## Lehi Station HTRZ Application

 CREATING A TRUE TRANSIT-ORIENTED COMMUNITY IN THE HEART OF SILICON SLOPES
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INCLUDES OVER 53 ACRES WITHIN THE HEART OF THE SILICON SLOPES, DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO THANKSGIVING POINT AND THE LEHI FRONTRUNNER STATION

BRINGS 1,800 RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO THE CORE OF A MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CENTER
Provides a total of 216 units of affordable housing (12\%), including 25\% of the units reserved for $60 \%$ ami (54)

INCREASES TRANSIT RIDERSHIP THROUGH NOT ONLY NORTH/SOUTH CONNECTIVITY, BUT ALSO EAST/WEST CONNECTIVITY AND LAST MILE SOLUTIONS

INCREASES ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT AND REDUCES THE NEED TO DRIVE TO WORK
Lehi is the hub of Silicon Slopes, and it is estimated that 30,000 Utahns commute into Lehi for work daily

## INCREASES ACCESS TO EDUCATION

UVU's Thanksgiving Point campus is located 0.2 miles from Lehi Station and approximately 0.3 miles from the heart of the project

PROVIDES ONGOING SUPPORT FOR THANKSGIVING POINT
As a partner on the project, Thanksgiving Point will benefit directly from nearly \$1B in investment
Each resident of the project will receive a Thanksgiving Point annual membership
PROVIDES CONNECTIVITY AND OPTIONS FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION THROUGH A ROBUST TRAIL SYSTEM RUNNING THROUGHOUT LEHI CITY

THE PROJECT WILL BE A TRUE S.M.A.R.T COMMUNITY
Sustainable, Mixed-use, Attractive, Realistic, and Transit-oriented

HTRZ FUNDS APPROXIMATELY HALF OF THE ESTIMATED \$237MM INVESTMENT GAP
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1,800 MULTIFAMILY UNITS (INCLUDING 162 UNITS AT 80\% AMI AND 54 UNITS AT 60\% AMI) 770,000 SQUARE FEET OF CLASS A OFFICE SPACE 80,000 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL SHOPS AND RESTAURANTS 70,000 SQUARE FOOT LIFESTYLE CLIMBING GYM

THE LINKING AND EXPANSION OF A REGIONAL TRAIL SYSTEM PROMOTING ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH AND WITHOUT HTRZ FUNDING

- The HTRZ development plan more than triples the number of residential units and allows for affordable housing.
- Without HTRZ funds, higher-density development around the Lehi FrontRunner station is not economically possible. Without HTRZ approval, Lehi Station would be underbuilt and impaired for decades to come. With HTRZ approval, 1,249 additional residential units are possible (216 being affordable), commercial uses are nearly tripled, and there is \$733MM in incremental investment.

|  | Market Driven Development | Proposed HTRZ Development | Increase Over Market Driven Plan | \% Increase Over Market Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multifamily Units | 551 | 1,800 | 1,249 | 227\% |
| 80\% AMI Affordable Units (incl. above) | - | 162 | 162 | NA |
| 60\% AMI Affordable Units (incl. above) | - | 54 | 54 | NA |
| Total Residential Units | 551 | 1,800 | 1,249 | 227\% |
| Class A Office (SF) | 236,500 | 770,000 | 533,500 | 226\% |
| Retail Space (SF) | 98,440 | 150,000 | 51,560 | 52\% |
| Total Project Investment |  |  |  |  |
| Multifamily | \$146,328,484 | \$619,832,096 | \$473,503,612 | 324\% |
| Office | \$82,135,217 | \$328,564,039 | \$246,428,821 | 300\% |
| Retail | \$26,578,800 | \$40,500,000 | \$13,921,200 | 52\% |
| Total | \$255,042,501 | \$988,896,135 | \$733,853,634 | 288\% |
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## \$237MM GAP FOR THE HTRZ DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The table below demonstrates the increased development costs associated with high-density residential and office development around Lehi Station. It also demonstrates the tax increment needed to offset the additional costs (the Gap) to meet a standard investment criteria.

The development teams believes in this project and believes in the thesis of transit-oriented communities. While HTRZ funds will not cover the entire Gap, the development team is willing to make up the difference with the belief that the project will outperform traditional underwriting over the long term.

## Projected Total Gap for the HTRZ

Total Units in HTRZ with Type V Wrap (structured parking) 1,800
$\times$ TIF Incentive per Unit
= Minimum Amount of TIF for Development
Residential Units Inside of HTRZ
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Units at } 80 \% \text { of AMI } & 9.00 \%\end{array}$
Units at 60\% of AMI
3.00\%

Total Affordable Units
$\times$ Value Loss per Unit
= Minimum Amount of TIF for Reduced Rents
Total Office Square Footage in HTRZ w/ Structured Parking
x HTRZ TIF Incentive PSF
= Minimum Amount of TIF for Development

There is a $\$ 115 \mathrm{MM}$ investment gap that will not be covered by HTRZ proceeds.

## TAXING ENTITIES WILL RECEIVE MORE TAX REVENUE WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HTRZ THAN WITHOUT

The table below demonstrates how taxing entities will receive more tax revenue with high-density development, enabled by HTRZ funding, than they would with traditional suburban low-density development.

- Over the 45 -year period, the HTRZ development will generate $\mathbf{\$ 2 7 6 . 4}$ million in incremental property taxes with $\$ 122.1$ million in funding from the HTRZ and $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 4 . 3}$ million going to the jurisdictions.
- Without HTRZ funding, traditional lower-density development would generate $\$ 79.8$ million in property taxes over the same 45-years
- The HTRZ development will generate approximately $2 x$ the amount of tax revenue to the jurisdictions.
- At full build out, the HTRZ development will generate $3.54 x$ the amount of property taxes traditional lower-density development would on an annual basis.

| Tax Revenues Generated (2022 Tax Rates) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | With HTRZ - High Density |  |  | Without HTRZ - Low Density |
| Taxing Entity: | $2022 \text { Tax }$ <br> Rates | 45-Year Tax Increment | $\begin{array}{r} 80 \% \text { to } \mathrm{HTRZ} \\ (25 \mathrm{Yr}) \end{array}$ | Balance to Taxing Entity | Total to Taxing Entity |
| Utah County | 0.005669 | \$22,508,615 | \$9,945,515 | \$12,563,100 | \$6,496,351 |
| Multicounty Assessing \& Collecting | 0.000055 | \$510,786 | \$225,692 | \$285,093 | \$147,421 |
| County Assessing \& Collecting | 0.000126 | \$3,779,813 | \$1,670,124 | \$2,109,688 | \$1,090,915 |
| Alpine School District | 0.000661 | \$194,915,752 | \$86,124,250 | \$108,791,502 | \$56,255,841 |
| Lehi City | 0.000400 | \$40,488,265 | \$17,889,890 | \$22,598,375 | \$11,685,569 |
| Lehi Metropolitan Water District | 0.001189 | \$204,314 | \$90,277 | \$114,037 | \$58,968 |
| North Utah County Water Conservancy | 0.000006 | \$408,628 | \$180,554 | \$228,074 | \$117,937 |
| Central Utah Water Conservancy | 0.000012 | \$13,620,947 | \$6,018,466 | \$7,602,481 | \$3,931,226 |
| Total | 0.008118 | \$276,437,120 | \$122,144,769 | \$154,292,351 | \$79,784,227 |
| Annual Tax Collections at Full Build Out assuming 2022 Tax Rates: |  | \$6,615,486 |  |  | \$1,871,395 |

8 | Lehi Station HTRZ Application


## THANKSGIVING STATION MEETS THE HTRZ OBJECTIVES

- Promotes greater utilization of public transit
- Increases availability of housing, including affordable housing
- Improves water conservation and air quality
- Encourages Transformative Mixed-Use Development and Collaborative Investment in Transit and Transportation
- Maximizes planning and economic development tools to strengthen and grow major transit corridors
- Increases access to employment and educational opportunities

WITHOUT HTRZ FUNDING A PROJECT LIKE THIS WOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE.

10 | Lehi Station HTRZ Application



## PROMOTES GREATER UTILIZATION OF PUBLIC TRANSIT

The planned development promotes a greater utilization of public transit through proximity, connectivity, last mile solutions, and TOD transit passes.

- Proximity - All 1,800 units will be within $1 / 3$ mile or less of the Lehi FrontRunner station parcel, and approximately $85 \%$ of units will be within 1/4 mile or less.
- Connectivity - An internal urban promenade, lined with retail, park space, and amenity space, will provide a direct path to the Lehi Station. The crossing of Ashton Boulevard will be signalized, and traffic calming measures will be implemented to ensure a safe and comfortable walk to the station. UTA's parcel has been master planned through the station area planning process to provide a seamless connection with the adjacent projects.
- Last Mile Solutions -UTA has been forward thinking to find last-mile solutions. They are currently studying transit options for the area to provide easy and reliable access to the east side of I-15. In addition, UTA currently provides multiple bus routes from the FrontRunner station to major employers such as Adobe, Xactware, and Texas Instruments. The project will also provide an expanded trail system allowing for active transportation options such as walking, biking, and scooters to be utilized as last mile solutions.
- Transit Passes - The project team is working with UTA to implement 'TOD Passes' which would allow for the project to purchase several shareable transit passes that could be reserved by residents on a daily basis. This provides a steady revenue stream to UTA and allows residents who historically have not utilized public transit to experience the convenience it provides.


IMPROVE WATER CONSERVATION AND AIR QUALITY

- Through its master planned design, the project mixes housing, retail establishments, entertainment venues, public transportation, and a major employment center into one cohesive community where residents don't need to rely on cars. Instead, residents can satisfy many of their daily needs through walking and other modes of transportation. True transit-oriented mixed-use communities like this provide the most efficient strategy for smart growth by reducing emissions, using water resources efficiently, and providing a safe, walkable community where residents can live, work, shop, and play.
- According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), mixed-use development leads to 20\% internal capture. Meaning approximately $20 \%$ of vehicular trips are eliminated due to bringing uses (office, retail, residential) within walking distance of each other. By providing access to transit, and other modes of transportation, trips can further be reduced by an additional $9.5 \%$. In sum, this project is designed to reduce nearly $30 \%$ of vehicular trips generated in a typical housing development.
- Per the Environmental Protection Agency, "High-density housing produces less runoff and less impervious cover than low-density development at all scales". Along with contributing to improved water quality, high-density development results in reduced water consumption per capita. This project will promote sustainability even further with planting of natural vegetation, the inclusion of street trees, and local sourcing of low carbon, durable, high-performance building materials that will stand the test of time.

- The Lehi Station mixed-use master plan is the opposite of traditional suburban development. Through collaboration with a team of renowned transit-oriented planners and urban designers, this project sets the new standard for transit-oriented communities along the Wasatch Front.
- The project team, Lehi City, Thanksgiving Point, and UTA have worked together extensively throughout the station area planning process to provide seamless connectivity within the overall project master plan.
- The entire development is oriented around access to transit, walkability, daily needs, unique restaurants, entertainment venues, and usable open space.
- When you combine the attraction of Thanksgiving Point, the employment center of Silicon Slopes, the convenience of FrontRunner, with unmatched design and sustainability-the result is a world class Transit Oriented CommunityThanksgiving Station.



## MAXIMIZES PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOOLS TO STRENGTHEN AND GROW MAJOR TRANSIT CORRIDORS

With explosive growth in Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain, traffic in Lehi has suffered due to its geographical location as an access point from I-15 to these cities. Lehi City, UDOT, Thanksgiving Point, and the project team have worked diligently to grow and expand the major transportation corridors surrounding the area. The plan was to take advantage of any tool that creates a better transit experience for residents, employees and visitors of the Lehi area. However, the only real viable long-term solution is to provide an alternative to sprawl into the exurbs. The induced demand conundrum was a catalyst for this project and the aim is to set the standard of future mixed-use development in Utah.
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- One of the most unique attributes of this project is the ability to bring housing, along with affordable housing, to the center of the major employment center, Silicon Slopes. Lehi City boasts some of the largest employers in the state including Texas Instruments, Young Living, Adobe, Entrata, and Sunrun. These employers, and countless more, can be accessed by either a short walk, a brief bike ride, or a quick transit trip.
- Thanksgiving Point, a stakeholder in this project, has a mission to bring the joy of learning and wonders of the natural world to life. They strive to spark curiosity in children about science and the natural world. Annual memberships will be made available for residents to explore this truly unique and unmatched amenity within the community.
- Utah Valley University's Thanksgiving Point campus is located directly adjacent to the north edge of the development. This campus offers in-person classes, continuing education courses, and numerous nondegree seeking options for individuals and families to participate in together.
- Mountain Land Technical College (MTECH) is located approximately $1 / 4$ of a mile from the project. MTECH's Lehi Campus offers programs in Healthcare, Automated Manufacturing, Information Technology, Construction Trades, and more.



## LAND USE COMPARISON



## MARKET PLAN - 551 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, LOWER DENSITY, SURFACE PARKING

- Type V-B Construction - 3 Stories, Surface Parking
- Maximum density - 25 units/acre
- Higher multifamily parking ratios - 2.0 stalls/unit
- Disconnected development with surface parking lots acting as impediments to walkability
- Not enough residential units to attract grocers or unique retail establishments
- No sense of community due to lack of placemaking features
- Promotes driving


## HTRZ PLAN - 1,800 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, HIGH DENSITY, ALL STRUCTURED PARKING

- Type V-A Construction - 5 Stories, Centralized Parking Structure
- Average density of 76 units/acre
- Reduced multifamily parking ratios - 1.5 stalls/unit and tapering down to 1.0 on subsequent phases
- Implementation of internal traffic calming features to put the pedestrian first and promote walkability
- Inclusion of placemaking strategies to create a sense of community and vibrancy
- Mixed-uses to create a true live, work, play environment through walkability and connectivity
- Able to attract more diverse retail establishments and grocers
- Master planning around the Lehi FrontRunner station to promote transit ridership
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## IMPEDIMENTS

- HTRZ was created to promote the right type of vertical development at transit stations along the Wasatch Front. Without HTRZ, transit stations will be underbuilt and impaired for decades to come. By utilizing HTRZ, transit-oriented developments can take full advantage of the billions of dollars invested in FrontRunner and can also minimize the future environmental impacts of growth.
- The development team is prepared to make a substantial investment around the Lehi FrontRunner station. However, there are several impediments that without HTRZ, make this investment unfeasible:
- Current market rents combined with substantially increased construction costs for buildings 5-stories or higher
- Costs for structured parking compared to surface parking
- Area specific power infrastructure upgrades (estimated to be \$17,000,000+)

[^0]
## MAP




## IMPACT OF HTRZ ON DEVELOPMENT

- If approved, HTRZ funding will be the sole incentive provided to this project, to date. Without HTRZ, densifying around the Lehi FrontRunner station is not financially feasible.
- All streets, open space, and park space will be privately owned but open to the public. The development will fund these projects and bear the costs of ongoing maintenance. Through keeping the streets private, the development will have more optionality to temporarily close streets for weekend farmer's markets, food trucks, and holiday events. Through keeping the park space private, the development will be able to attract more unique and upscale restaurants. Both of these decisions also ease the burden on Lehi City resources.
- One of the larger infrastructure improvements needed is the upsizing of power availability. Currently, there is enough available power to build approximately 600 units. In order to exceed this number, significant improvements are required such as substation expansion, property acquisition, and the procurement of new circuits and transformers. Without HTRZ to offset the additional costs of parking structures, these improvements would not be possible in even the best market conditions.
- With HTRZ funding, the project will be able to meet the objectives described in the HTRZ legislation and promote a higher utilization of public transit, increase the availability of housing and affordable housing, conserve scarce water resources, improve air quality through vehicular trip reduction, and demonstrate transformative mixed-use development.
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## SILICON SLOPES

- The Silicon Slopes area of Lehi is home to some of the most recognized companies in Utah. Adobe, Texas Instruments, Young Living, and many other companies have made significant investments in the local area and provide high-quality jobs that help fuel Utah's economic growth.
- Bringing a true, master planned mixed-use community to the heart of Silicon Slopes will support companies in recruiting and retaining the talent they need to grow and expand their businesses.
埌 TEXAS INSTRUMENTS



## ONE STOP FROM THE POINT

- With the recent announcement of a FrontRunner stop being included in The Point project, there is tremendous opportunity to create an economic barbell between the heart of Silicon Slopes (Lehi City) and The Point.
- The proposed development is one FrontRunner stop from The Point connecting two world-class transitoriented communities and enabling another level of live, work, play.
- This is an incredible opportunity to create seamless connectivity between two of the State's major economic drivers.

號


## THANKSGIVING POINT

- Thanksgiving Point is a partner and stakeholder in the proposed development. Over the last 25 years, The Ashton family, and individual donors, have contributed more than \$300MM to Thanksgiving Point. One of the core values of this development is to provide an ongoing revenue stream to sustain the community benefit that Thanksgiving Point provides to Utah County and Utah as a whole.
- Thanksgiving Point memberships will be made available for each residential unit. This will allow all residents to visit Thanksgiving Point at no cost to them. All profits from these membership sales will go directly to Thanksgiving Point to help fund their ongoing efforts to "Bring the joy of learning and wonders of the natural world to life" for future generations.
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## PRO FORMA MULTIFAMILY \& OFFICE

The following models summarize the incremental development costs associated with the development of higher density residential and office projects, and the tax increment needed to buy down or offset the costs to meet a standard investment criteria.

## MARKET DRIVEN MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT

Multifamily pro forma representing a typical 3-story garden style surface parked project at 25 units per acre.
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# HTRZ ENHANCED MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT 

This pro forma represents a 5-story wrap project with a centralized parking structure. This represents an increase in density from 25 to 80 units per acre. But for HTRZ, this increased density adjacent to the Lehi FrontRunner station would not be possible.
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## INCREMENTAL COSTS OF HIGH DENSITY MULTIFAMILY

The valuation analysis below highlights the HTRZ funding needed to offset the additional cost of densifying around the Lehi FrontRunner Station. This is the gap between low-density residential development ( $25 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ) and high-density residential development ( $80 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ ).

| 5-Story Type V Wrap Construction | Per Unit | Per RSF | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Construction Costs | 229,187 | 281 | $69,902,090$ |
| Structured Parking Costs | 45,000 | 55 | $13,725,000$ |
| Power Infrastructure Upgrades (prorated) | 6,967 | 9 | $2,125,000$ |
| Soft Costs | 52,400 | 64 | $15,981,879$ |
| Land Costs | 10,797 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $3,293,136$ |
| Total Costs | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 4 , 3 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 5 , 0 2 7 , 1 0 5}$ |
| Less: HTRZ TIF Incentive |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 , 0 2 8 , 5 8 0}$ |
| Ratio of Incentive to Total Costs |  | $\mathbf{2 2 , 9}$ |  |

## AFFORDABLE HOUSING ANALYSIS

- This affordable housing analysis quantifies the loss in value from reduced rents for the 80\% and 60\% AMI units.
- This analysis looks at a typical 305unit phase and factors for $9 \%$ of the units at $80 \%$ AMI (27) and $3 \%$ of the units at 60\% AMI (9). Utilities are assumed to be \$250/month and are included in the rent.
- In a typical 305 -unit phase, the 36 affordable units reduce stabilized NOI by $\$ 194,547$ annually. When a $5.00 \%$ capitalization rate is applied, this NOI loss results in a loss of value of $\$ 3,890,932$ or $\$ 108,081$ per affordable unit.
- The total project will provide 162 units at 80\% AMI and 54 units at 60\% AMI.
- All affordable units will be spread throughout the project and will be located in the same buildings, with the same amenities and floor plans as the market rate units.

|  |  | Affordable Rent Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Size (SF) | Unit Mix <br> \% | Market <br> Rent | $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ AMI <br> Rent | Difference <br> vs. Market | $\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ AMI <br> Rent | Difference <br> vs. Market |  |  |
| Studio | 550 | $10 \%$ | 1,350 | 1,344 | $(6)$ | 1,008 | $(342)$ |  |  |
| One-Bed | 715 | $52 \%$ | 1,550 | 1,536 | $(14)$ | 1,152 | $(398)$ |  |  |
| Two-Bed | 1,006 | $35 \%$ | 1,789 | 1,728 | $(61)$ | 1,296 | $(493)$ |  |  |
| Three-Bed | 1,230 | $3 \%$ | 2,000 | 1,920 | $(80)$ | 1,440 | $(560)$ |  |  |

AMI Rent Source: https://ric.novoco.com/tenant/rentincome/calculator/z1.jsp

|  | Loss per Unit from Reduced Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Loss in Value from Reduced Rents

| Cap Rate | NOI at Market Rent | Value | NOI w/ <br> AMI Units | Value | Variance from <br> Market | Loss Per Unit |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $4.75 \%$ | $4,587,284$ | $96,574,401$ | $4,392,737$ | $92,478,683$ | $(4,095,718)$ | $(113,770)$ |
| $5.00 \%$ | $4,587,284$ | $91,745,681$ | $4,392,737$ | $87,854,749$ | $(3,890,932)$ | $(108,081)$ |
| $5.25 \%$ | $4,587,284$ | $87,376,839$ | $4,392,737$ | $83,671,189$ | $(3,705,650)$ | $(102,935)$ |

## Summary

| Loss Per Unit | Total Affordable Units |  | Total Value Loss |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $(108,081)$ | $\mathbf{x}$ | 216 | $=$ | $(23,345,595)$ |

## MARKET DRIVEN OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

Office pro forma representing a typical surface parked property at 0.50 floor area ratio.

| Suite | Tenant | Gross SF | Rentable SF |  | Rent PSF | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | Tenant A | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 |
| 200 | Tenant B | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 |
| 300 | Tenant C | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 |
| 400 | Tenant A | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 |
| 500 | Tenant B | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 |
| 600 | Tenant C | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 |
| Totals |  | 180,000 | 153,000 |  | \$42 | 6,426,000 |
| Base Year Stabilized Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Rent |  |  |  |  |  | 6,426,000 |
| Vacancy \& Credit Loss |  |  |  | 7.00\% |  | $(449,820)$ |
| Effective Gross Income |  |  |  |  |  | 5,976,180 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  | 7.00 | PSF | (1,071,000) |
| Management Fees |  |  |  | 4.00\% | of EGI | $(239,047)$ |
| Reserves |  |  |  | 0.50 | PSF | $(76,500)$ |
| Total Expenses \& Reserves |  |  |  |  |  | $(1,386,547)$ |
| Net Operating Income |  |  |  |  |  | 4,589,633 |
| Construction Interest |  |  |  |  |  | (2,688,000) |
| Construction Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  | 1,901,633 |
| Long Term Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  | $(3,041,618)$ |
| Long Term Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  | 1,548,015 |
| Project Market Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Value |  |  |  | 7.00\% |  | 65,566,183 |
| Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Loan |  |  |  |  |  | 38,400,000 |
| Interest Rate |  |  |  |  |  | 7.00\% |
| Annual Construction Interest |  |  |  |  |  | 2,688,000 |
| Loan to Value |  |  |  |  |  | 58.6\% |
| Loan to Cost |  |  |  |  |  | 61.4\% |
| Permanent Loan |  |  |  |  |  | 39,340,000 |
| Loan to Value |  |  |  |  |  | 60.0\% |
| Interest Rate |  |  |  |  |  | 6.00\% |
| Annual Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  | $(3,041,618)$ |
| Amortization Period |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |
| Debt Yield |  |  |  |  |  | 11.67\% |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio |  |  |  |  |  | 1.51 |


| Project \& Site |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site (Acres) |  | 8.26 |
| Floor to Area Ratio |  | 0.50 |
| Rentable Building SF |  | 153,000 |
| Gross Building SF |  | 180,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |
| Construction Costs |  | 40,500,000 |
| Power Infrastructure Upgrades (prorated) |  |  |
| Parking Structure Costs (4/1,000 RSF) 612 | 4,500 | 2,754,000 |
| Architecture \& Engineering |  | 2,187,957 |
| Permits \& Impact Fees |  | 1,562,827 |
| Legal \& Misc. |  | 120,000 |
| Taxes \& Insurance |  | 275,000 |
| Construction Loan Fees \& Interest Reserve (18 months) |  | 2,769,200 |
| Development Overhead (5\%) |  | 2,765,653 |
| Soft Cost Contingency |  | 578,425 |
| Private Roads, Parks, Amenities |  | 1,800,000 |
| Land Costs |  | 7,200,000 |
| Total Project Costs |  | 62,513,062 |
| Per RSF |  | \$409 |
| Investment |  |  |
| Total Project Costs |  | 62,513,062 |
| HTRZ TIF Incentives |  |  |
| Adjusted Project Costs |  | 62,513,062 |
| Construction Loan |  | 38,400,000 |
| Equity Requirement - Construction |  | 24,113,062 |
| Equity Requirement - Perm Loan |  | 23,173,062 |
| Yield on Cost |  | 7.34\% |
| Market Cap Rate |  | 7.00\% |
| Yield/Cap Rate Spread |  | 0.34\% |
| Cash-on-Cash Return |  | 6.68\% |

## HTRZ ENHANCED OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

This pro forma represents an increase in density from 0.50 to 2.02 floor area ratio by including a parking structure. Mixing uses such as office and residential increases affordability, allows for cross-parking, and promotes walkability while taking vehicles off the road and contributing to improved air quality. But for HTRZ, this type of dense development adjacent to the Lehi FrontRunner station would not be possible.

| Suite | Tenant | Gross SF | Rentable SF |  | Rent PSF | Total | Project \& Site |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | Tenant A | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 | Site (Acres) 2.05 |  |  |
| 200 | Tenant B | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 | Floor to Area Ratio |  | . 02 |
| 300 | Tenant C | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 | Hor to Area Ratio |  |  |
| 400 | Tenant A | 30,000 | 25,500 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 | Rentable Building SF |  | 153,000 |
| 500 | Tenant B | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 | Gross Building SF |  | 180,000 |
| 600 | Tenant C | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | \$42 | 1,071,000 | Construction Costs |  |  |
| Totals |  | 180,000 | 153,000 |  | \$42 | 6,426,000 |  |  |  |
| Base Year Stabilized Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction Costs <br> Power Infrastructure Upgrades (prorated) |  | 40,500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,125,000 |
| Gross Potential Rent |  |  |  | 7.00\% |  | 6,426,000 |  |  | Parking Structure Costs (4/1,000 RSF) 612 | 30,000 | 18,360,000 |
| Vacancy \& Credit Loss |  |  |  |  |  | $(449,820)$ | Parking Structure Costs (4/1,00 RSF) 612 | 10,360,00 |  |
| Effective Gross Income |  |  |  |  |  | 5,976,180 | Architecture \& Engineering |  | 2,688,251 |  |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  | Permits \& Impact Fees |  | 1,920,179 |  |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  | 7.00 | PSF | $(1,071,000)$ | Legal \& Misc. |  | 120,000 |  |
| Management Fees |  |  |  | 4.00\% | of EGI | $(239,047)$ | Taxes \& Insurance |  | 350,000 |  |
| Reserves |  |  |  | 0.50 | PSF | $(76,500)$ | Construction Loan Fees \& Interest Reserve (18 months) |  | 2,769,200 |  |
| Total Expenses \& Reserves |  |  |  |  |  | $(1,386,547)$ | Development Overhead (5\%) |  | 3,751,250 |  |
| Net Operating Income |  |  |  |  |  | 4,589,633 | Soft Cost Contingency |  | 641,119 |  |
| Construction Interest |  |  |  |  |  | (2,688,000) | Private Roads, Parks, Amenities |  | 1,800,000 |  |
| Construction Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  | 1,901,633 | Land Costs |  | 1,782,178 |  |
| Long Term Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  | $(3,041,618)$ | Total Project Costs |  | 76,807,178 |  |
| Long Term Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  | 1,548,015 |  |  |  |  |
| Project Market Value |  |  |  |  |  |  | Per RSF |  | \$502 |  |
| Market Value |  |  |  | 7.00\% |  | 65,566,183 | Investment |  |  |  |
| Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Project Costs |  | 76,807,178 |  |
| Construction Loan |  |  |  |  |  | 38,400,000 | HTRZ TIF Incentives |  | $(14,294,116)$ |  |
| Interest Rate |  |  |  |  |  | 7.00\% | Adjusted Project Costs |  | 62,513,062 |  |
| Annual Construction Interest |  |  |  |  |  | 2,688,000 | Construction Loan |  | 38,400,000 |  |
| Loan to Value |  |  |  |  |  | 58.6\% |  |  |  |  |
| Loan to Cost |  |  |  |  |  | 50.0\% | Equity Requirement - Construction |  | 24,113,062 |  |
| Permanent Loan |  |  |  |  |  | 39,340,000 | Equity Requirement - Perm Loan |  | 23,173,062 |  |
| Loan to Value |  |  |  |  |  | 60.0\% | Yield on Cost |  | 7.34\% |  |
| Interest Rate |  |  |  |  |  | 6.00\% |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  | $(3,041,618)$ | Market Cap Rate |  | 7.00\% |  |
| Amortization Period |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | Yield/Cap Rate Spread |  | 0.34\% |  |
| Debt Yield |  |  |  |  |  | 11.67\% | Cash-on-Cash Return |  | 6.68\% |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio |  |  |  |  |  | 1.51 |  |  |  |  |

## INCREMENTAL COSTS OF HIGH-DENSITY OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

The valuation analysis below highlights the HTRZ funding needed to offset the additional cost of densifying around the Lehi FrontRunner Station. This is the gap between low-density office development ( 0.50 FAR) and high-density office development (2.02 FAR).

| 5-Story Type V Wrap Construction | Per RSF | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Construction Costs | 276.47 | $42,300,000$ |
| Structured Parking Costs | 120.00 | $18,360,000$ |
| Power Infrastructure Upgrades (prorated) | 13.89 | $2,125,000$ |
| Soft Costs | 80.00 | $12,240,000$ |
| Land Costs | 11.65 | $1,782,178$ |
| Total Costs | $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 7 6 , 8 0 7 , 1 7 8}$ |
| Less: HTRZ TIF Incentive | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 , 2 9 4 , 1 1 6}$ |
| Ratio of Incentive to Total Costs | $\mathbf{l}$ |  |
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## TOTAL GAP FOR THE HTRZ DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## Projected Total Gap for the HTRZ

Total Units in HTRZ with Type V Wrap (structured parking)
x TIF Incentive per Unit
$=$ Minimum Amount of TIF for Development
\$141,808,012
Residential Units Inside of HTRZ

Units at 60\% of AMI
3.00\%

Total Affordable Units
x Value Loss per Unit
= Minimum Amount of TIF for Reduced Rents
\$23,345,595
Total Office Square Footage in HTRZ w/ Structured Parking
$\times$ HTRZ TIF Incentive PSF
\$93
= Minimum Amount of TIF for Development
\$71,937,708
Combined Total

## EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR

| Tax Districts | Final Tax Rate |  |  | Assumptions (Res | emiaj) |  | Unit Types | Infiation | Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UTAH COUNTY | 0.000661 |  |  | \% Primar | 100\% |  | Apartments | 1.00\% | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| MULTICOUNTY ASSESSING \& Collecting Levy | 0.000015 |  |  | Primar Av | 55\% |  | Class A Office | 1.00\% | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| COUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY | 0.000111 |  |  | \%Secondary | 0\% |  | Retail Shops | 1.00\% | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | 0.005724 |  |  |  |  |  | UTA Apartments | 1.00\% | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| LeHICITY | 0.001189 |  |  |  |  |  | UTA Retail | 1.00\% | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEHI METROPOLTAN WATER DISTRICT | 0.000006 |  |  |  |  |  | UTA Office | 1.00\% | No |  |  |  |  |  |
| NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY | ${ }^{0.0000012}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Centralutah water conservancy | 0.000400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total | 0.008118 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year |  | ${ }_{2024}^{1}$ | ${ }_{2025}^{2}$ | 2026 | 4 2027 | 5 2028 | 6 2029 | 7 2030 | 8 2031 | 2032 | 10 2033 | 11 2034 | 12 2035 | 13 2036 |
| Absorption | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 1,600 |  | 70 | 305 | 225 | 250 | 225 | 225 | 225 | 75 |  |  |  |  |
| Class A Office | 770,000 |  | 380,000 |  |  | 120,000 | 270,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail Shops | 150,000 | 70,000 |  | 23,500 | 33,000 |  | 23,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA Apartments | 200 |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA Retail UTA Office | 47,000 27,000 |  |  |  |  | 47,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 27,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 270,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Absorption | 1,238,800 | 70,000 | 380,070 | 24,005 | 33,225 | 167,250 | 563,725 | 225 | 225 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Values | Per Sq.Ft./Sale Price |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$300,000 | \$300,000 | \$303,00 | \$306,030 | \$309,90 | \$312,181 | \$315,303 | \$318,456 | \$321,641 | \$324,57 | \$328,106 | \$331,387 | \$334,701 | \$338,048 |
| Class A Office | \$300 | \$300 | \$303 | \$306 | \$309 | \$312 | \$315 | \$318 | \$322 | \$325 | \$328 | \$331 | \$335 | \$338 |
| Retail Shops | \$200 | \$200 | \$202 | \$204 | \$206 | \$208 | \$210 | \$212 | \$214 | \$217 | \$219 | \$221 | \$223 | \$225 |
| UTA Apartments | \$240,000 | \$240,000 | \$242,400 | \$244,824 | \$247,272 | \$24,745 | \$252,242 | \$254,765 | \$257,312 | \$259,886 | \$262,84 | \$265,109 | \$267,760 | \$270,438 |
| UTA Retail | \$200 | \$200 | \$202 | \$204 | \$206 | \$208 | \$210 | \$212 | \$214 | \$217 | \$219 | \$221 | \$223 | \$225 |
| UTA Office | \$300 | \$300 | \$303 | \$306 | \$309 | \$312 | \$315 | \$318 | \$322 | \$325 | \$328 | \$331 | \$335 | \$338 |
| Absorbed Assessed Values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$275,807,933 | \$0 | \$11,665,500 | \$51,336,533 | \$38,249,925 | \$42,924,915 | \$39,018,748 | \$39,408,936 | \$39,803,025 | \$13,400,352 | so | so | \$0 | so |
| Class A Office | \$237,733,588 | \$0 | \$115,140,000 | so | so | \$37,461,744 | \$85,131,814 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| Retail Shops | \$30,534,204 | \$14,000,000 | so | \$4,794,470 | \$6,79,987 | so | \$4,939,747 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| UTA Apartments | \$26,930,40 | \$0 | so | \$26,930,640 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 |
| UTA Retail | \$9,781,678 | \$0 | \$0 | so | so | \$9,781,678 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| UTA Office | \$85,131,814 | \$0 | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | \$85,131,814 | so | so | \$0 | so | \$0 | so | so |
| Total Annual Value | \$665,919,827 | \$14,000,000 | \$126,805,500 | \$83,061,643 | \$45,049,911 | \$90,168,337 | \$214,222,123 | \$39,408,936 | \$39,803,025 | \$13,400,352 | 50 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| Total C Cumulative Value |  | \$14,000,000 | \$140,945,500 | \$225,416,598 | \$272,720,675 | \$365,616,219 | \$ $583,494,505$ | \$628,738,385 | \$674,888,794 | \$694,977,434 | \$701,927,208 | \$708,946,480 | \$716,035,945 | \$723,196,304 |
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EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT.

| Year |  | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 2037 \\ 204 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 2038 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ 2039 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 2040 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 2041 \\ 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 2042 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 2043 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 2044 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2045 \\ 2045 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23 \\ 2046 \end{array}$ | 24 2047 | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 2048 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26 \\ 2049 \end{array}$ | $2050$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Absorption Apartments Class A Officice Retail Shops UTA Apartments UTA Retail UTA Office | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ 1,600 \\ 770,000 \\ 150,000 \\ 200 \\ 47,000 \\ 270,000 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Absorption | 1,238,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Market Values | Per Sq.Ft./Sale Price |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$300,000 | \$341,428 | \$344,842 | \$348,291 | \$351,774 | \$355,291 | \$358,844 | \$362,433 | \$366,057 | \$369,718 | \$373,415 | \$377,149 | \$380,920 | \$384,730 | \$388,577 |
| Class A Office | \$300 | \$341 | \$345 | \$348 | \$352 | \$355 | \$359 | \$362 | \$366 | \$370 | \$373 | \$377 | \$381 | \$385 | 5389 |
| Retail Shops | \$200 | \$228 | \$230 | \$232 | \$235 | \$237 | \$239 | \$242 | \$244 | \$246 | \$249 | \$251 | \$254 | \$256 | \$259 |
| UTA Apartments | \$240,000 | \$273,142 | \$275,874 | \$278,633 | \$281,419 | \$284,233 | \$287,075 | \$289,946 | \$292,846 | \$295,774 | \$298,732 | \$301,719 | \$304,736 | \$307,784 | \$310,862 |
| UTA Retail | \$200 | $\$ 228$ $\$ 381$ | \$230 | ${ }_{\$} 5322$ | \$235 | \$237 | \$239 | \$242 | \$244 | \$246 | $\stackrel{\text { S249 }}{ }$ | \$251 | \$254 | \$256 | \$259 |
| UTA Office | \$300 | \$341 | \$345 | \$348 | \$352 | \$355 | \$359 | \$362 | \$366 | \$370 | \$373 | \$377 | \$381 | \$385 | \$389 |
| Absorbed Assessed Values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$275,807,933 | so | so | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so |
| Class A Office | \$237,733,558 | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| Retail Shops | \$30,534,204 | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| UTA Apartments | \$26,930,640 | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| UTA Retail | \$9,781,678 | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| UTA Office | \$85,131,814 | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| Total Annual Value | \$665,919,827 | 50 | so | 50 | S0 | S0 | 50 | s0 | so | S0 | so | S0 | so | 50 | so |
| Total Cumulative Value |  | \$730,428,267 | \$737,732,550 | \$745,109,876 | \$752,560,974 | \$760,086,584 | \$767,687,450 | \$775,364,324 | \$783,117,968 | \$790,949,147 | \$798,858,639 | \$800,847,225 | \$814,915,697 | \$805,110,806 | \$650,542,484 |


| Discount Rate | 7.0\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Long Term Inflation Rate (post absorption) | 1.0\% |
|  | Check |


|  | Year Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail Shop 2024 | 25 | \$15,933,306 | \$16,092,639 | \$16,253,565 | S16,416,101 | \$16,50,262 | \$16,746,065 | \$16,913,525 | \$17,082,661 | \$17,25, 48 | \$17,42,022 | \$17,60, 282 | \$17,776,285 |  |  |
| Apartments 2025 | 25 | \$13,144,977 | \$13,276,427 | \$13,409,191 | \$11,543,283 | \$13,68,716 | \$13,815,503 | \$13,95, 658 | \$14,093,195 | \$14,234,127 | \$14,376,468 | \$14,520,233 | \$14,665,435 | \$14,812,090 |  |
| Apartments 2026 | 25 | \$57,274,544 | \$57,847,290 | \$58,425,763 | \$59,010,020 | \$59,60, 121 | \$60,196,122 | \$60,798,083 | \$61,406,064 | \$62,020,124 | \$62,640,326 | \$63,266,729 | \$63,899,396 | \$64,53,390 | \$65,183,744 |
| Apartments 2027 | 25 | \$42,251,713 | \$42,674,230 | S43,100,972 | 543,531,982 | \$43,96, ,302 | 544,406,975 | 544,851,045 | \$45,299,555 | \$45,752,551 | \$46,210,076 | \$46,672,177 | S47,138,899 | \$47,61,288 | 548,086,391 |
| Apartments 2028 | 25 | \$46,946,348 | \$47,415,811 | \$47,889,969 | \$48,368,869 | \$48,85, 558 | \$49,341,083 | 549,834,494 | \$50,332,839 | \$50,836,168 | \$51,344,529 | \$51,857,975 | \$52,376,554 | \$52,900,320 | \$53,429,323 |
| Apartments 2029 | 25 | \$42,251,713 | \$42,674,230 | \$43,100,972 | \$43,531,982 | \$43,96, ,02 | \$44,406,975 | \$44,851,045 | \$45,29,555 | \$45,752,51 | \$46,210,076 | \$46,672,177 | \$47,138,899 | \$47,610,288 | \$48,086,391 |
| Apartments 2030 | 25 | \$42,251,713 | \$42,674,230 | \$43,100,972 | \$43,531,982 | \$43,66,302 | \$44,406,975 | \$44,851,045 | \$45,29,555 | \$45,75, 551 | \$46,210,076 | \$46,672,177 | \$47,138,899 | \$47,610,288 | \$48,086,391 |
| Apartments 2031 | 25 | \$42,251,713 | \$42,674,230 | \$43,100,972 | \$43,531,982 | \$43,96, 3 ,02 | \$44,406,975 | \$44,851,045 | \$45,29, 555 | \$45,752,551 | \$46,210,076 | \$46,672,177 | \$47,138,899 | \$47,610,288 | \$48,086,391 |
| Apartments 2032 | 25 | \$14,083,904 | \$14,224,743 | \$14,366,991 | \$14,510,661 | \$14,65,767 | \$14,802,325 | \$14,950,348 | \$15,099,852 | \$15,25,850 | \$15,403,359 | \$15,557,392 | \$15,712,966 | \$15,870,096 | \$16,028,797 |
| UTA Apartments | 25 | \$33,045,663 | \$30,346,119 | \$30,649,580 | \$30,956,076 | \$31,265,637 | \$31,578,293 | \$31,894,076 | \$32,213,017 | \$32,535,147 | \$32,86,499 | \$33,189,104 | \$33,52, 2995 | \$33,856,205 | \$34,194,767\| |
| UTA Retail | 25 | \$10,698,077 | \$10,805,058 | \$10,913,108 | S11,022,239 | \$11,132,462 | \$11,243,786 | \$11,356,22 | \$11,469,786 | \$11,584,484 | \$11,700,329 | \$11,817,332 | \$11,935,506 | \$12,054,861 | \$12,175,409 |
| UTA Office | 25 | \$92,185,556 | \$93,107,411 | \$94,038,485 | \$94,978,870 | \$95,92,659 | \$96,887,946 | \$97,856,825 | ¢98,835,393 | \$99,823,747 | \$100,821,985 | \$101,83,204 | S102,888,507 | \$103,876,992 | \$104,915,762 |
| Class A Office 2025 | 25 | \$119,742,634 | \$131,040,060 | \$132,350,461 | \$133,673,966 | \$135,010,705 | \$136,360,812 | \$137,724,420 | \$139,101,665 | \$140,492,681 | \$141,897,608 | \$143,316,584 | \$144,79,750 | \$146,197,247 |  |
| Class A Office 2028 | 25 | \$40,971,358 | \$41,381,072 | \$41,794,882 | \$42,212,831 | \$42,34,960 | \$43,061,309 | \$43,491,922 | \$43,926,841 | \$44,366,110 | \$44,809,771 | \$45,257,869 | \$45,710,447 | \$46,167,552 | \$46,629,227 |
| Class A Office 2029 | 25 | \$92,185,556 | \$93,107,411 | \$94,038,485 | \$94,978,870 | \$95,98,659 | \$96,887,946 | \$97,856,825 | \$98,835,393 | \$99,823,747 | \$100,821,985 | \$101,830,204 | \$102,888,507 | \$103,876,992 | \$104,915,762 |
| Retail Shops 2026 | 25 | \$5,39,038 | \$5,402,529 | \$5,46,554 | \$5,51,120 | \$5,566,231 | \$5,621,893 | \$5,678,112 | \$5,734,893 | \$5,792,242 | \$5,850,165 | \$5,908,666 | \$5,96,753 | 56,027,430 | 56,087,705 |
| Retail Shops 2027 | 25 | \$7,51,416 | \$7,58,530 | \$7,662,395 | \$7,73,019 | \$7,816,409 | \$7,894,573 | \$7,973,519 | 58,053,254 | \$8,133,787 | \$8,215,125 | 58,297,276 | 58,38,249 | \$8,46,051 | \$8,548,692 |
| Retail Shops 2029 | 25 | \$5,39,038 | \$5,402,529 | \$5,456,554 | \$5,51,120 | \$5,566,231 | \$5,621,893 | \$5,678,112 | \$5,734,893 | \$5,792,242 | \$5,850,165 | \$5,908,666 | \$5,967,753 | \$6,027,430 | \$6,087,705 |
| Total |  | \$730,428,267 | \$737,732,550 | \$745,199,876 | \$752,560,974 | \$760,086,584 | \$767,687,450 | \$775,364,324 | \$783,117,968 | \$790,949,147 | \$798,858,639 | \$806,847,225 | \$814,915,697 | \$805,110,806 | \$650,542,484 |

## EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT.

| Year |  | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 2051 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2052 \\ 2052 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ 2053 \\ 2035 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31 \\ 2054 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ 2055 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 2056 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 2057 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35 \\ 2058 \\ 205 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ 2059 \\ 2059 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ 2060 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38 \\ 2061 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39 \\ 2062 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4003 \\ 2063 \end{array}$ | 41 2064 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Absorption Apartments Class A Office Retail Shops UTA Apartments UTA Retail UTA Office | Total 1,600 770,000 150,000 200 47,000 270,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Absorption | 1,238,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Market Values | Per Sq.Ft./Sale Price |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$300,000 | \$392,463 | \$396,387 | \$400,351 | \$404,355 | \$408,398 | \$412,482 | \$416,607 | \$420,773 | \$424,981 | \$429,231 | \$433,523 | \$437,858 | \$442,237 | \$446,659 |
| Class A Office | \$300 | \$392 | \$396 | \$400 | \$404 | \$408 | \$412 | \$417 | \$421 | \$425 | \$429 | \$434 | \$438 | \$442 | \$447 |
| Retail Shops | \$200 | \$262 | \$264 | \$267 | \$270 | \$272 | \$275 | \$278 | \$281 | \$283 | \$286 | \$289 | \$292 | \$295 | \$298 |
| UTA Apartments | \$240,000 | \$313,970 | \$317,110 | \$320,281 | \$323,484 | \$326,719 | \$329,986 | \$333,286 | \$336,618 | \$339,98 | \$343,385 | \$346,818 | \$350,287 | \$353,789 | \$357,327 |
| UTA Retail | \$200 | \$262 | \$264 | \$267 | \$270 | \$272 | \$275 | \$278 | 5281 | 5283 | \$286 | \$289 | \$292 | \$295 | \$298 |
| UTA Office | \$300 | \$392 | \$396 | \$400 | \$404 | \$408 | \$412 | \$417 | \$421 | \$425 | \$429 | \$434 | \$438 | \$442 | \$447 |
| Absorbed Assessed Values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$275,807,933 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| Class A Office | \$237,733,558 | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | \$0 |
| Retail Shops | \$30,53, 204 | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UTA Apartments | \$26,930,440 | so | so | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | \$0 | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UTA Retail | \$9,781,678 | so | so | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | so |
| UTA Office | \$85,13, 814 | so | so | \$0 | so | \$0 | \$0 | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | so |
| Total Annual Value | \$665,919,827 | so | 50 | \$0 | 50 | 50 | \$0 | 50 | 50 | so | so | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total C Cumulative Value |  | 50,527,001 | \$498,258,824 | \$387,06,651 | \$116,757,412 | \$67,385,707 | \$17,014,891 | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | \$0 |



\section*{EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT. <br> | Year |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4064 \\ 2064 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 42 \\ 2065 \end{array}$ | 43 2066 | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \\ 2067 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ 2068 \end{gathered}$ | 46 2069 | ${ }^{47}$ | 48 2071 | ${ }_{2} 49$ | 50 2073 | 51 2074 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Absorption Apartments Class A Office Retail Shops UTA Apartments UUA Retail UTA Office | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ 71,600 \\ 770,00 \\ 150,000 \\ 200 \\ 47,00 \\ 47000 \\ 270,000 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Absorption | 1,238,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Market Values | Per Sq.Ft./ Sale Price |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$300,000 | \$446,659 | \$451,126 | \$455,637 | \$460,193 | \$464,795 | \$469,433 | \$474,138 | \$478,879 | \$483,668 | \$488,505 | \$493,390 |
| Class A Office | \$300 | \$447 | \$451 | \$456 | \$460 | \$465 | \$469 | \$474 | \$479 | \$484 | \$489 | \$493 |
| Retail Shops | \$200 | \$298 | \$301 | \$304 | \$307 | \$310 | \$313 | \$316 | \$319 | \$322 | \$326 | \$329 |
| UTA Apartments | \$240,000 | \$357,327 | \$360,901 | \$364,510 | \$368,155 | \$371,836 | \$375,555 | \$379,310 | \$383,103 | \$386,934 | \$390,804 | \$394,712 |
| UTA Retail | \$200 | \$298 | \$301 | \$304 | \$307 | \$310 | \$313 | \$316 | \$319 | \$322 | \$326 | \$329 |
| UTA Office | \$300 | \$447 | \$451 | \$456 | \$460 | \$465 | \$469 | \$474 | \$479 | \$484 | \$489 | \$493 |
| Absorbed Assessed Values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | \$275,807,933 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| Class A Office | \$237,73,558 | so | s0 | so | so | so | s0 | so | so | so | so | \$0 |
| Retail Shops | \$30,534,204 | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | \$0 | so | \$0 | \$0 |
| UTA Apartments | \$26,930,640 | so | so | so | so | so | s0 | so | so | so | so | \$0 |
| UTA Retail | \$9,781,678 | so | so | so | \$0 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| UTA Office | \$85,131,814 | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so | so |
| Total Annual Value | \$665,919,827 | \$0 | 50 | so | so | so | 50 | so | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Total C Cumulative Value |  | \$0 | \$0 | so | \$0 | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 | \$0 | \$0 |

## EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT.

| Year |  | ${ }_{2}^{1} 204$ | ${ }_{2}^{2025}$ | ${ }^{3} 26$ | ${ }_{2027}^{4}$ | 5 2028 | ${ }_{2029}^{6}$ | ${ }_{2030}^{7}$ | 8 2031 | ${ }_{2032}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ \\ 2033 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ \\ 2034 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{ }{2035}{ }_{2035}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Incremental Value Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Year Taxable Value |  | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 |
| Assessed Value |  | \$35,659,600 | \$162,605,100 | \$247,076,198 | \$294,380,275 | \$387,275,819 | \$605,154,105 | \$650,397,985 | \$696,488,394 | \$716,637,034 | \$723,586,808 | \$730,606,080 | \$737,695,545 |
| Incremental Value |  | \$14,000,000 | \$140,945,500 | \$225,416,598 | \$272,720,675 | \$365,616,219 | \$583,494,505 | \$628,738,385 | \$674,828,794 | \$694,977,434 | \$701,927,208 | \$708,946,480 | \$716,035,945 |
| Base Year Taxable Value Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| utah county | \$472,461 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 |
| muticountr assessing a collecting levy | \$10,722 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 |
| COUNTY ASSESIING \& COLLECTING LEVY | \$79,339 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 |
| ALPINE SCHOOLDISTRICT | \$4,091,325 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 |
| LEHIITY | \$849,858 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 |
| LEHI Metropolitan Water ilstrict | \$4,289 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$8,577 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 |
| central Ltah water conservancy | \$285,907 | \$8,64 | \$8,664 | \$8,64 | \$8,64 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 |
| total | \$5,802,477 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 |
| Incremental Tax Reverues - 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah county | \$12,431,894 | \$9,254 | \$93,165 | \$149,000 | \$180,268 | \$241,672 | \$385,690 | \$415,596 | \$446,062 | \$459,380 | \$463,974 | \$468,614 | \$473,300 |
| mutticounty assessing a Collecting levy | \$282,116 | \$210 | \$2,14 | \$3,81 | \$4,091 | \$5,484 | \$8,52 | \$9,431 | \$10,122 | \$10,425 | \$10,529 | \$10,634 | \$10,741 |
| countr Assessing a colecting levy | \$2,087,655 | \$1,554 | \$15,645 | \$25,021 | \$30,272 | \$40,583 | \$64,768 | \$69,790 | \$74,906 | \$77,142 | \$77,914 | \$78,693 | \$79,480 |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | \$107,655,312 | \$80,136 | \$806,772 | \$1,20,285 | \$1,561,053 | \$2,092,787 | \$3,33,923 | \$3,598,899 | \$3,862,720 | \$3,978,051 | \$4,017,831 | 54,058,010 | \$4,098,590 |
| LEHIC CITY | \$22,362,363 | \$16,646 | \$167,584 | \$268,020 | \$324,265 | \$434,718 | \$693,775 | \$747,570 | \$802,371 | \$826,328 | \$834,591 | \$842,937 | \$851,367 |
| LeHI Metropoltan Water ilstrict | \$112,846 | \$84 | \$846 | \$1,352 | \$1,636 | \$2,94 | \$3,51 | \$3,72 | \$4,049 | \$4,170 | \$4,212 | \$4,254 | \$4,296 |
| north utah countr water conservancy | \$225,692 | \$168 | \$1,691 | \$2,705 | \$3,273 | \$4,387 | \$7,002 | \$7,545 | \$8,098 | 58,340 | \$8,423 | \$8,507 | \$8,592 |
| CEntral utah water conservancy | 57,52,083 | \$5,600 | \$56,378 | \$90,167 | \$109,088 | \$146,246 | \$233,398 | \$251,495 | \$269,932 | \$277,991 | \$280,771 | \$283,579 | \$286,414 |
| total | \$152,680,962 | \$113,652 | \$1,144,196 | \$1,829,932 | \$2,213,946 | \$2,968,072 | \$4,736,808 | \$5,104,098 | \$5,478,260 | \$5,641,827 | \$5,698,245 | \$5,75, 228 | \$5,812,780 |
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MLITCOUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY
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MULTICOUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEY
COUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTNG LEVY
ALPINE SCHOOLDISTRICT
LEHH CITY
LEHI METROPOLITAN WATERDISTRICT
NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONSERVANG

| $80 \%$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $80 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| Incremental Tax Revenues to Taxing Entities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Utah county | \$2,486,379 | \$1,851 | \$18,633 | \$29,800 | \$36,054 | \$48,334 | \$77,138 | \$83,119 | \$89,212 | \$91,876 | \$92,795 | \$93,723 | \$99,660 |
| muticounty Assessing a collecting levy | \$56,423 | \$42 | \$423 | \$676 | \$818 | \$1,097 | \$1,750 | \$1,886 | \$2,024 | \$2,085 | \$2,106 | \$2,127 | \$2,148 |
| County assessing \& Collecting levy | \$417,531 | \$311 | \$3,129 | \$5,004 | \$6,054 | \$8,117 | \$12,954 | \$13,958 | \$14,981 | \$15,428 | \$15,583 | \$15,739 | \$15,896 |
| ALPINE SCHool district | \$21,531,062 | \$16,027 | \$161,354 | \$258,057 | \$312,211 | \$418,557 | \$667,985 | \$719,780 | \$772,544 | \$795,610 | \$80,566 | \$811,602 | \$819,718 |
| LEHICITY | \$4,472,473 | \$3,329 | \$33,517 | \$53,604 | \$64,853 | \$86,944 | \$138,755 | \$149,514 | \$160,474 | \$165,266 | \$166,918 | \$168,587 | \$170,273 |
| LeHI Metropoltan Water ilstict | \$22,569 | \$17 | \$169 | \$270 | \$327 | \$439 | \$700 | \$754 | \$810 | \$834 | \$842 | \$851 | \$859 |
| north utah countr water conservancy | \$45,138 | \$34 | \$338 | \$541 | \$655 | \$877 | \$1,400 | \$1,509 | \$1,620 | \$1,668 | \$1,685 | \$1,701 | \$1,718 |
| central utah water conservancy | \$1,504,617 | \$1,120 | \$11,276 | \$18,033 | \$21,818 | \$29,249 | \$46,680 | \$50,299 | \$53,986 | \$55,598 | \$56,154 | \$56,716 | \$57,283 |
| total | \$30,536,192 | \$22,730 | \$228,839 | \$365,986 | \$442,789 | \$593,614 | \$947,362 | \$1,020,820 | \$1,095,652 | \$1,128,365 | \$1,139,649 | \$1,151,046 | \$1,162,556 |
| Tax Revenues to HTRZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| muticounty Assessing a collecting levy | \$225,992 | \$168 | \$1,691 | \$2,705 | \$3,273 | \$4,387 | \$7,02 | \$7,545 | \$8,998 | \$8,340 | \$8,423 | \$8,507 | \$8,592 |
| County assessing \& Colecting levy | \$1,67,124 | \$1,243 | \$12,516 | \$20,017 | \$24,218 | \$32,467 | \$51,814 | \$55,832 | \$59,925 | \$61,714 | \$62,331 | \$62,954 | \$63,584 |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | \$86,124,250 | \$64,109 | \$645,418 | \$1,032,228 | \$1,248,843 | \$1,674,230 | \$2,671,938 | \$2,879,119 | \$3,090,176 | \$3,18,441 | \$3,214,265 | \$3,246,408 | \$3,27, 872 |
| LEHIITY | \$17,889,890 | \$13,317 | \$134,067 | \$214,416 | \$259,412 | \$347,774 | \$555,020 | \$598,056 | \$641,897 | \$661,063 | \$667,673 | \$674,350 | \$681,093 |
| LeHI METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT | \$90,277 | \$67 | \$677 | \$1,82 | \$1,309 | \$1,755 | \$2,801 | \$3,018 | \$3,239 | \$3,336 | \$3,369 | \$3,403 | \$3,437 |
| north utah countr water conservancy | \$180,554 | \$134 | \$1,353 | \$2,164 | \$2,618 | \$3,510 | \$5,602 | \$6,036 | \$6,478 | \$6,672 | \$6,739 | \$6,806 | \$6,874 |
| Central utah water conservancy | \$6,018,466 | \$4,480 | \$45,103 | \$72,133 | \$87,271 | \$116,997 | \$186,718 | \$201,196 | \$215,945 | \$222,393 | \$224,617 | \$226,863 | \$229,132 |
| total | \$122,144,769 | \$90,922 | \$915,356 | \$1,463,946 | \$1,711,157 | \$2,374,458 | \$3,789,447 | \$4,083,279 | \$4,382,608 | \$4,513,461 | \$4,58,596 | \$4,604,182 | \$4,650,224 |
| Agency Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Percent |  | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |
| Administrative Amount | (53,664,343) | ( $\$ 2,728)$ | (\$27,461) | (\$43,918) | ( 553,135 ) | (\$71,234) | (\$113,683) | ( 5122,498$)$ | (\$131,478) | (\$135,404) | (\$136,758) | ( $\$ 138,125)$ | (\$139,507) |
| Housing Percent |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Housing Amount | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | \$0 | so | \$0 | \$0 |
| Remaining Increment for Projects | \$118,480,426 | \$88,194 | \$887,896 | \$1,420,027 | \$1,718,022 | \$2,303,224 | \$3,675,763 | \$3,960,780 | \$4,251,130 | \$4,378,058 | \$4,421,838 | \$4,466,057 | \$4,510,717 |
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## EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT.

| Year |  | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 | 2040 | 2041 | 2042 | 2043 | 2044 | 2045 | 2046 | 2047 |
| Incremental Value Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Year Taxable Value |  | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 |
| Assessed Value |  | \$744,85,904 | \$752,087,867 | \$759,39,150 | \$766,769,476 | \$774,220,574 | \$781,746,184 | \$789,347,050 | \$797,023,924 | \$804,777,568 | \$812,608,747 | \$820,518,239 | \$828,506,825 |
| Incremental Value |  | \$723,196,304 | \$730,428,267 | \$737,732,550 | \$745,109,876 | \$752,560,974 | \$760,086,584 | \$767,687,450 | \$775,364,324 | \$783,117,968 | \$790,949,147 | \$798,858,639 | \$806,847,225 |
| Base Year Taxable Value Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH County | \$472,461 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 |
| muticountr assessing a Colecting levy | \$10,722 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 |
| County Assesing e collecting levy | \$79,339 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | \$4,091,325 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 |
| LEHICITY | \$849,858 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 |
| LEHI METROPOLTAN WATER DISTRIICT | \$4,289 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$8,577 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 |
| centralutah water conservancy | \$285,907 | \$8,64 | 58,664 | \$8,64 | \$8,664 | \$8,64 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 |
| Total | \$5,802,477 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 |
| Incremental Tax Revenues - 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$478,033 | \$482,813 | \$487,641 | \$492,518 | \$497,443 | \$502,417 | \$507,441 | \$512,516 | \$517,641 | \$522,817 | \$528,046 | \$533,326 |
| muticounty Assessing a collecting levy | \$288,116 | \$10,848 | \$10,956 | \$11,066 | \$11,177 | \$11,288 | \$11,401 | \$11,515 | \$11,630 | \$11,747 | \$11,864 | \$11,983 | \$12,103 |
| Countr assessing e collecting levy | \$2,087,655 | \$80,275 | \$81,078 | \$81,888 | \$82,707 | \$83,534 | \$84,370 | \$85,213 | \$86,065 | \$86,926 | \$87,795 | \$88,673 | \$89,560 |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRIIT | \$107,655,312 | \$4,13, 976 | \$4,18,971 | \$4,22,781 | \$4,265,009 | \$4,307,659 | \$4,350,736 | \$4,394,243 | \$4,438,185 | \$4,482,567 | \$4,527,393 | \$4,572,667 | \$4,618,394 |
| LeHIIITY | \$22,362,36 | \$89,880 | \$868,479 | \$877,164 | \$885,936 | \$894,795 | \$903,743 | \$912,780 | \$921,908 | \$931,127 | \$940,439 | \$949,843 | \$959,341 |
| Lehi metropoutan water district | \$112,846 | \$4,339 | \$4,383 | \$4,426 | \$4,471 | \$4,515 | \$4,561 | \$4,606 | \$4,652 | \$4,699 | \$4,746 | \$4,793 | \$4,841 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$225,692 | \$8,678 | \$8,765 | \$8,853 | \$8,941 | \$9,031 | \$9,121 | \$9,212 | \$9,304 | \$9,397 | \$9,491 | \$9,586 | \$9,682 |
| Central utah water conservancy | \$7,523,083 | \$289,279 | \$292,171 | \$295,093 | \$298,044 | \$301,024 | \$304,035 | \$307,075 | \$310,146 | \$313,247 | \$316,380 | \$319,543 | \$322,739 |
| total | \$152,680,962 | \$5,870,908 | \$5,929,617 | \$5,988,913 | \$6,048,802 | \$6,109,290 | \$6,170,383 | 56,232,087 | \$6,29,408 | 56,357,352 | \$6,420,925 | \$6,485,134 | 56,549,986 |
| Contribution to HTRZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| utah county |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| multicounty assessing a collecting levy |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| countr assesing e collecting levy |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRIIT |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| LEHICITY |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| LEHI Metropolitan Water distict |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| North utah county water conservancy |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| Central utah water conservancy |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Tax Revenues to Taxing Entities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$95,607 | \$96,563 | \$97,528 | \$98,504 | \$99,489 | \$100,483 | \$101,488 | \$102,503 | \$103,528 | \$104,563 | \$105,609 | \$106,665 |
| muticounty Assessing a Collecting levy | \$56,423 | \$2,170 | \$2,191 | \$2,213 | \$2,235 | \$2,258 | \$2,80 | \$2,303 | \$2,326 | \$2,349 | \$2,373 | \$2,397 | \$2,421 |
| COUNTY ASSESSING \& Collecting levy | \$417,531 | \$16,055 | \$16,216 | \$16,378 | \$16,541 | \$16,707 | \$16,874 | \$17,043 | \$17,213 | \$17,385 | \$17,559 | \$17,735 | \$17,912 |
| ALPINE SCHool district | \$21,531,062 | \$827,915 | \$836,194 | \$844,566 | \$853,002 | \$861,532 | \$870,147 | \$878,849 | \$887,637 | \$896,513 | \$905,479 | \$914,533 | \$923,679 |
| LEHICITY | \$4,472,473 | \$171,976 | \$173,696 | \$175,433 | \$177,187 | \$178,959 | \$180,749 | \$182,56 | \$184,382 | \$186,225 | \$188,088 | \$189,969 | \$191,868 |
| Lehi metropoutan water district | \$22,569 | \$868 | \$877 | \$885 | \$894 | \$903 | \$912 | \$921 | \$930 | \$940 | \$949 | \$959 | \$968 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$45,138 | \$1,736 | \$1,753 | \$1,771 | \$1,788 | \$1,806 | \$1,824 | \$1,842 | \$1,861 | \$1,879 | \$1,898 | \$1,917 | \$1,936 |
| Central utah water conservancy | \$1,504,617 | \$57,856 | \$58,434 | \$59,019 | \$59,609 | \$60,205 | \$60,807 | \$61,415 | \$62,029 | \$62,649 | \$63,276 | \$63,909 | \$64,48 |
| TOTAL | \$30,536,192 | \$1,174,182 | \$1,185,923 | \$1,197,783 | \$1,209,760 | \$1,21,858 | \$1,234,077 | \$1,246,417 | \$1,258,882 | \$1,271,470 | \$1,284,185 | \$1,297,027 | \$1,309,997 |
| Tax Revenues to HTRZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH COUNTY | \$9,945,515 | \$382,426 | \$386,250 | \$390,113 | \$394,014 | \$397,954 | \$401,934 | \$405,953 | \$410,013 | \$414,113 | \$418,254 | \$422,436 | \$426,661 |
| muticounty assessing a Colecting levy | \$225,692 | \$8,678 | \$8,765 | \$8,853 | \$8,941 | \$9,031 | \$9,121 | \$9,212 | \$9,304 | \$9,397 | \$9,491 | \$9,586 | \$9,682 |
| COUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY | \$1,670,124 | \$66,220 | \$64,862 | \$65,511 | \$66,166 | \$66,827 | \$67,496 | \$68,171 | \$68,852 | \$69,541 | \$70,236 | \$70,939 | \$71,648 |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | \$86,12, 2 250 | \$3,311,661 | \$3,34,777 | \$3,378,225 | \$3,412,007 | \$3,446,127 | \$3,48,588 | \$3,515,394 | \$3,50,548 | \$3,58,054 | \$3,621,914 | \$3,558,133 | \$3,694,715 |
| LeHIITY | \$17,89,890 | \$687,904 | \$694,783 | \$701,731 | \$708,74 | \$715,836 | \$722,94 | \$730,224 | \$737,527 | \$744,902 | \$752,351 | \$759,874 | \$767,473 |
| LeHI METROPOLTAN WAtER DISTRICT | \$90,277 | \$3,471 | \$3,506 | \$3,541 | \$3,577 | \$3,612 | \$3,648 | \$3,685 | \$3,722 | \$3,759 | \$3,797 | \$3,835 | \$3,873 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$180,554 | \$6,943 | \$7,012 | \$7,082 | \$7,153 | \$7,225 | \$7,297 | \$7,370 | \$7,443 | \$7,518 | \$7,593 | \$7,669 | \$7,746 |
| Central utah water conservancy | 56,018,466 | \$231,423 | \$233,737 | \$236,074 | \$238,435 | \$240,820 | \$243,228 | \$245,660 | \$248,117 | \$250,598 | \$253,104 | \$255,635 | \$258,191 |
| Total | \$122,144,769 | \$4,996,726 | \$4,773,693 | \$4,791,130 | \$4,839,042 | \$4,887,432 | \$4,936,306 | \$4,985,669 | \$5,035,526 | \$5,085,881 | \$5,136,740 | \$5,188,108 | \$5,239,989 |
| Agency Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |  |  | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |
| Administrative Amount | ( $53,664,343)$ | (\$140,902) | (\$142,311) | (\$143,734) | (\$145,171) | (\$146,623) | (\$148,089) | (\$149,570) | (\$151,066) | (\$152,576) | ${ }_{\text {( } \$ 154,102)}$ | ${ }_{\text {( } \$ 155,643)}$ | (\$157,200) |
| Housing Percent |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Housing Amount | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 | \$0 | so | s0 | s0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 |
| Remaining Increment for Projects | \$118,480,426 | \$4,55, 824 | \$4,601,383 | \$4,647,396 | \$4,693,870 | \$4,740,809 | \$4,788,217 | \$4,836,099 | \$4,884,460 | \$4,933,305 | \$4,982,638 | \$5,032,464 | \$5,082,789 |
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## EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT.

| Year |  | ${ }^{25}$ | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{27}$ | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }^{29}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{31}$ | 32 | ${ }^{33}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{35}$ | ${ }^{36}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2048 | 2049 | 2050 | 2051 | 2052 | 2053 | 2054 | 2055 | 2056 | 2057 | 2058 | 2059 |
| Incremental Value Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Year Taxable Value |  | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,559,600 |
| Assessed Value |  | \$836,575,297 | \$826,770,406 | \$672,202,084 | \$572,186,601 | \$519,918,424 | \$499,266,251 | \$138,417,012 | \$88,045,307 | \$38,674,491 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 | \$21,659,600 |
| Incremental Value |  | \$814,915,997 | \$805,110,806 | \$650,542,484 | \$550,527,001 | \$498,258,824 | \$387,60,651 | \$116,757,412 | \$67,385,707 | \$17,014,891 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Base Year Taxable Value Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH COUNTY \$472,461 |  | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 |
| MULTICOUNTY ASSESSIING \& COLLECTING LEVY \$ \$10,722 |  | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 | \$325 |
| COUNTY ASSESSING \& Collecting levy |  | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,04 | \$2,04 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,404 | \$2,04 |
|  |  | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 | \$123,980 |
| LeH1 CITY \$849,858 |  | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 |
| Lehl metropoutan water district | \$4,289 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 | \$130 |
| NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONsERVANCY | \$8,577 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 | \$260 |
| Central utah water conservancy | \$285,907 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,64 | \$8,64 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 | \$8,664 |
| total | \$5,802,477 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 | \$175,833 |
| Incremental Tax Revenues - 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH COUNTY ${ }_{\text {mUITICOUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY }}$ | \$12,431,894 | \$538,659 | \$532,178 | \$430,009 | \$363,898 | \$329,349 | \$256,208 | \$77,177 | \$44,542 | \$11,247 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
|  | \$282,116 | \$12,224 | \$12,077 | \$9,758 | \$8,258 | \$7,474 | \$5,814 | \$1,751 | \$1,011 | \$255 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| COUNTY ASSESSIING \& COLLECTING LEVY | \$2,08, 65 | \$90,456 | \$89,367 | \$72,210 | \$61,108 | \$55,307 | \$43,024 | \$12,960 | \$7,480 | \$1,889 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | \$107,655,312 | \$4,664,577 | \$4,608,454 | \$3,723,705 | \$3,151,217 | \$2,852,034 | \$2,218,660 | \$668,319 | \$385,716 | 597,393 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 |
| LEHIIITY | \$22,362,363 | \$968,935 | \$957,277 | \$773,495 | \$654,577 | \$592,430 | \$460,864 | \$138,825 | \$80,122 | \$20,231 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| LEHI METROPOLTAN WATER DISTRICT NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY | \$112,846 | \$4,889 | \$4,831 | \$3,903 | \$3,03 | \$2,990 | \$2,326 | \$701 | \$404 | \$102 | s0 | \$0 | s0 |
|  | \$225,692 | \$9,779 | \$9,661 | \$7,807 | \$6,606 | \$5,979 | \$4,651 | \$1,001 | \$809 | \$204 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| central utah water conservancy | \$7,523,083 | \$325,966 | \$322,044 | \$260,217 | \$220,211 | \$199,304 | \$155,043 | \$46,703 | \$26,954 | \$6,806 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| total | \$152,680,962 | \$6,615,486 | \$6,535,890 | \$5,281,104 | \$4,469,178 | \$4,044,865 | \$3,146,591 | \$947,837 | \$547,037 | \$138,127 | s0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Contribution to HTRZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH COUNTYMUITICOUNTY ASESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
|  |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| MOITCONTYASEESSINQ \& COLECTING LEVY |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRIIT |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| LEHI CITY |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| LEHI METROPOLITAN WATERDISTRICT NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY central utah water conservancy |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
|  |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
|  |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Tax Revenues to Taxing Entities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$107,732 | \$106,436 | \$86,002 | \$72,780 | \$65,870 | \$51,242 | \$15,435 | \$8,908 | \$2,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UTAH COUNTY ${ }_{\text {muticounty Assesing a collecting Levy }}$ | \$56,423 | \$2,445 | \$2,415 | \$1,952 | \$1,652 | \$1,995 | \$1,163 | \$350 | \$202 | \$51 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| COUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY | \$417,531 | \$18,091 | \$17,873 | \$14,442 | \$12,222 | \$11,061 | \$8,605 | \$2,592 | \$1,996 | \$378 | s0 | \$0 | s0 |
|  | \$21,531,062 | \$932,915 | \$921,691 | \$744,741 | \$630,243 | \$570,407 | \$443,732 | \$133,664 | \$77,143 | \$19,479 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| LeHI CITY | \$4,472,473 | \$193,787 | \$191,455 | \$154,699 | \$130,915 | \$118,486 | \$92,173 | \$27,765 | \$16,024 | \$4,046 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| LEHI METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY | \$22,569 | \$978 | \$966 | \$781 | \$661 | \$598 | \$465 | \$140 | \$81 | \$20 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 |
|  | \$45,138 | \$1,956 | \$1,932 | \$1,561 | \$1,321 | \$1,196 | \$930 | \$280 | \$162 | \$41 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| CEntral utah Water conservancy | \$1,504,617 | \$65,193 | \$64,409 | \$52,043 | \$44,042 | \$39,861 | \$31,009 | \$9,341 | \$5,391 | \$1,361 | so | \$0 | so |
| total | \$30,536,192 | \$1,323,097 | \$1,307,178 | \$1,056,221 | \$893,836 | \$808,973 | \$629,318 | \$189,567 | \$109,407 | \$27,625 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| Tax Revernues to HTRZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH COUNTY | \$9,945,515 | \$430,927 | \$425,743 | \$344,007 | \$291,119 | \$263,49 | \$204,966 | \$61,741 | \$35,634 | \$8,997 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| muticountr assessing a colecting Levy | \$225,692 | \$9,79 | \$9,661 | \$7,807 | \$6,006 | \$5,979 | \$4,551 | \$1,001 | \$809 | \$204 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Countr assessing \& Collecting levy | \$1,670,124 | \$72,365 | \$71,494 | \$57,768 | \$48,887 | \$44,245 | \$34,419 | \$10,368 | \$5,984 | \$1,511 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| ALPINE SCHool district | \$86,124,250 | \$3,731,662 | \$3,88,763 | \$2,978,964 | \$2,520,973 | \$2,281,627 | \$1,774,928 | \$534,656 | \$308,573 | \$77,915 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 |
| LEHICITY | \$17,889,890 | \$775,148 | \$765,821 | \$618,796 | \$523,661 | \$473,944 | \$368,691 | \$111,060 | \$64,097 | \$16,185 | so | \$0 | so |
| LEHI METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT NORTH UTAH COUNTY WATER CONSERVANCY | \$90,277 | \$3,912 | \$3,865 | \$3,123 | \$2,643 | \$2,392 | \$1,861 | \$560 | \$323 | \$82 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | \$180,554 | \$7,823 | \$7,729 | \$6,245 | \$5,285 | \$4,783 | \$3,721 | \$1,121 | \$647 | \$163 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| Centralutah water conservancy | \$6,018,466 | \$260,773 | \$257,635 | \$208,174 | \$176,169 | \$159,443 | \$124,034 | \$37,362 | \$21,563 | \$5,445 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| total | \$122,144,769 | \$5,292,389 | \$5,228,712 | \$4,224,883 | \$3,575,343 | \$3,235,892 | \$2,517,273 | \$758,269 | \$437,630 | \$110,502 | so | \$0 | \$0 |
| Agency Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative PercentAdministative Amount |  | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |
|  |  | (\$158,772) | (\$156,861) | (\$126,746) | (\$107,260) | $(597,077)$ | ( 575,518 ) | ( 522,748 ) | (\$13,129) | ( 53,315 ) | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| Housing Percent |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Housing Amount | \$0$\$ 118,480,426$ | so | so | so | so | so | so | \$0 | \$0 | so | so | so | so |
| Remaining Increment for Projects |  | \$5,133,617 | \$5,071,850 | \$4,098,137 | \$3,468,082 | \$3,138,815 | \$2,441,754 | \$735,521 | \$424,501 | \$107,186 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
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EXHIBIT A: HTRZ PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT PROJECTIONS BY YEAR CONT.

| Year |  | ${ }_{\substack{37 \\ 2050}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{38 \\ 2061}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{39 \\ 2062}}$ | ${ }_{2063}^{40}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Incremental Value caluabion |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base eear Taxable value |  | \$21,59,600 | \$22,559,600 | \$22, 55, 600 | \$21,59,500 |
| $\frac{\text { Assessed Value }}{\text { Incementivalue }}$ |  | \$21,659,600 | \$22,659,600 | \$22,659,600 | \$21,659,600 |
|  |  | 50 | 50 | so | so |
| Base vear Taxall Value Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAH Countr | S472,461 | \$14,317 | S14,317 | \$14,317 | \$14,317 |
| MUTTICOUNTY ASSESSING \& Couleting levr | \$10,722 | 5325 | 5325 | \$225 | 5325 |
| countr Assessinge Collecting levy | 579,339 | S2204 | \$2,404 | \$2,04 | S2,04 |
| AlPNe SCHOOL DISTRIT | S4,091,325 | S123,980 | ${ }_{\text {S123,980 }}$ | S123,980 | S123,980 |
| เEHIITY | 5849,958 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 | \$25,753 |
| Lehl Metropoutan water bistict | ${ }_{54,289}$ | 5130 | ${ }^{13130}$ | ${ }^{5130}$ | ${ }_{5130}$ |
| north utah countr watre conservancr | 58577 | 5260 | 5260 | 5260 | 5260 |
| Central UTta Water conservancr | 5828,907 | 58,64 | 58,64 | 58,64 | 58,664 |
| total | 55,82,477 | 5175,83 | 5175,833 | S175,833 | 5175,833 |
| Incremental Tax Revenues - 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAA County | S12,431,894 | 50 | so | so |  |
| MUTTICOUNTY ASSESSING \& Couecting levr | ${ }_{\text {S }}^{5282,1165}$ | 50 | so | so | so |
| countr Assessing e coulecting levy | S22087,555 | so | so | so | so |
| AlPNe SCHOOL District | S107,55,312 | 50 | so | so | so |
| Le\#llity | 522,362363 | 50 | so | so | so |
| LeH Meltropoutan watr oistict | ${ }_{\text {sinl2,846 }}$ | 50 | so | so | so |
| north utah countr water conservancr | \$225,692 | so | so | so | so |
| Central UTta Water conservancr | 57,52,083 | 50 | so | so | 50 |
| тотal | S152, 880,962 | 50 | so | so | so |
| Contribution tofrrz |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTAHCOUNTY MuITICOUNTY ASESSING \& coulecting levr |  | ${ }^{80 \%}$ | 80\% | 80\% | ${ }^{\text {80\% }}$ |
|  |  | ¢ | 80\% | 80\% | (80\% |
| ALPME SCHOOL DISTRICT |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| LEH ITIT |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| LEH M M Tropooltan Water istrict |  | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% |
| Noorth utat countr Water conservacr CenTralurah watercouscevacr |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {80\% }}^{80 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {80\% }}^{80 \%}$ | ${ }_{80 \%}^{80 \%}$ | 80\%\% |


| Incremental Tax Revenues to Taxing Entities |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UTAH COUNTY | \$2,486,379 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| MULTICOUNTY ASSESSING \& COLLECTING LEVY | \$56,423 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Countr assessing a coulecting levy | \$417,531 | \$0 | \$0 | so | \$0 |
| ALPINE SCHool district | \$21,531,062 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LEHICITY | \$4,472,473 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LEHI METROPOLTAN WAtER DIStRICT | \$22,569 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$45,138 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Central utah water conservancy | \$1,504,617 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| total | \$30,536,192 | s0 | \$0 | s0 | so |
| Tax Revenues to HTRZ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| muticounty Assessing a Collecting levy | \$225,992 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| COUNTY ASSESSING \& Collecting levy | \$1,670,124 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT | \$86,124,250 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LeHI CITY | \$17,889,890 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LEHI Metropoltan Water district | \$90,277 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| north utah county water conservancy | \$180,554 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Central utah water conservancy | \$6,018,466 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| total | \$122,144,769 | \$0 | \$0 | so | so |
| Agency Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Percent |  | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% |
| Administrative Amount | ( $53,664,343$ ) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | so |
| Housing Percent |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Housing Amount | so | \$0 | so | so | so |
| Remaining Increment for Projects | \$118,480,426 | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
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