% |  |
| 2013 Q1 | 570 | 13,102,398 | 12,547,946 | 95.80\% | \$25.90 | \$21.50 | \$25.89 | \$25.50 | \$21.50 | \$25.62 | \$2.16 | \$2.14 | -3.72\% |  |
| 2012 Q4 | 570 | 13,093,598 | 12,406,208 | 94.80\% | \$26.81 | \$32.21 | \$26.89 | \$25.49 | \$32.21 | \$25.72 | \$2.24 | \$2.14 | 3.74\% | -3.34\% |
| 2012 Q3 | 570 | 13,093,598 | 12,399,179 | 94.70\% | \$25.83 | \$32.21 | \$25.92 | \$25.53 | \$32.21 | \$25.73 | \$2.16 | \$2.14 | 2.65\% |  |
| 2012 Q2 | 570 | 13,093,598 | 12,433,467 | 95.00\% | \$25.06 | \$32.49 | \$25.25 | \$23.97 | \$32.49 | \$24.34 | \$2.10 | \$2.03 | -3.63\% |  |
| 2012 Q1 | 569 | 13,084,598 | 12,506,598 | 95.60\% | \$26.05 | \$32.49 | \$26.20 | \$25.43 | \$32.49 | \$25.69 | \$2.18 | \$2.14 | -5.82\% |  |
| 2011 Q4 | 569 | 13,084,598 | 12,432,353 | 95.00\% | \$27.70 | \$32.49 | \$27.82 | \$26.63 | \$32.49 | \$26.84 | \$2.32 | \$2.24 | 3.65\% | 4.98\% |
| 2011 Q3 | 569 | 13,084,598 | 12,402,997 | 94.80\% | \$26.74 | \$29.29 | \$26.84 | \$26.37 | \$29.99 | \$26.58 | \$2.24 | \$2.22 | 0.68\% |  |
| 2011 Q2 | 569 | 13,084,598 | 12,316,667 | 94.10\% | \$26.58 | \$28.14 | \$26.66 | \$26.12 | \$28.80 | \$26.30 | \$2.22 | \$2.19 | -0.11\% |  |
| 2011 Q1 | 569 | 13,084,598 | 12,287,786 | 93.90\% | \$26.61 | \$28.14 | \$26.69 | \$25.80 | \$28.80 | \$26.01 | \$2.22 | \$2.17 | 0.72\% |  |
| 2010 Q4 | 567 | 13,040,575 | 12,339,885 | 94.60\% | \$26.45 | \$27.17 | \$26.50 | \$25.56 | \$27.71 | \$25.40 | \$2.21 | \$2.12 | 2.00\% |  |
| Avg. | 570 | 13,134,796 | 12,452,030 | 94.80\% | \$27.28 | \$28.19 | \$27.32 | \$26.78 | \$28.33 | \$26.89 | \$2.28 | \$2.24 | 0.64\% | 2.26\% |

Source: Costar
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## Exhibit 10: Documents Reviewed

| No. Description | Document Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Current lease with 716 W. 4th Ave. LLC | 2. Anchorage Extension of Lease and Lease Amendment No. 3 |
| 2 Area calculations for 716 W . 4th Ave. | 3. BOMA Rim Architect Floor Plans |
| 3 Area calculations for 716 W .4 4th Ave. parking | 4. RIM Architects Parking Layout |
| 42015 monthly tenant operating statement | 5. Anchorage LIO CY2015 Actual Expenses |
| 52011 property tax assessment appeal | 6. Landlord Lowering Appraisal of 716 W 4th Ave 2.14.2011 |
| 62016 public inquiry parcel details for 716 W 4th Ave | 7. Municipality of Anchorage Assessment 21216 |
| 72013 public inquiry parcel details for 716 W 4th Ave | 7a 712, 716 W 4th 2013 assessment |
| 8 List, size and rate of all State leases in Anchorage | 8. Exec Branch Leases for Anchorage |
| 9 List, size and rate of all State leases in Alaska | 9. LAA Statewide Leases |
| 102013 AHFC cost estimation report for 716 W 4th Ave | 10. Evaluation of Costs Estimate for Downtown Development (AHFS) 10102013 |
| 11 Summary of all 716 W 4th appraisals | 11. Appraisal Overview by Serena Carlsen |
| 12 July 8, 2015 Kidder Mathews appraisal of 716 W 4th | 11a. Kidder Mathews Appraisal |
| 13 December 5, 2014 Reliant appraisal of 716 W 4th | 11b. Reliant Appraisal LIO Building Full Doc |
| 14 June 1, 2014 Waronzof appraisal of 716 W 4th | 11c. Waronzof Associates Appraisal |
| 15 LAA analysis of Test Fits 1-4 | 12. LAA Analysis of 716 W Fourth Ave Proposal 2.5.16 |
| 16 Landlord proposed purchase option | 13. 716 W Fourth Avenue LLC Proposal 1.29.16 |
| 17 November 24, 2015 State presentation of scenarios | 13a. Senator Stevens Anch LIO 10 Yr Comparison |
| 18 State presentation of scenarios updated to 20 years | 13b. Anchorage Office Space Scenarios 20 Year updated |
| 19 Construction cost estimate for 909 West 9th | 14. HMS Conceptual Design Submittal for 909 W 9th Ave |
| 20 Total Development cost estimate for 909 West 9th | 14a. NANA Information |
| 21 Payment support of Tls at 716 W 4 th | 15a. Tenant Improvement Payment Log \$7.5 M |
| 22 Invoices for temporary space leased during Tls | 16. Temporary Space Costs Paid at 716 W 4th Avenue |
| 23 Scenario analysis prepared by appraiser (excel) | 22. Peter Shorett Anchorage Legislative Offices Scenario Analysis State Rates |
| 24 Scenario analysis prepared by appraiser (PDF) | 22a. Peter Shorett Analysis PV |
| 25 DOR summary of scenario analysis | 23. Devene Mitchell Email |
| 26 February 2, 2016 bond analysis | 23a. Debt Service Scenarios for 37.95 million |
| 27 December 14, 2015 loan analysis \#1 | 24. AIDEA LIO Scenario 1 |
| 28 December 14, 2015 loan analysis \#2 | 24a. AIDEA LIO Scenario 2 |
| 29 Email from AHFC with bonding scenarios | 25. AHFC Mike Strand |
| 30 2015-2016 maintenance issue log | 716 W 4th Avenue Building Maintenance and Operating Problems |
| 31 1993-2016 Anchorage office space activity log | Anchorage Office Space Recap |
| 32 Scenario analysis prepared by landlord - Long | Atwood vs Anch LIO - Long Version Landlord Figures Not Actuals |
| 33 Scenario analysis prepared by landlord - Short | Atwood vs Anch LIO - Short Version Landlord Figures Not Actuals |
| 34 Survey of Anchorage parking spaces and rates | Downtown Parking Comparison - July 2015 |

## Alaska Legislative Council

## Exhibit 10: Documents Reviewed

| No. | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| 352015 monthly tenant operating statement | Exhibit C |
| 36 Actual tenant operating expense between 11-16 | FY11-FY16 ALIO Cost Compilation |
| 37 In place parking operating contract with operator | img-224135117-0001 Parking Contract 4-2015 |
| 38 In place parking maintenance contract with operator | img-224123211-0001 car park maintenance contract |
| 39 Mr. Lowe notes/comments to scenario analysis | Herron Request AHFC Buller Memo Attachment 1.22.16 |
| 40 AHFC email requesting the to seek external guidance | Herron Request AHFC Buller Memo 1.22.16 |
| 41 ADIEA email summarizing bonding analysis | Anch LIO AIDEA Information Email |
| 42 AHFC email quoting bonding rate for 20-year term | FW LIO Building Lease Bond Debt Service |
| 43 AHFC 716 W 4th 30-Year bond service analysis | SC16A_30YearDebtService |
| 44 Landlord 2015 operating expense estimate | 716 2015 operating expenses |
| 45 Landlord prepared scenario analysis (excel) | Test fit 4 |
| 46 Landlord prepared scenario analysis (excel) | Test fit 7 |
| 472012 State owned Anchorage office rates | FY12 PBF Rates without LPPG Depreciation - Final 11.1.10 |
| 482013 State owned Anchorage office rates | FY13 PBF Rates without LPPG Depreciation X Building - Final 11.18.11 |
| 492014 State owned Anchorage office rates | FY14 PBF Rates without LPPG Depreciation Final.1 8-27-12 by Building w... |
| 502015 State owned Anchorage office rates | FY15 PBF Rates with 7-year tiered LPPG Depreciation without GMC by Bldg |
| 512016 State owned Anchorage office rates | FY16 PBF Rates GF Credit 7.1.5 |
| 52 Atwood Floor 1 Plan | LIO 1 |
| 53 Atwood Floor 2 Plan | LIO 2 |
| 54 Atwood Floor 19 Plan | LIO 19 |
| 552016 State owned Anchorage office rates | FY16 PDF Rates by Building 7.1.15 |
| $56733 ~ W ~ 4 t h ~(t e m p ~ o f f i c e) ~ 1 s t ~ f l o o r ~ l a y o u t ~ p l a n ~$ | 1st Floor 2013-12 |
| 57733 W 4th (temp office) 2nd floor layout plan | 2nd Floor 2015-11 |
| 58733 W 4th (temp office) 3rd floor layout plan | 3rd Floor 2015-040-15 Color Graphic Plan |
| 59733 W 4th (temp office) 4th floor layout plan | 4th Floor 2012-07-25 Color Graphic Plan |
| 60 Available office space and rates in 733 W 4th | CB4 Marketing Package |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See "Extension of Lease and Lease Amendment No.3"
    ${ }^{2}$ See "Evaluation of Cost Estimate for Downtown Development", Bratslavsky Consulting Engineers, October 10, 2013.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ See "Exec Branch Leases for Anchorage"

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ See Costar market rent data, Exhibit 9. Costar data is based on rentable area rather than usable area; therefore a rentable to usable space adjustment factor of 1.10 is applied to adjust the market rent to usable rent per square foot.
    ${ }^{5}$ See RIM Architects: "BOMA Floor Area Calculations for 716 W 4th Avenue", updated March 11, 2016. Note that the DGS calculated office space to be 30,549 Sq.ft based on the areas indicated on the individual floor plans. The plans indicate that such numbers are for convenience only and do not correspond to actual net areas. The analysis in this report is based on the BOMA table, which identifies 34,102 Sq.ft of office space. (See Exhibit 7).
    ${ }^{6}$ The notion of "usable area" is somewhat subjective and difficult to compare between different types of buildings, such as in this case, where the LOB is a single tenant building and has exclusive use of common areas as well as the office suites. By contrast, in the Attwood Building, the Legislature will also have access to common areas, but on a shared rather than exclusive basis.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ See Exhibits 1-6 for detailed annual cash flow analyses and assumptions

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ See, for example, letter from Alaska Bankers Association to the Budget Conference Committee, "Support for maintaining the State of Alaska's good credit", April 8, 2015.

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ The discount rate is based on the 20-year nominal Treasury bond rate. (See OMB Circular A-94 Appendix C, November 2015 Revision)

[^6]:    ${ }^{10}$ See 716 W Fourth Avenue LLC Proposal, January 29, 2016
    ${ }^{11}$ The Lessor has also indicated that the $\$ 980,000$ prepayment penalty associated with the existing building loan would be waived by the lender.
    ${ }^{12}$ I also understand that the City of Anchorage has indicated interest in financing the purchase of the building.
    ${ }^{13}$ See AHFC LIO Building Lease Purchase Bond Debt Service and email regarding 20-year bond rate.
    ${ }^{14}$ See CoStar market data, Exhibit 9.

