

September 16, 2020

Via email: traceygarcia@elpasoco.com
Board of County Commissioners
Planning Commission
El Paso County, Colorado
Re: Proposed Grandview Estates Metropolitan District Nos. 1-5
To the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission:
This firm represents KO1515, LLC ("KO"), which is the owner of approximately 70 acres of undeveloped property within the boundaries of the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1, which District, along with 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 (the "4-Way Ranch Districts," or individually "4-Way No. 1," and "4-Way No. 2," respectively), lies adjacent to the boundaries of the proposed Grandview Estates Metropolitan District Nos. 1-5 (the "Grandview Districts"). The Service Plan for the proposed Grandview Districts is pending approval from the El Paso County Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. This letter submits certain objections to the approval of the proposed Service Plan.

## Procedural Background

The Service Plan is being considered in accordance with the provisions of Section 32-1201, et seq., C.R.S., and in particular the provisions of that section relating to hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. In accordance with Section 32-$1-204$, C.R.S., such proceedings are open to the public and "[a]ny testimony or evidence which in the discretion of the board of county commissioners is relevant to the organization of the proposed special district shall be considered." KO hereby offers the following testimony and evidence relevant to the organization of the Grandview Districts.

## Statutory Elements Concerning Service Plan and Approval

- Section 32-1-101, et seq., C.R.S. constitutes the "Special District Act," which governs the formation and operations of special districts in Colorado
- Section 32-1-102(2), C.R.S. states that the legislative intent behind the adoption of the Special District Act to include that the purpose of the Act, among other matters, is "to prevent the unnecessary proliferation and fragmentation of local government of
local government and to avoid excessive diffusion of local tax sources." The El Paso County Special District Policies incorporate this same policy.
- Section 32-1-203 establishes certain findings that the Board of County Commissioners are to make in connection with approving, disapproving or conditionally approving a service plan for a proposed new district. Several of these findings are particularly relevant to the consideration of the Grandview Districts Service Plan:
- Whether there is sufficient existing and projected need for organized service in the area to be serviced by the proposed special district;
- Whether existing service in the area to be served by the proposed district is inadequate for present and projected needs;
- Whether adequate service is or is not available to the area to be served by other existing special districts; and
- Whether the creation of the proposed district will be in the best interests of the area proposed to be served.
- For reasons outlined below, KO submits that the Service Plan for the proposed Grandview Districts fails to establish facts that provide a basis for the Board of County Commissioners to meet the above criteria, and that, accordingly, the Service Plan should not be approved.

The 4-Way Ranch Districts Remain Authorized to Serve Property Within the Area Proposed to Be Included Within the Grandview Districts

KO submits the following in support of its objections to the organization of the Grandview Districts, and the Service Plan submitted for approval:

- The 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts were organized with the approval of the Board of County Commissioners in 2005 of a Consolidated Service Plan for both 4 Way No. 1 and No 2. The property within the proposed Grandview Districts (the "Property") is within the original boundaries of 4-Way No. 2 and was intended to be served by that District in accordance with the Consolidated Service Plan.
- The Consolidated Service Plan for the 4-Way Ranch Districts was amended in 2009, to reflect changes in the plan for development, infrastructure needs and financing plan adjustments. Including an increase in the maximum debt authorization to accommodate such changes. At that time the boundaries of 4-Way No. 1 and 4-Way No. 2 remained unchanged.
- The Consolidated Service Plan for the 4-Way Ranch Districts, both originally and as amended, proposed that 4-Way No. 2 serve the Property.
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- The Property remains with the boundaries of 4-Way No. 2. The Board of 4-Way No. 2 adopted a Resolution conditionally excluding this territory from its boundaries, to be held in limbo until the organization of the new Grandview Districts or until December 31, 2021 (the "Conditional Exclusion Resolution").
- In the event the Grandview Districts are not organized by December 31, 2021, the exclusion will be a nullity and the Property will remain within the boundaries of 4-Way No. 2, and will continue to be served by 4-Way No. 2.
- There is no need for creation of the Grandview Districts, because the Property is already located within the boundaries of an existing special district that was organized specifically for the purpose of serving this property. To the extent that the existing Consolidated Service Plan for the 4-Way Ranch Districts does not accommodate adjustments to the development plans for this territory since the 2009 Service Plan amendment, the Consolidated Service Plan can be amended again, in like manner, to accommodate such changes, including any adjustments to authorized debt limits.
- The Service Plan for the Grandview Districts fails to articulate a reason why service to the Property through the existing 4-Way No. 2 is infeasible.
- It would frustrate the legislative intent expressed in connection with the adoption of the Special District Act to approve the Service Plan for the Grandview Districts because this would contribute to the proliferation of special districts, under circumstances where an existing District - in fact the specific District organized to serve this area - already exists. Moreover it would result in the further fragmentation of the districts already existing to serve this area.
- Since 4 -Way No. 2 was organized specifically to serve the Property, it is selfevident that the conditions to the County's approval of the Service Plan cannot be met, because there is an existing special district with the ability to serve this territory.
- Furthermore, the organization of the Grandview Districts at this time would not be in the interests of the property to be served, because it could lead to conflicting responsibilities between the 4 -Way Ranch Districts and the Grandview Districts, as discussed in the following section.

The Grandview Service Plan Approval Should Be Denied and the Consolidated Service Plan for the 4-Way Ranch Districts Amended

- Since the date of approval of the amended Consolidated Service Plan of the 4 Way Districts, some fundamental changes in the composition of the taxing boundaries of those Districts have occurred and others appear to be forthcoming, which in turn will have material and adverse effects on the composition and functioning of the Districts as envisioned in the Consolidated Service Plan and on 4 Way Ranch District No. 1 in
particular. A powerpoint document is attached that reflects the boundary changes described below.
- Specifically, the original boundaries of 4-Way No. 1 has been reduced drastically through a prior exclusion of property from that District and the inclusion of that property into 4 -Way No. 2. The combined territory of the property within the original boundaries of the 4-Way Ranch Districts was approximately 1,325 acres. The result of that exclusion was that District No. 1 went from 557.48 acres to 244.61 acres.
- Furthermore, as a result of litigation between disgruntled residential property owners within 4-Way No. 1 against the then-developer controlled Board, it is anticipated that the owners of the balance of the residential acreage within 4-Way No. 1 will exclude their property from that District, leaving only the property owned by KO within 4-Way No. 1's boundaries. At that point District No. 1 will be reduced to approximately 70 acres of property.
- If the exclusions initiated by parties related to the organizers of the Grandview Districts are carried out, the total area of 4-Way No. 2 will go from 1,080.87 acres to 312.87 acres. After this combination of exclusions the combined acreage will go from approximately 1,325 acres to 557 acres. As noted 4 -Way No. 1 may further be reduced to only 70 acres.
- Such drastic changes in taxing boundaries will result in a similarly drastic reduction in the ability of the 4-Way Ranch Districts to discharge indebtedness that was proposed to be issued by those Districts and, in the case of 4-Way No. 1, its ability to continue to operate. Where, as here, there are changes of a "basic or essential nature, including but not limited to...a decrease in the financial ability of the district to discharge existing or proposed indebtedness..." (Section 32-1-207(2)(a), C.R.S.), such changes constitute a material modification warranting an amendment to the Service Plan.
- No such amendment to the 4-Way Ranch Districts Service Plan has been proposed, and in the absence of a service plan amendment approved by the County (as it was in 2009), the capabilities of 4-Way No. 2 to serve the Property to be included within the Grandview Districts will not be known.
- Under Section 32-1-207(2)(a) and 3)(a), C.R.S. any material modification of a service plan is to be approved by the Board of County Commissioners.
- On February 5, 2018, this office notified the County of then-existing departures from the Service Plan for the 4 -Way Ranch Districts, driven by the fundamentally different economic situation within the Districts as a result of various development delays, rendering the financing plans in the Service Plan completely inapplicable as they no longer described the current or future development circumstances within the Districts. A copy of that letter is attached as Exhibit A.
- The changed circumstances outlined in the February 5, 2018 letter are compounded by the subsequent shrinking of the boundaries of the 4-Way Ranch Districts as outline above, further undermining the relevancy of the financing plans and other materials contained in the 2009 service plan amendment.
- Approval of the Grandview Districts will result in all of the property that was envisioned in the original 4-Way No. 2 District to be severed from the original Consolidated 4-Way No. 1 and 4-Way No. 2 Districts. This result, in combination with the other past and anticipated changes to 4 -Way No. 1 will cause 4 -Way No. 1 to be reduced to a mere 70 acres with an utterly insufficient tax base to continue operations. The final outcome will be the fragmentation of what was two districts operating in combination under a consolidated service plan into seven districts with one unlikely to survive. There will be significantly adverse impacts on the property at issue as well as the economics and development of the property and the surrounding eastern El Paso County area.
- Prior to approving the organization of a new set of Districts to serve property that is already capable of being served by 4 -Way Ranch District No. 2, the Board of County Commissioners should first require an examination and, if necessary, formal approval of a service plan amendment for the 4-Way Ranch Districts, to adjust the terms of that service plan to accommodate present circumstances, which necessarily involves an understanding of the effects of excluding the Property proposed for inclusion in the Grandview Districts, and potentially results in that territory remaining within 4-Way Ranch District No. 2, rather than necessitating creation of a new district to serve this territory.

Sincerely,

## WHITE BEAR ANKELE TANAKA \& WALDRON



William P. Ankele, Jr.
Shareholder

EXHIBIT A

February 5, 2018

## VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Craig Dossey
Executive Director
El Paso County, Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910

## Re: 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District Nos. 1 \& 2 Material Modification of Service Plan

Dear Mr. Dossey:
Our office represents KO1515, LLC ("KO1515"), the owner of approximately 68 acres of mostly-undeveloped and vacant land zoned for mixed commercial and industrial uses (the "Property"). The Property is located within the boundaries of the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 ("District 1"). In 2005, the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners (the "BOCC") approved the Service Plan (the "Service Plan") for both District 1 and the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 ("District 2") in conformance with C.R.S. §§ 32-1-201, et seq. Collectively, District 1 and District 2 may be referred to herein as the "Districts," and individually as a "District." Due to revisions to the projected development plans of the property located within each of the Districts' respective boundaries, the BOCC subsequently approved an amended and restated Service Plan for both of the Districts in 2009, which replaced the original Service Plan in its entirety; please note that any references to the "Service Plan" in this letter refers to the 2009 BOCC-approved version of the Service Plan, a copy of which is enclosed with this letter for your reference.

The purpose of this letter is to apprise the BOCC that a further amendment to the Service Plan is necessary pursuant to C.R.S. § 32-1-207(2)(a).

Pursuant to C.R.S. § 32-1-207(1), the facilities, services and financial arrangements of a special district must conform so far as practicable to its approved service plan. Furthermore, pursuant to C.R.S. § 32-1-207(2)(a), to the extent that the facilities, services and financial arrangements of a special district don't specifically conform to the approved service plan, material modifications of the service plan as originally approved must be considered and approved by the governing body of such special district (which in this case, is the BOCC). Such approval by the BOCC of material modifications are required for "changes of a basic or essential nature" to the original service plan

Statutory examples of "changes of a basic or essential nature" may include, without limitation: any addition to the types of services provided by the special district; a decrease in the level of services; a decrease in the financial ability of the special district to discharge the existing or proposed indebtedness; or a decrease in the existing or projected need for organized service in the area. Recent circumstances within the Districts suggest that there have indeed been "changes of a basic or essential nature" to the circumstances of the Districts, and that these changed circumstances constitute material modifications to the Service Plan that warrant the BOCC to require an amendment to the Service Plan before the Districts may undertake any further material action - in particular any action by either of the Districts to incur additional indebtedness.

The Service Plan, as amended, contained development projections for the Districts that form the basis for the proposed issuance of debt, and the Districts' ability to discharge that debt on a reasonable basis. Actual development within the Districts is materially behind that which was projected in the Service Plan and, as a result, the integrity of the financing plan in the Service Plan has been fundamentally - and fatally - compromised.

As presented in the Service Plan, District 1 was projected to include approximately 565 total residential units plus an additional 77 acres of mixed use commercial by full build-out in 2019. District 2 was projected to be fully built-out by 2030, consisting of approximately 2,500 residential units, plus an additional 46 acres of mixed use commercial property. The financing plans also projected that District 1 would have a 2017 assessed value of $\$ 27,403,000$, and District 2's 2017 assessed value would be $\$ 10,630,000$. Based upon the growth assumptions, the financing plans projected that District 1 would have issued $\$ 20,000,000$ in general obligation bonds in 2012, and District 2 would have issued $\$ 54,000,000$ of general obligation bonds in three separate issuances (2011, 2015 and 2018) to help finance the development of the public infrastructure needed for the entire proposed 4-Way Ranch development.

In stark contrast to the projections contained within the Service Plan, very little development has occurred within the Districts, and as a result the 2017 assessed value of District 1 is only $\$ 1,732,350$ and the 2017 assessed value for District 2 is only $\$ 19,200$. To date, only District 1 has issued any debt, and that debt consists of developer bonds issued in 2011 totaling $\$ 2,900,000$. In short, the financing plans contained within the Service Plan bears no relationship to current circumstances, and thus no longer forms a reasonable basis to support the issuance of additional debt by the Districts, or the conduct of any other financial activities

Moreover, the financing plans for each of the Districts are dependent upon one another to fully function and operate as intended. There are numerous instances contained within each District's respective Service Plan financing plan where the revenues generated by one District are shared with, or pledged to, the other District. For example, it was anticipated that District 2 would be responsible for issuing nearly $73 \%$ ( $\$ 54,000,000$ of the total $\$ 74,000,000$ approved by the Service Plan) of the total amount of bonds needed to finance the construction and installation of the public infrastructure needed for the entire 4-Way Ranch development. Additionally, the financing plans provide that District 1 expected to receive a total transfer of $\$ 6,474,705$ from District 2 (and District 2 correspondingly transferring the sum of $\$ 7,969,593$ ) for use in District 1 's general fund between
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2009 and 2045. None of these projected activities has occurred or are likely to occur for the foreseeable future, which is another example of the flaws in the financing plans as they currently exist.

In terms of the statutory basis upon which the BOCC may require a further amendment to the Service Plan, the lack of development and resulting assessed value represent both a decrease in the financial ability of the Districts to discharge any existing or proposed indebtedness, as well as a "change of a basic or essential nature."

For the foregoing reasons, KO1515 hereby requests the BOCC to direct the Boards of Directors of District 1 and District 2 to submit a further amendment to the Service Plan to revise and update the financing plans in accordance with current circumstances.

Thank you for your prompt attention, and please let us know if you have any questions.
Very truly yours,
WHITE BEAR ANKELE TANAKA \& WALDRON
Professional Corporation


William P. Ankele, Jr.
WPA/btn

## CC: Ms. Ingrid Richter <br> Mr. Kevin O’Neill

Enclosures

# 4-WAY RANCH METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS NO. 1 \& 2 FIRST AMENDMENT TO CONSOLIDATED SERVICE PLAN 

El Paso County, Colorado

Submitted December 29, 2009, as corrected

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated Service Plan (the "Original Service Plan") for the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts No. 1 \& 2 (the "Districts") was approved by the Board of Commissioners of El Paso County on September 8, 2005 by County Resolution 05-381 ("County Resolution").

This First Amendment to the Consolidated Service Plan is submitted to the County for the purpose of updating the Districts' financial and improvements plans and authorizing the issuance of additional indebtedness, in order that the Districts may finance, construct and install additional improvements within the Districts.

Except as noted herein, the Districts’ financial and jurisdictional limitations incorporated in the original Service Plan and County Resolution have not been modified, including the Districts' existing debt service and operations mill levy caps.

## II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND and EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Districts were organized in 2005 to serve the needs of a new predominantly residential community, with some commercial property and open space, known as " 4 -Way Ranch." The primary purpose of the Districts is to provide a central water system, roadway and other necessary public improvements and services for the use and benefit of the Districts' inhabitants and taxpayers, including sanitary sewer, drainage, roadway and park and recreation improvements.

The 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts encompass the 4-Way Ranch development project, divided into two phases. The 4-Way Ranch project is generally located in north central El Paso County known as the Falcon area, between Eastonville Road and Highway 24 north of Stapleton Drive totaling 1,325 acres, planned for residential and commercial land uses. Current development activity in the project includes nine residential homes constructed in District No. 1. The 4-Way Ranch project has an anticipated build-out of approximately eight years for the first phase, and approximately twenty-one years to complete the second phase.

Since its formation, a central water system and related public improvements have been constructed and dedicated to District No. 1 for operation and maintenance. These water system improvements include wells, a water filtration plant building, piping, fire hydrants, and a 522,000 gallon potable water storage tank, constructed and installed within 4 Way Ranch Filing No. 1, necessary to provide water service to the Districts' customers.

Based on updated calculations, at build-out the Districts are projected to collectively have approximately $\$ 151,044,000$ in assessed valuation. Collectively, the Districts anticipate the issuance of debt up to $\$ 74,000,000.00$ in general obligation bonds and/or revenue bonds, to finance the necessary public improvements and District organization costs for the project, expected to take place in phased bond issuances. The estimated debt service mill levy is 35.000
mills over a 30-year period to pay the debt, with an additional operations mill levy not to exceed 10.000 mills.

## III. DEVELOPMENT

Since the approval of the Original Service Plan, the Developer has completed and recorded the final plat for the 4-Way Ranch Subdivision Phase I, and the initial development of the area is complete, including the completed construction of a central water system and distribution system, roadways, storm drainage improvements, and the completion of residential homes in the community. Presently, the Developer is going through the platting process for the 4-Way Ranch Subdivision Filing No. 2 with the County, for the development of the commercial property. Each final plat filing will be subject to compliance with the El Paso County Master Plan and the El Paso County Land Development Code.

Development projections for the 4-Way Ranch project have been modified to provide for greater density of residential units and increased commercial square footage, as well as planning for the possibility of a central sewer system and related improvements, as may be necessary. The executive summary of an updated Market Study for the area dated September, 2009 prepared by King \& Associates, is attached as Exhibit A. This Market Study provides an independent assessment and determination of development timing and absorption schedule involving land uses proposed for development and assists to demonstrate the projected demand and need for the Districts’ services.

District No. 1 consists predominantly of residential property, with 42 lots already developed including 137 lots (minimum 2.5 acres), plus approximately 77 acres of mixed use commercial, including retail/restaurant, office/warehouse and medical/professional land uses. District No. 2 is anticipated to consist predominantly of residential property, with capacity for approximately 2,500 dwelling units, plus approximately 46 acres of mixed use commercial, also planned for retail/restaurant, office/warehouse and medical/professional land uses. Both Districts are planned to include open space with public park and recreation improvements.

## IV. FINANCIAL PLAN ANALYSIS

The updated Financial Plan for Districts 1 and 2 is attached to this Amendment as Exhibit B illustrates how the proposed services and facilities may be financed and operated by the Districts, based on the updated development projections. The updated Financial Plan is intended to supersede the financial plan of the Original Service Plan.

The public improvements planned for the 4-Way Ranch project have increased in the amount of proposed facilities and their costs, as more particularly described in Section V of this Amendment. The combined total cost of the public improvements projected for 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts No. 1 \& 2 is One Hundred Nineteen Million Fifty-seven Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-three Dollars (\$119,057,743), inclusive of contingencies, engineering and construction management, and exclusive of costs of issuance, organizational costs, inflation and similar costs.

The projected amounts of bonded indebtedness for both Districts have increased as follows:

The 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 initially projects the issuance of a single series of bonds in approximately the amount of Twenty Million Dollars (\$20,000,000). The 4Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 initially projects the issuance of Fifty-four Million Dollars $(\$ 54,000,000)$ of bonds in three phases.

The Districts’ maximum authorized general obligation indebtedness shall not exceed Seventy-four Million Dollars ( $\$ 74,000,000$ ) without prior express authorization of the County, and any increase in authorized general obligation debt beyond this amount shall constitute a material modification of the Service Plan.

This Amendment shall not affect the Districts’ Debt Service Mill Levy Cap of 50.00 mills nor the Districts' additional limited operational mill levy of 10.00 mills, as set forth in the Original Service Plan.

## V. INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

The updated Description of Districts' Facilities and Costs, for which the Districts plan to provide for their financing, design, construction, acquisition and installation based on the updated development projections, is attached to this Amendment as Exhibit C, and includes the costs in current dollars of each improvement, together with an explanation of the methods, basis and/or assumptions used. An updated map showing the revised location of the Phase I and Phase II roadway facilities is included as Exhibit D.

In addition to the increased level of facilities needed to serve the additional development, this Amendment expands the Districts' plans for the financing, construction and operation of a central wastewater system and related facilities to serve both the contemplated commercial property as well as the residential property for the project. Central wastewater service for the 4 Way Ranch project may be provided either by a nearby or adjacent facility, such as through the Paint Brush Hills treatment facility (served by the adjacent Woodmen Hills Metropolitan District), or through the proposed Santa Fe Springs wastewater treatment facility, served by the nearby Sunset Metropolitan District, or by the Districts’ finance, construction, ownership and operation of necessary central wastewater facilities. The financial feasibility of the Districts' construction of a wastewater treatment facility will be met though a combination of property tax revenues, tap fee revenues, other District fees, water resource fees, potential contributions from neighboring developments and other fees, rates and charges as allowed by law.

An "Updated Central Water and Wastewater System Facilities Plan" dated August, 2009, prepared by JDS-Hydro Consultants, Inc., describing the Districts' water rights, water supply, water quality and treatment, water storage and proposed system and anticipated central sewer system improvement requirements relevant to the increased development projections is attached hereto as Exhibit E; this updated plan is intended to supersede the water system facilities plan included in the Original Service Plan.

## VI. COUNTY APPROVAL

An increase in the Districts' debt limit is deemed to be a material modification of the Districts’ Original Service Plan, pursuant to Section V.B. of the Original Service Plan. This

Amendment to Service Plan for the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts No. 1 and 2 meets the requirements of the provisions for the modification of a service plan set forth in the Special District Act, § 32-1-207(2), C.R.S., the applicable requirements of the Colorado Constitution, and those of El Paso County, El Paso Land Development Code, Sec. 9.3.

It is further submitted that other than as provided in this Amendment, the limitations and other terms and requirements contained the Original Service Plan continue in force, which include:

- $\quad$ The Districts shall continue to be subject to mill levy caps of 50 mills for debt service and 10 mills for operations as described in the Original Service Plan (Section IV.C.) and the County Resolution (para. 1);
- The Districts' bond issuances shall not exceed the maximum term of 30 years without prior approval from the County, pursuant to the provisions of the Original Service Plan (Section IV.B.) and the County Resolution (para. 3);
- District No. 2 shall not be authorized to issue any bonds until the Board of County Commissioners' approval of the zoning and preliminary plan for the property within District No. 2's boundaries, as provided in the Original Service Plan (Section IV.B);
- The Districts shall not be entitled to any Conservation Trust ("Lottery") funds without prior express approval of the County, as described in the Original Service Plan (Section IV.H.) and County Resolution (para. 4); and
- The Districts shall not be authorized to fund any "Local Public Improvements" or entry features without prior approval of the Board of County Commissioners, as described in the County Resolution (para. 6) and in the attached Exhibit C.

The Districts therefore seek approval by the County of this Amendment in accordance with the provisions of Section 32-1-207(2), C.R.S., and requests that the El Paso County Board of Commissioners adopt a resolution which approves this Amendment to Consolidated Service Plan for the Districts as submitted.

Respectfully submitted,
SETER \& VANDER WALL, P.C.


Barbara T. Vander Wall Counsel to 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts No. 1 and 2

## EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A: Executive Summary of Market Study (dated September, 2009)
Exhibit B: $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Updated Financial Plan for Districts No. } 1 \text { \& \& } 2 \text { (Including Debt } \\ & \text { Projions) }\end{aligned}$

Exhibit C: Updated Description of Districts' Facilities \& Costs
Exhibit D: Updated Map of Location of the Phases I and II Roadway Facilities
Exhibit E: Updated Central Water and Wastewater System Facilities Plan

## EXHIBIT A

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF MARKET STUDY (Dated September, 2009)

King \& Associates, Inc.
Strategic planning and economic analysis

4-Way Ranch<br>El Paso County, Colorado

## MARKET RESEARCH REPORT

Completed for:
4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District \#1 \& \#2

## Completed by:

King \& Associates, Inc.
9003 W. Coco Drive
Littleton, Colorado 80128
303.333.3834

## Introduction

King \& Associates, Inc. has been retained by the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District \#1 and \#2 (the Districts) to provide an independent assessment and determination of development timing involving land uses proposed for development within the Districts. The Districts are located near the Town of Falcon in unincorporated El Paso County, Colorado at approximately Stapleton Drive and U. S. Highway 24. Overall, the Districts include 1,325 acres, with development anticipated to include primarily residential land uses. The purpose of this report is to assess the parameters of the project including proposed land uses, development intensity and sales potential along with providing a projection of development timing and schedule (absorption) in relation to anticipated conditions within the local and regional marketplace.

## Trade Area

To analyze the demand for residential and commercial development planned within the 4Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts a geographic trade area (Trade Area) has been identified. It is anticipated that the majority of customers who will purchase homes and utilize the commercial development planned within the Districts will live within the identified Trade Area. A larger Trade Area has been identified than would be typical for most master planned communities since 4-Way Ranch is located within an area that is a bedroom community to the metropolitan Colorado Springs area.

The Trade Area boundaries include Murphy Road on the north, the Curtis Road alignment on the east, Academy Boulevard (State Highway 83) on the west and State Highway 94 to the south. The following map outlines the trade area.

## 4-Way Ranch - Trade Area Map



Source: King \& Associates, Inc.

## ExEcutive Summary

## Overview

- The 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District \#1 \& \#2 include 1,325 acres, planned for residential and commercial land uses located in El Paso County, Colorado.
- The Districts are located in a rapidly developing area near the Town of Falcon, Colorado, a bedroom community just outside of Colorado Springs.
- The land use plan for the project outlines the development of 3,065 residential housing units and nearly 750,000 square feet of commercial space.
- Development activity in the project has included 9 homes constructed in District \#1, with 2 additional end-user lot sales on which home have not been constructed.


## Demographics and Employment

- Population in El Paso County has increased at a rate of approximately 1.85\% annually since 2000 and by a rate of $5.33 \%$ per year in the Trade Area.
- From 2009 through 2025, population in El Paso County is forecast to increase by rate of $1.84 \%$ annually, while stronger growth is forecast in the Trade Area with a projected average population growth rate of approximately $3.21 \%$ annually.
- The economy in Colorado Springs and surrounding El Paso County area has been negatively impacted by falling employment levels, slowing in the local housing market, fall-out from sub-prime mortgages and higher home foreclosure rates.
- Employment levels decreased in El Paso County with a loss of -2,100 jobs during 2008.
- Job losses have continued in El Paso County and employment levels have decreasing by $-6,000$ during the first half of 2009.
- Future employment growth in the Colorado Springs region is anticipated to increase slowly with a forecast $.6 \%$ average annual growth rate.


## Residential Market Trends and Demand Forecast - Region

- During 2008, the total number of residential building permits issued in the region fell $-36 \%$ compared with 2007 activity.
- Through mid-year 2009, regional building activity continues to fall with the number of permits issued through July 2009 totaling 787 units, down $48 \%$ from the 1,517 units permitted in the region during the same period in 2008.
- New home sales have also declined during the past few years in El Paso County with sales totaling approximately 2,100 units in 2008, compared with nearly 3,100 sales in 2007.
- Through mid-year 2009 there have been 581 new homes sold in El Paso County, down $48 \%$ from 1,102 sales during the same period in 2008.
- Near-term housing demand (2009 - 2013) is projected to average 3,000 to 3,500 units per year in El Paso County with overall demand (2009-2025) of 4,000 to 4,500 units annually.
- However, during the next twelve to eighteen months, new home demand is anticipated to be less than forecast as the local housing market and economy begin to recover.


## Residential Market Trends and Demand Forecast-Trade Area

- The Trade Area dominates the new housing market in the El Paso County region, capturing approximately $50 \%$ of new home sales during the past three years.
- In 2008, there were 870 new homes sold in 34 active residential projects in the Trade Area.
- Through mid-year 2009, new home sales have totaled 248 units in 25 active projects.
- Trade Area housing demand is projected to total 1,500 to 2,000 units per year during the 2009-2013 time period.
- Over the entire forecast period extending through 2025, housing demand in the Trade Area is projected to range from 2,500 to 3,000 units annually.
- As with the larger El Paso County region, Trade Area housing demand is anticipated to be less than forecast, reflecting slow recovery within the local housing market.


## Competitive Projects -Trade Area

- Weak market conditions exist for larger-lot, custom and semi-custom homes in the Trade Area and throughout El Paso County.
- However, Paintbrush Hills (Falcon Hills) and portions of Meridian Ranch are currently the two most competitive projects, which would be comparable to the larger lot development areas in 4-Way Ranch.
- Residential development areas with suburban densities are also planned in 4-Way Ranch.
- Depending on development timing of these homes, competitive projects would primarily include Meridian Ranch and Falcon Highlands (Gables).
- In addition to currently active projects in the Trade Area, there are also several planned projects with suburban densities that are anticipated for development in the immediate Falcon area.


## 4-Way Ranch Residential Absorption Forecast

- With a review of market factors and competitive projects, King \& Associates, Inc. has completed an absorption forecast for residential development in 4-Way Ranch.
- The residential absorption forecast extends from 2009 through 2030 and includes single-family and multi-family units.
- Over the entire forecast period, King \& Associates, Inc. projects residential absorption to average nearly 140 units per year.
- During the near-term (2009-2013), increasing annual absorption averaging approximately 47 units per year is forecast, representing anticipated improvement in the local housing market.
- With average projected absorption of 140 units annually, 4-Way Ranch will account for approximately $6 \%$ of projected trade area housing demand over the entire forecast period.
- King \& Associates, Inc. believes this to be reasonable since the average capture rate per project in the trade has equaled approximately $5 \%$ since 2006.
- King \& Associates, Inc. believes that 4-Way Ranch may experience higher absorption rates depending on the degree that the following elements are implemented within the project that typically characterize successful master planned communities.
- A wide-range of housing product types at multiple price points.
- A selection of capable local and national homebuilders.
- A comprehensive marketing program.
- Extensive design features - entry signage, landscaping, hardscaping, fencing, architectural treatments, etc. - that compare favorably with competitive Trade Area projects.


## Trade Area Commercial Demand Forecast

- Trade area commercial demand has been forecast based on recent absorption trends.
- However, due to weak market conditions, commercial demand forecasts have been adjusted to reflect more stabilized market and economic conditions.
- During the near-term (2009-2013), annual Trade Area demand is projected to total $25,000-50,000$ square feet for office, 200,000 to 300,000 square feet for retail and 25,000 to 50,000 square feet for industrial space.
- Projected near-term commercial demand in the Trade Area will likely be lower than forecast during the next twelve to eighteen months as the local economy improves and commercial market trends stabilize.
- Over the entire forecast period (2009 - 2025), annual Trade Area demand is projected to total $50,000-100,000$ square feet for office, 250,000 to 350,000 square feet for retail and 50,000 to 75,000 square feet for industrial space.


## 4-Way Ranch Commercial Absorption Forecast

- Nearly 750,000 square feet of commercial space is planned in 4-Way Ranch.
- Of total projected commercial development in 4-Way Ranch, approximately 560,000 square feet of retail space is planned along with 100,000 square feet of office / warehouse and 80,000 square feet of medical office space.
- Commercial absorption has been projected in 4-Way Ranch.
- From 2009 through 2013, 7,900 square feet of retail space is projected to absorb in the project.
- The majority of commercial absorption is projected to occur during three remaining time periods with absorption of approximately 260,000 square feet of retail, office / warehouse and medical office space from 2014-2020, 264,000 square feet of retail and office / warehouse space from 2021-2025 and 211,000 square feet of retail and medical office development from 2026 2030.

4-Way Ranch Project Assessment

- 4-Way Ranch is located in an area that has accounted for approximately half of all new home construction activity in El Paso County during the past few years.
- The Trade Area is expected to continue its dominant share of the overall regional housing market in future years.
- 4-Way Ranch is a master planned community, which is anticipated to include a wide array of housing choices and amenities that will be attractive to homebuyers.
- The project is located adjacent to the Town of Falcon, a community with a rural character but is also near large-community amenities and service within Colorado Springs.
- The project includes a planned clubhouse facility, expansive in-project open space areas and trail network.
- The project is near major transportation routes providing access to employment, shopping and community facilities located in Colorado Springs.
- Initial development in the project has begun, with market awareness throughout the local building and home buying community.
- Due to location, project attributes and development program, 4-Way Ranch is well positioned to become a successful project within the Trade Area.


## Project Description

The 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts \#1 \& \#2 comprise approximately 1,325 acres located northwest of the intersection of Stapleton Drive and U. S. Highway 24 near the Town of Falcon, in unincorporated El Paso County, Colorado. The Districts entail a master planned community design concept that includes both residential and commercial land uses. In total, 3,065 single and multi-family residential units are planned in the Districts. Commercial development anticipated in the Districts includes 561,300 square feet of retail, slightly more than 100,000 square feet of office / warehouse space and nearly 80,000 square feet of medical office development. The following table summarizes development planned in 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts \#1 and \#2.

It should be noted that a limited amount of residential development has occurred in the project. To date, nine single-family homes have been constructed in District \#1 and two lots have sold to end-users.

4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts \#1 \& \#2 Development Program

| Development Type / <br> Location | Residential |  | Commercial |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single family | Multi-family | Retail | Office/Whse. | Med. Office |
| District 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing \#1 | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| Filing \#2 | 175 |  |  |  |  |
| Filing \#3 | 175 |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcel \#1 |  | 175 | 7,900 | 35,000 |  |
| Parcel \#2 |  |  | 17,000 |  |  |
| Parcel \#3 |  |  |  | 18,000 |  |
| Parcel \#4 |  |  | 155,100 |  |  |
| Parcel \#5 |  |  |  |  | 53,600 |
| Parcel \#6 |  |  | 51,300 |  |  |
| Total | 390 | 175 | 231,300 | 53,000 | 53,600 |
| District 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filings \#1-\#13 | 2,500 |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcel \#1 |  |  | 145,000 | 50,000 |  |
| Parcel \#2 |  |  | 185,000 |  | 26,000 |
| Total | 2,500 | 0 | 330,000 | 50,000 | 26,000 |
| Overall total | 2,890 | 175 | 561,300 | 103,000 | 79,600 |

Source: 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts \#1 \& \#2.
Note: Planned retail development includes retail stores, pads, restaurants and big box users.

## EXHIBIT B

UPDATED FINANCIAL PLAN FOR DISTRICTS NO. 1 \& 2 (INCLUDING DEBT PROJECTIONS)

# 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No's 1 and 2 

Forecasted Statement of Sources and Uses of Cash

For the Years Ending
December 31, 2005 through 2039

Board of Directors<br>4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No's 1 and 2<br>El Paso County, Colorado

We have compiled the accompanying forecasted statements of sources and uses of cash of the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No's 1 and 2 (Exhibits I), the related projected debt service schedules (Exhibits II) and the analysis of absorption, development fees and assessed values (Exhibits III) for the years ending December 31, 2009 through 2045, in accordance with standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

A compilation is limited to presenting in the form of a forecast information that is the representation of management and does not include evaluation of the support for the assumptions underlying the forecast. We have not examined the forecast and, accordingly, do not express an opinion or any other form of assurance on the accompanying statements or assumptions. Furthermore, there will usually be differences between the forecasted and actual results, because events and circumstances frequently do not occur as expected, and those differences may be material. We have no responsibility to update this report for events and circumstances occurring after the date of this report.

## PRELIMINARY DRAFT....SUBJECT TO CHANGE

October 6, 2009

## 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No's 1 and 2

Summary of Significant Assumptions and Accounting Policies

December 31, 2009 through 2045

The foregoing forecast presents, to the best of the District's knowledge and belief, the expected cash receipts and disbursements for the forecast period. Accordingly, the forecast reflects its judgment as of October 6, 2009. The assumptions disclosed herein are those that management believes are significant to the forecast. There will usually be differences between the forecasted and actual results, because events and circumstances frequently do not occur as expected, and those differences may be material.

The purpose of this forecast is to show the amount of funds available for the future construction of infrastructure from the issuance of general obligation bonds by District No's 1and 2, the available revenues for the repayment of the debt from a cap of 50.000 mills, the revenues and related costs associated with the proposed water / sewer distribution system in District № 1 and the available funds for operating costs by District No's 1 and 2 from the imposition of a 10.000 mill operating levy.

## Note 1: Ad Valorem Taxes

The primary source of revenue for the District No's 1 and 2 will be the collection of ad valorem taxes. Residential property in District No's 1 and 2 is forecasted to be assessed at $7.96 \%$ of market values. Market values for 2,890 single family attached units are forecasted to range from $\$ 350,000$ to $\$ 550,000$ as of 2009 . Finished lots are forecasted at $10 \%$ of completed market values. Market values for 175 multi-family units are forecasted at $\$ 250,000$ per unit. Commercial property in District No's 1 and 2 is forecasted to be assessed at $29 \%$ of market values. Market values for 743,900 square feet of commercial property is estimated to range from $\$ 106$ to $\$ 210$ per finished square foot. Market values for residential and commercial property are forecasted to inflate at $1 \%$ per year. All property is assumed to inflate at $2 \%$ biennially thereafter. Exhibits III detail the forecasted absorption, market values and related assessed values for District No's 1 and 2.

Property is assumed to be assessed annually as of January 1st. Property included in this forecast is assumed to be assessed on the January $1^{\text {st }}$ subsequent to completion. The forecast recognizes the related property taxes as revenue in the subsequent year.

The County Treasurer currently charges a $1.5 \%$ fee for the collection of property taxes. These charges are reflected in the accompanying forecast as a reduction to the property tax revenue.

The mill levy imposed by the District No's 1 and 2 are proposed to equal 10.000 mills for the General Fund and 35.000 mills for the Debt Service Fund. The mill levies are subject to adjustment for changes in the ratio of assessed values to market values, provided that the total levy for each District is subject to a cap of 50.000 mills. It is forecasted that the General Fund mill levy will decrease for both District No's 1 and 2 as indicated in Exhibits I .

The forecast assumes that Specific Ownership Taxes collected on motor vehicle registrations will be $7 \%$ of property taxes collected. Specific Ownership Taxes are forecasted to be pledged to the repayment of debt.

# 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No's 1 and 2 

Summary of Significant Assumptions and Accounting Policies

December 31, 2009 through 2045

Note 2: Interest Income
Interest income is assumed to be earned at 2.0\% per annum. Interest income is based on the year's beginning cash balance and an estimate of the timing of the receipt of revenues and the outflow of disbursements during the course of the year.

## Note 3: Tap Fees

It is forecasted that District No's 1 and 2 will tap fees of $\$ 16,000$ for each single family detached residential home and each single family equivalent of commercial property and a fee of $\$ 10,000$ on each multi-family residential home. It is forecasted that the commercial property will equate to 293 single family equivalents. Exhibits III detail the collection of the above fees by year. The $\$ 16,000$ fee is comprised of a water system development fee of $\$ 10,000$, a sewer system development fee of $\$ 5,000$ and a water resource development fee of $\$ 1,000$. It is anticipated that the $\$ 1,000$ water system development fees will be paid to the developer as a one time water lease payment. The balance of the fees are forecasted to be pledged for the payment of principal and interest on the bonds described in Note 4.

## Note 4: Bond Assumptions

District No. 1 forecasts the issuance of general obligation bonds totaling $\$ 20,000,000$ on June 1, 2012. The bonds are forecasted to have a maturity of 30 years from the date of issuance and are forecasted to carry a coupon rate of $7.00 \%$. The net proceeds of the bonds after issuance costs of $\$ 800,000$, a reserve requirement of $\$ 2,000,000$ and capitalized interest in the amount of $\$ 1,400,000$ are forecasted to be available for capital improvements and the repayment of developer advances.

District No. 2 forecasts the issuance of general obligation bonds totaling $\$ 49,000,000$ in three series in 2011, 2015 and 2018. The bonds are forecasted to have a maturities of up to 30 years from the date of issuance and are forecasted to carry a coupon rate of $7.00 \%$. The net proceeds of the bonds after issuance costs, reserve funds and capitalized interest as indicated in Exhibit I for District No. 2, are forecasted to be available for capital improvements and the repayment of developer advances.

The bonds are anticipated to be secured by a limited mill levy not to exceed 50.000 mills and the reserve funds described above. A portion of the tap fees described in Note 3 are pledged for debt service.

## Note 5: District Improvements

Construction costs for district improvements for District No 1 are forecasted to total \$31,541,920 and for District No 2 the improvements are forecasted to total $\$ 87,515,823$. A portion of the improvement costs totaling $\$ 12,941,920$ for District No 1 and $\$ 43,542,543$ for District No 2 are not forecasted to be funded from the bond issues described in Note 4. It is projected that these improvements will be contributed to the Districts.

## 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No's 1 and 2

## Summary of Significant Assumptions and Accounting Policies

December 31, 2009 through 2045

## Note 6: Operating and Maintenance Expenses

District No 1 is forecasted to incur operating costs in the amount of $\$ 50,000$ per year. Operating expenses are forecasted to inflate at $2 \%$ per annum. It is expected that the developer will advance funds to the Districts until such time as the 10.000 mill levy forecasted to be imposed by District No's 1 and 2 are sufficient to cover the operating expenses. It is forecasted that the developer will be repaid the advances with interest at $7 \%$ per annum.

## Note 7: Water and Sewer Operations

District No 1 is forecasted to operate water and sewer treatment and distribution systems and to serve the residents and the commercial property in District No's 1 and 2. The estimated costs per year are those described in the Engineer's report. Costs at build-out are forecasted to inflate at $5.0 \%$ per annum. The District intends to impose a monthly charge for potable and irrigation water at a forecasted average rate of $\$ 47.00$ per month and a month sewer charge of $\$ 22.00$ per month.

## Note 8: Park and Recreation Maintenance

District No 1 is forecasted to provide park and recreation maintenance to the residents and commercial property in District No's 1 and 2 as indicated in Exhibit I. Park and recreation maintenance costs are forecasted to inflate at $2.5 \%$ per annum. The costs are expected to be paid from the 10.000 mill levy in the General Fund's of District No's 1 and 2.

4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No 1

|  | Total |  | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash For the Years Ended December 31, 2009 through 2041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |  | Exhibit I$2019$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $2012$ |  |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning cash available | \$ |  |  |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | General Fund |  |  |  |  |  | (0) \$ | (0) \$ | \$ (0) \$ |  | 177,783 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property taxes |  | 3,644,670 |  | 11,970 |  | 12,319 |  | 13,003 |  | 16,583 |  | 28,613 |  | 45,760 |  | 66,233 | 121,983 | 147,418 | 274,032 |  | 174,609 |  |  |  |  |
| Water / sewer service fees |  | 59,495,870 |  | 5,796 |  | 14,076 |  | 31,186 |  | 109,846 |  | 200,926 |  | 416,517 |  | 540,717 | 785,753 | 930,653 | 1,087,973 |  | 1,220,453 |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer from District \#2 |  | 6,474,705 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,713 |  | 19,925 |  | 39,990 | 71,055 | 104,709 | 146,293 |  | 113,593 |  |  |  |  |
| Developer advances |  | 869,082 |  | 133,084 |  | 137,721 |  | 195,227 |  | 192,032 |  | 194,209 |  | 16,809 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 70,484,327 |  | 150,850 |  | 164,116 |  | 239,416 |  | 318,461 |  | 429,461 |  | 499,011 |  | 646,940 | 978,791 | 1,182,780 | 1,508,298 |  | 1,508,655 |  |  |  |  |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water / sewer operations |  | 41,049,807 |  | 78,670 |  | 90,430 |  | 159,314 |  | 231,403 |  | 325,889 |  | 383,514 |  | 439,675 | 497,785 | 561,056 | 620,708 |  | 679,667 |  |  |  |  |
| Park and recreation maintenance |  | 8,552,576 |  | 22,000 |  | 22,501 |  | 27,887 |  | 33,749 |  | 49,022 |  | 59,607 |  | 70,791 | 83,255 | 96,505 | 250,000 |  | 256,250 |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative costs |  | 2,305,579 |  | 50,000 |  | 51,000 |  | 52,020 |  | 53,060 |  | 54,122 |  | 55,204 |  | 56,308 | 57,434 | 58,583 | 59,755 |  | 60,950 |  |  |  |  |
| County treasurer fees |  | 54,667 |  | 180 |  | 185 |  | 195 |  | 249 |  | 429 |  | 686 |  | 993 | 1,830 | 2,211 | 4,110 |  | 2,619 |  |  |  |  |
| Repay developer advances |  | 1,278,027 |  |  |  | . |  | . |  |  |  | . |  | . |  | 79,173 | 338,487 | 464,425 | 395,942 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 53,240,656 |  | 150,850 |  | 164,116 |  | 239,416 |  | 318,461 |  | 429,462 |  | 499,011 |  | 646,940 | 978,791 | 1,182,780 | 1,330,515 |  | 999,486 |  |  |  |  |
| Ending cash available |  | \$ 17,243,671 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | (0) \$ | (0) \$ | (0) \$ | 177,783 | \$ | 686,953 |  |  |  |  |
| Mill Levy |  |  |  | 10.000 |  | 10.000 |  | 10.000 |  | 10.000 |  | 10.000 |  | 10.000 |  | 10.000 | 10.000 | 10.000 | 10.000 |  | 6.000 |  |  |  |  |

## Capital Project Fund



4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1
Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash
For the Years Ended December 31, 2009 through 2041

|  |  | Total |  | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Debt Ser | vice | Fund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning cash available | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 77,288 | \$ | 277,241 | \$ | 644,036 | \$ | 4,093,863 | \$ | 3,718,845 | \$ | 4,916,533 | \$ | 3,534,641 | \$ | 4,141,262 | \$ | 3,448,325 | \$ | 3,076,870 |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property taxes |  | 30,748,242 |  | 41,895 |  | 43,117 |  | 45,511 |  | 58,041 |  | 100,144 |  | 160,160 |  | 231,817 |  | 426,942 |  | 515,965 |  | 959,112 |  | 1,018,551 |
| Specific ownership taxes |  | 2,398,784 |  | 3,771 |  | 3,881 |  | 4,096 |  | 5,224 |  | 9,013 |  | 14,414 |  | 20,864 |  | 38,425 |  | 46,437 |  | 86,320 |  | 83,521 |
| Tap Fees |  | 9,903,634 |  | 32,000 |  | 160,000 |  | 330,636 |  | 720,000 |  | 960,000 |  | 2,566,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 2,734,997 |  | 800,000 |  | 640,000 |  | 160,000 |
| Transfer from Capital Project Fund |  | 3,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest income |  | 666,996 |  | 4,250 |  | 5,602 |  | 9,899 |  | 14,433 |  | 19,327 |  | 21,016 |  | 20,904 |  | 15,597 |  | 7,401 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  | 47,117,656 |  | 81,916 |  | 212,600 |  | 390,142 |  | 4,197,698 |  | 1,088,484 |  | 2,761,590 |  | 1,073,585 |  | 3,215,962 |  | 1,369,803 |  | 1,685,432 |  | 1,262,072 |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt service - Series 2012 |  | 46,503,925 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 700,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,430,000 |  | 2,003,000 |  | 2,000,500 |  | 1,544,500 |
| Water lease payment |  | 752,795 |  | 2,000 |  | 10,000 |  | 20,665 |  | 45,000 |  | 60,000 |  | 159,500 |  | 50,000 |  | 170,937 |  | 50,000 |  | 40,000 |  | 10,000 |
| Paying agent / trustee fees |  | 50,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |
| County treasurer fees |  | 461,219 |  | 628 |  | 647 |  | 683 |  | 871 |  | 1,502 |  | 2,402 |  | 3,477 |  | 6,404 |  | 7,739 |  | 14,387 |  | 15,278 |
|  |  | 47,767,939 |  | 4,628 |  | 12,647 |  | 23,348 |  | 747,871 |  | 1,463,502 |  | 1,563,902 |  | 2,455,477 |  | 2,609,341 |  | 2,062,739 |  | 2,056,887 |  | 1,571,778 |
| Ending cash available |  | $(650,284)$ | \$ | 77,288 | \$ | 277,241 | \$ | 644,036 | \$ | 4,093,863 | \$ | 3,718,845 | \$ | 4,916,533 | \$ | 3,534,641 | \$ | 4,141,262 | \$ | 3,448,325 | \$ | 3,076,870 | \$ | 2,767,164 |
| Reserve Fund included above |  |  |  | . |  | . |  |  |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |
| Capitalized Interest included above |  |  |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | 700,000 |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  |  |
| Surplus Fund included above |  |  |  | 77,288 |  | 277,241 |  | 644,036 |  | 1,393,863 |  | 1,718,845 |  | 2,916,533 |  | 1,534,641 |  | 2,141,262 |  | 1,448,325 |  | 1,076,870 |  | 767,164 |
| Mill Levy |  |  |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |
| Total Mill Levy |  |  |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 41.000 |


| Total | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  |  |  | Calculation of Assessed Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market values - residential homes (000's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning |  |  | 1,100 | 2,772 | 3,872 | 8,924 | 17,289 | 38,987 | 67,344 | 138,110 | 161,198 | 187,741 |
| Increases (see Exhibit III) | 230,112 | 1,100 | 1,650 | 1,100 | 4,974 | 8,365 | 21,353 | 28,356 | 69,419 | 23,088 | 23,319 | 23,552 |
| Biennial reassessment (1\% per annum) | 61,659 | . | 22 | . | 77 | . | 346 | . | 1,347 | . | 3,224 | . |
| Ending market values | 291,771 | 1,100 | 2,772 | 3,872 | 8,924 | 17,289 | 38,987 | 67,344 | 138,110 | 161,198 | 187,741 | 211,293 |
| Residential assessment ratio |  | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% |
| Assessed value - residential (000's) |  | 88 | 221 | 308 | 710 | 1,376 | 3,103 | 5,361 | 10,994 | 12,831 | 14,944 | 16,819 |
| Market values - lots \& commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning |  | - | 3,826 | 3,487 | 3,421 | 3,269 | 5,121 | 5,078 | 4,354 | 4,154 | 6,588 | 42,962 |
| Increases - commercial (see Exhibit III) | 50,695 |  |  |  |  | 1,402 | . | . | . |  | 39,126 |  |
| Adjust to actual for 2009 | 0 | 1,736 | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) | (174) |
| Increase (decrease) finished lots | 693 | 2,090 | (165) | 108 | 22 | 624 | 103 | (550) | (55) | 2,607 | $(2,607)$ | (435) |
| Biennial reassessment (1\% per annum) | 11,715 | . | . | . | . |  | 28 | . | 29 | . | 29 | . |
| Ending market values | 63,103 | 3,826 | 3,487 | 3,421 | 3,269 | 5,121 | 5,078 | 4,354 | 4,154 | 6,588 | 42,962 | 42,354 |
| Commercial assessment ratio |  | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% |
| Assessed value - commercial (000's) |  | 1,109 | 1,011 | 992 | 948 | 1,485 | 1,473 | 1,263 | 1,205 | 1,910 | 12,459 | 12,283 |
| Oil and Gas Assessed value (000's) |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Total assessed valuation (000's) |  | 1,197 | 1,232 | 1,300 | 1,658 | 2,861 | 4,576 | 6,623 | 12,198 | 14,742 | 27,403 | 29,101 |
| Outstanding debt |  | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 19,000,000 | 17,900,000 | 17,150,000 | 16,350,000 | 15,950,000 | 15,660,000 | 15,350,000 | 15,020,000 |
| Outstanding debt to AV ratio |  |  | 1623.50\% | 1538.10\% | 1145.74\% | 625.60\% | 374.78\% | 246.85\% | 130.76\% | 106.23\% | 56.02\% | 51.61\% |


|  | 2020 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2023 |  | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash <br> For the Years Ended December 31, 2009 through 2041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2029 |  | 2030 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2024 |  |  |  | 2025 |  | 2026 |  | 2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Genera | al Fu | und |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning cash available | \$ | 686,953 | \$ | 1,292,574 | \$ | 1,981,274 | \$ | 2,867,040 | \$ | 3,668,749 | \$ | 4,541,593 | \$ | 5,494,421 | \$ | 6,506,228 | \$ | 7,567,231 | \$ | 8,737,575 | \$ | 9,950,298 | \$ 11,231,741 |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property taxes |  | 184,858 |  | 186,396 |  | 190,124 |  | 95,665 |  | 106,412 |  | 106,412 |  | 108,528 |  | 108,528 |  | 110,686 |  | 110,686 |  | 112,888 | 112,888 |
| Water / sewer service fees |  | 1,344,653 |  | 1,468,853 |  | 1,704,579 |  | 1,882,839 |  | 2,007,039 |  | 2,131,239 |  | 2,255,439 |  | 2,379,639 |  | 2,562,335 |  | 2,686,535 |  | 2,810,735 | 2,810,735 |
| Transfer from District \#2 |  | 145,622 |  | 175,885 |  | 209,761 |  | 120,316 |  | 139,880 |  | 178,311 |  | 197,677 |  | 213,739 |  | 234,134 |  | 252,326 |  | 300,447 | 317,161 |
| Developer advances |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1,675,133 |  | 1,831,134 |  | 2,104,464 |  | 2,098,820 |  | 2,253,331 |  | 2,415,962 |  | 2,561,644 |  | 2,701,906 |  | 2,907,155 |  | 3,049,547 |  | 3,224,070 | 3,240,784 |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water / sewer operations |  | 741,914 |  | 807,003 |  | 875,212 |  | 946,850 |  | 1,021,675 |  | 1,095,727 |  | 1,173,596 |  | 1,255,648 |  | 1,342,289 |  | 1,432,845 |  | 1,528,929 | 1,631,084 |
| Park and recreation maintenance |  | 262,656 |  | 269,223 |  | 275,953 |  | 282,852 |  | 289,923 |  | 297,171 |  | 304,601 |  | 312,216 |  | 320,021 |  | 328,022 |  | 336,222 | 344,628 |
| Administrative costs |  | 62,169 |  | 63,412 |  | 64,680 |  | 65,974 |  | 67,293 |  | 68,639 |  | 70,012 |  | 71,412 |  | 72,841 |  | 74,297 |  | 75,783 | 77,299 |
| County treasurer fees |  | 2,773 |  | 2,796 |  | 2,852 |  | 1,435 |  | 1,596 |  | 1,596 |  | 1,628 |  | 1,628 |  | 1,660 |  | 1,660 |  | 1,693 | 1,693 |
| Repay developer advances |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1,069,512 |  | 1,142,434 |  | 1,218,698 |  | 1,297,111 |  | 1,380,488 |  | 1,463,134 |  | 1,549,837 |  | 1,640,904 |  | 1,736,811 |  | 1,836,824 |  | 1,942,628 | 2,054,704 |
| Ending cash available | \$ | 1,292,574 | \$ | 1,981,274 | \$ | 2,867,040 | \$ | 3,668,749 | \$ | 4,541,593 |  | 5,494,421 | \$ | 6,506,228 | \$ | 7,567,231 | \$ | 8,737,575 | \$ | 9,950,298 |  | 11,231,741 | \$ 12,417,821 |
| Mill Levy |  | 6.000 |  | 6.000 |  | 6.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 |  | 3.000 | 3.000 |

## Capital Project Fund

| Beginning cash available | \$ | . \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | . |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond proceeds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developer advance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developer contribution |  |  | 100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | . | 100,000 |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  |  |  | . |  | . |  |  |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Issuance costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer to Debt Service (Reserve) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer to Debt Service (Cap Int) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Repay developer advances |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital - Water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital - Sewer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital - Streets |  |  | 100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | . | 100,000 |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  |  |
| Ending cash available | \$ | - \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | . | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | . | \$ |  | \$ |  |



| 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Market values - residential homes (000's) |  |  |  |  | Calculation of Assessed Valuation |  |  |  | 254,004 | 259,084 | 259,084 | 264,266 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning | 211,293 | 234,549 | 239,354 | 244,141 | 244,141 | 249,024 | 249,024 | 254,004 |  |  |  |  |
| Increases (see Exhibit III) | 19,030 | 4,805 | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biennial reassessment (1\% per annum) | 4,226 | . | 4,787 | . | 4,883 | - | 4,980 | . | 5,080 | - | 5,182 | . |
| Ending market values | 234,549 | 239,354 | 244,141 | 244,141 | 249,024 | 249,024 | 254,004 | 254,004 | 259,084 | 259,084 | 264,266 | 264,266 |
| Residential assessment ratio | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% |
| Assessed value - residential (000's) | 18,670 | 19,053 | 19,434 | 19,434 | 19,822 | 19,822 | 20,219 | 20,219 | 20,623 | 20,623 | 21,036 | 21,036 |
| Market values - lots \& commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning | 42,354 | 41,861 | 41,426 | 42,254 | 42,947 | 53,960 | 53,960 | 55,025 | 55,025 | 56,112 | 56,112 | 57,220 |
| Increases - commercial (see Exhibit III) |  | - | . |  | 10,167 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjust to actual for 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increase (decrease) finished lots | $(1,305)$ | (435) | - | 693 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biennial reassessment ( $1 \%$ per annum) | 812 | . | 829 | . | 845 | - | 1,065 | . | 1,087 | . | 1,108 |  |
| Ending market values | 41,861 | 41,426 | 42,254 | 42,947 | 53,960 | 53,960 | 55,025 | 55,025 | 56,112 | 56,112 | 57,220 | 57,220 |
| Commercial assessment ratio | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% |
| Assessed value - commercial (000's) | 12,140 | 12,013 | 12,254 | 12,455 | 15,648 | 15,648 | 15,957 | 15,957 | 16,272 | 16,272 | 16,594 | 16,594 |
| Oil and Gas Assessed value (000's) | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |
| Total assessed valuation (000's) | 30,810 | 31,066 | 31,687 | 31,888 | 35,471 | 35,471 | 36,176 | 36,176 | 36,895 | 36,895 | 37,629 | 37,629 |
| Outstanding debt | 14,665,000 | 14,285,000 | 13,880,000 | 13,445,000 | 12,980,000 | 12,485,000 | 11,955,000 | 11,385,000 | 10,775,000 | 10,125,000 | 9,430,000 | 8,685,000 |
| Outstanding debt to AV ratio | 47.60\% | 45.98\% | 43.80\% | 42.16\% | 36.59\% | 35.20\% | 33.05\% | 31.47\% | 29.20\% | 27.44\% | 25.06\% | 23.08\% |



Beginning cash available

Property taxes
Water / sewer service fees
Transfer from District \#2

Expenditures
Water / sewer operations
ark and recreation maintenance
dministrative costs
County treasurer fees
Repay developer advances

Ending cash available
Mill Levy

Revenues
Bond proceeds
Developer advance

Expenditures
Transfer to Debt Service (Reserve)
Transfer to Debt Service (Cap Int)
Repay developer advances
apital - Wate
Capital - Street

Ending cash available

|  | 2032 |  | 2033 |  | 2034 |  | 2035 |  | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 <br> Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash <br> For the Years Ended December 31, 2009 through 2041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2040 |  | 2041 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2036 |  |  |  | 2037 |  | 2038 |  | 2039 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Debt Serv | vice | Fund |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning cash available | \$ | 1,516,622 | \$ | 1,566,058 | \$ | 1,616,988 | \$ | 1,698,231 | \$ | 1,778,221 | \$ | 1,890,030 | \$ | 2,003,924 | \$ | 2,148,931 | \$ | 2,300,475 | \$ | $(650,284)$ |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property taxes |  | 1,343,228 |  | 1,343,228 |  | 1,369,952 |  | 1,369,952 |  | 1,397,210 |  | 1,397,210 |  | 1,425,014 |  | 1,425,014 |  | 1,453,373 |  |  |
| Specific ownership taxes |  | 102,085 |  | 102,085 |  | 104,116 |  | 104,116 |  | 106,188 |  | 106,188 |  | 108,301 |  | 108,301 |  | 110,456 |  |  |
| Tap Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer from Capital Project Fund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest income |  | 30,522 |  | 31,515 |  | 32,824 |  | 34,420 |  | 36,319 |  | 38,554 |  | 41,117 |  | 44,054 |  | 16,339 |  |  |
|  |  | 1,475,835 |  | 1,476,828 |  | 1,506,892 |  | 1,508,488 |  | 1,539,717 |  | 1,541,952 |  | 1,574,432 |  | 1,577,369 |  | 1,580,168 |  |  |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt service - Series 2012 |  | 1,404,250 |  | 1,403,750 |  | 1,405,100 |  | 1,407,950 |  | 1,406,950 |  | 1,407,100 |  | 1,408,050 |  | 1,404,450 |  | 4,509,125 |  | - |
| Water lease payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paying agent / trustee fees |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County treasurer fees |  | 20,148 |  | 20,148 |  | 20,549 |  | 20,549 |  | 20,958 |  | 20,958 |  | 21,375 |  | 21,375 |  | 21,801 |  |  |
|  |  | 1,426,398 |  | 1,425,898 |  | 1,425,649 |  | 1,428,499 |  | 1,427,908 |  | 1,428,058 |  | 1,429,425 |  | 1,425,825 |  | 4,530,926 |  | . |
| Ending cash available | \$ | 1,566,058 | \$ | 1,616,988 | \$ | 1,698,231 | \$ | 1,778,221 | \$ | 1,890,030 | \$ | 2,003,924 | \$ | 2,148,931 | \$ | 2,300,475 | \$ | $(650,284)$ | \$ | (650,284) |
| Reserve Fund included above |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | . |  |  |
| Capitalized Interest included above |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  |  |
| Surplus Fund included above |  | (433,942) |  | $(383,012)$ |  | (301,769) |  | $(221,779)$ |  | (109,970) |  | 3,924 |  | 148,931 |  | 300,475 |  | $(650,284)$ |  | (650,284) |
| Mill Levy |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  |  |
| Total Mill Levy |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 3.000 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Year | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 <br> Forecasted Schedule of General Obligation Debt - Series 2012 <br> For the Years Ended December 31, 2012 through 2039 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Princinal | Coupon | Interest | Annual | Outstanding <br> Balance |
|  |  |  |  |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2012 |  |  | 700,000 | 700,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2013 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2013 |  |  | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2014 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2014 |  |  | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2015 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2015 | 1,000,000 | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 2,400,000 | 19,000,000 |
| 2016 |  |  | 665,000 |  | 19,000,000 |
| 2016 | 1,100,000 | 7.000\% | 665,000 | 2,430,000 | 17,900,000 |
| 2017 |  |  | 626,500 |  | 17,900,000 |
| 2017 | 750,000 | 7.000\% | 626,500 | 2,003,000 | 17,150,000 |
| 2018 |  |  | 600,250 |  | 17,150,000 |
| 2018 | 800,000 | 7.000\% | 600,250 | 2,000,500 | 16,350,000 |
| 2019 |  |  | 572,250 |  | 16,350,000 |
| 2019 | 400,000 | 7.000\% | 572,250 | 1,544,500 | 15,950,000 |
| 2020 |  |  | 558,250 |  | 15,950,000 |
| 2020 | 290,000 | 7.000\% | 558,250 | 1,406,500 | 15,660,000 |
| 2021 |  |  | 548,100 |  | 15,660,000 |
| 2021 | 310,000 | 7.000\% | 548,100 | 1,406,200 | 15,350,000 |
| 2022 |  |  | 537,250 |  | 15,350,000 |
| 2022 | 330,000 | 7.000\% | 537,250 | 1,404,500 | 15,020,000 |
| 2023 |  |  | 525,700 |  | 15,020,000 |
| 2023 | 355,000 | 7.000\% | 525,700 | 1,406,400 | 14,665,000 |
| 2024 |  |  | 513,275 |  | 14,665,000 |
| 2024 | 380,000 | 7.000\% | 513,275 | 1,406,550 | 14,285,000 |
| 2025 |  |  | 499,975 |  | 14,285,000 |
| 2025 | 405,000 | 7.000\% | 499,975 | 1,404,950 | 13,880,000 |
| 2026 | . |  | 485,800 |  | 13,880,000 |
| 2026 | 435,000 | 7.000\% | 485,800 | 1,406,600 | 13,445,000 |
| 2027 | - |  | 470,575 |  | 13,445,000 |
| 2027 | 465,000 | 7.000\% | 470,575 | 1,406,150 | 12,980,000 |
| 2028 | . |  | 454,300 |  | 12,980,000 |
| 2028 | 495,000 | 7.000\% | 454,300 | 1,403,600 | 12,485,000 |
| 2029 | . |  | 436,975 |  | 12,485,000 |
| 2029 | 530,000 | 7.000\% | 436,975 | 1,403,950 | 11,955,000 |
| 2030 |  |  | 418,425 |  | 11,955,000 |
| 2030 | 570,000 | 7.000\% | 418,425 | 1,406,850 | 11,385,000 |
| 2031 |  |  | 398,475 |  | 11,385,000 |
| 2031 | 610,000 | 7.000\% | 398,475 | 1,406,950 | 10,775,000 |
| 2032 |  |  | 377,125 |  | 10,775,000 |
| 2032 | 650,000 | 7.000\% | 377,125 | 1,404,250 | 10,125,000 |
| 2033 |  |  | 354,375 |  | 10,125,000 |
| 2033 | 695,000 | 7.000\% | 354,375 | 1,403,750 | 9,430,000 |
| 2034 |  |  | 330,050 |  | 9,430,000 |
| 2034 | 745,000 | 7.000\% | 330,050 | 1,405,100 | 8,685,000 |
| 2035 | . |  | 303,975 | . | 8,685,000 |
| 2035 | 800,000 | 7.000\% | 303,975 | 1,407,950 | 7,885,000 |
| 2036 | . |  | 275,975 | . | 7,885,000 |
| 2036 | 855,000 | 7.000\% | 275,975 | 1,406,950 | 7,030,000 |
| 2037 |  |  | 246,050 | . | 7,030,000 |
| 2037 | 915,000 | 7.000\% | 246,050 | 1,407,100 | 6,115,000 |
| 2038 |  |  | 214,025 | . | 6,115,000 |
| 2038 | 980,000 | 7.000\% | 214,025 | 1,408,050 | 5,135,000 |
| 2039 |  |  | 179,725 |  | 5,135,000 |
| 2039 | 1,045,000 | 7.000\% | 179,725 | 1,404,450 | 4,090,000 |
| 2040 |  |  | 143,150 |  | 4,090,000 |
| 2040 | 4,090,000 | 7.000\% | 143,150 | 4,509,125 |  |
|  | 20,000,000 |  | 26,371,100 | 46,503,925 |  |


| 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 1 |
| :---: |
| Forecasted Schedules of Absorption |
| and Market Values |
| For the Years Ended December 31,2009 through 2022 |



Undeveloped Land \& Finished Lots
Filing 1
Filing 2
Filing 3


|  | Market Value | Prior | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Schedule of Market Values |  |  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 1 | 550,000 | 1,100,000 | 1,650,000 | 1,100,000 | 2,777,500 | 3,927,385 | 5,666,656 | 5,723,322 | 578,056 | - | . | - | - | . |  |  |  | 21,422,918 |
| Filing 2 | 435,000 |  | . | . | 2,196,750 | 4,437,435 | 8,963,619 | 11,316,569 | 11,429,734 | 11,544,032 | 11,659,472 | 11,776,067 | 7,136,296 | . |  |  |  | 80,459,973 |
| Filing 3 | 435,000 | . | . | . | . | . | 6,722,714 | 11,316,569 | 11,429,734 | 11,544,032 | 11,659,472 | 11,776,067 | 11,893,827 | 4,805,106 |  |  |  | 81,147,521 |
| Muti-Family | 250,000 | . | . | . | . | . |  | . | 45,981,690 | . | . | . | . | . |  |  |  | 45,981,690 |
|  |  | 1,100,000 | 1,650,000 | 1,100,000 | 4,974,250 | 8,364,820 | 21,352,988 | 28,356,459 | 69,419,214 | 23,088,063 | 23,318,944 | 23,552,133 | 19,030,124 | 4,805,106 |  |  |  | 229,012,102 |


| Commercial - Square feet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parcel 1 Retail | 174 |  | . | . | . | 1,402,127 | - | - | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | 1,402,127 |
| Parcel 10 ffice Warehouse | 114 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | 4,288,541 | . | . | . |  | . | . | 4,288,541 |
| Parcel 2 Retail | 210 |  | . | . | . |  |  | . | . |  | 3,832,884 | . | . | . |  |  |  | 3,832,884 |
| Parcel 3 Office Warehouse | 106 |  | - | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |  | . | . | . |  | . | 2,162,377 |  |
| Parcel 4 Big Box | 131 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | 11,926,204 | . | - | - |  | . |  | 11,926,204 |
| Parcel 4 Retail | 124 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | 9,334,444 | . | . | . |  |  |  | 9,334,444 |
| Parcel 5 Medical Office | 170 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | 9,743,566 | . | . | . | . | . | - | 9,743,566 |
| Parcel 6 Retail | 137 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 8,004,779 |  |
| Total Commercial |  | . | . | . | . | 1,402,127 | . | . | . | . | 39,125,639 | . | . | . | . | . | 10,167,156 | 40,527,767 |
| Undeveloped Land \& Finished Lots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 1 | 55,000 | 2,090,000 | (165,000) | (110,000) | $(275,000)$ | $(385,000)$ | (550,000) | (550,000) | $(55,000)$ |  | . | . | . | . |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 2 | 43,500 | . | . | 217,500 | 217,500 | 435,000 | 217,500 |  | . | . | . | $(435,000)$ | (652,500) | - |  |  | . | . |
| Filing 3 | 43,500 | . | . | . | . | 652,500 | 435,000 | . | . | . | - | . | $(652,500)$ | $(435,000)$ | . | - | - | . |
| Commercial (sq feet) | 10 | . | . | . | 79,000 | (79,000) | . | . | . | 2,607,000 | $(2,607,000)$ | $\cdot$ | . | . | . | 693,000 | $(693,000)$ | . |
|  |  | 2,090,000 | (165,000) | 107,500 | 21,500 | 623,500 | 102,500 | (550,000) | (55,000) | 2,607,000 | $(2,607,000)$ | (435,000) | $(1,305,000)$ | (435,000) | . | 693,000 | (693,000) |  |

4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District No 2

| 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 |
| :---: |
| Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash |
| For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 through 2045 |



|  |  | Total |  | 2011 |  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Debt Serv | vice | Fund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning cash available | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 2,902,250 | \$ | 2,250,250 | \$ | 1,620,072 | \$ | 1,812,321 | \$ | 6,997,429 | \$ | 6,172,437 | \$ | 5,460,784 | \$ | 6,616,576 | \$ | 5,902,555 | \$ | 5,378,666 |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property taxes |  | 87,361,259 |  |  |  |  |  | 20,300 |  | 70,796 |  | 142,097 |  | 252,479 |  | 372,063 |  | 519,822 |  | 672,717 |  | 862,397 |  | 1,041,616 |
| Specific ownership taxes |  | 6,681,658 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,827 |  | 6,372 |  | 12,789 |  | 22,723 |  | 33,486 |  | 46,784 |  | 55,163 |  | 70,717 |  | 85,413 |
| Tap Fees |  | 42,175,000 |  |  |  | 800,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 1,600,000 |  | 1,600,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |
| Transfer from Capital Project Fund |  | 11,060,000 |  | 3,600,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,760,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,700,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest income |  | 3,200,055 |  | 4,250 |  | . |  |  |  | 18,143 |  | 14,354 |  | 110,593 |  | 95,378 |  | 78,984 |  | 100,189 |  | 87,933 |  | 79,367 |
|  |  | 150,477,972 |  | 3,604,250 |  | 800,000 |  | 822,127 |  | 1,695,311 |  | 7,529,240 |  | 2,385,795 |  | 2,500,927 |  | 4,745,590 |  | 3,228,069 |  | 3,421,047 |  | 3,606,396 |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt service - Series 2011 |  | 51,401,125 |  | 700,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 1,400,000 |
| Debt service - Series 2015 |  | 68,514,750 |  |  |  | . |  |  |  | . |  | 840,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |
| Debt service - Series 2018 |  | 26,292,850 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 350,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |
| Water lease payments |  | 2,635,938 |  | . |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  | 125,000 |  | 125,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |
| Paying agent / trustee fees |  | 70,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |
| County treasurer fees |  | 1,310,420 |  | . |  | . |  | 305 |  | 1,062 |  | 2,131 |  | 3,787 |  | 5,581 |  | 7,797 |  | 10,091 |  | 12,936 |  | 15,624 |
|  |  | 150,225,083 |  | 702,000 |  | 1,452,000 |  | 1,452,305 |  | 1,503,062 |  | 2,344,131 |  | 3,210,787 |  | 3,212,581 |  | 3,589,797 |  | 3,942,091 |  | 3,944,936 |  | 3,947,624 |
| Ending cash available |  | 252,889 | \$ | 2,902,250 | \$ | 2,250,250 | \$ | 1,620,072 | \$ | 1,812,321 | \$ | 6,997,429 | \$ | 6,172,437 | \$ | 5,460,784 | \$ | 6,616,576 | \$ | 5,902,555 | \$ | 5,378,666 | \$ | 5,037,438 |
| Reserve Fund included above |  |  |  | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  | 3,900,000 |  | 3,900,000 |  | 3,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |
| Capitalized Interest included above |  |  |  | 1,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  | . |  | 2,520,000 |  | 840,000 |  |  |  | 350,000 |  | . |  | . |  |  |
| Surplus Fund included above |  |  |  | 2,250 |  | 750,250 |  | 120,072 |  | 312,321 |  | 577,429 |  | 1,432,437 |  | 1,560,784 |  | 1,366,576 |  | 1,002,555 |  | 478,666 |  | 137,438 |
| Mill Levy |  |  |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |
| Total Mill Levy |  |  |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 45.000 |  | 41.000 |  | 41.000 |  | 41.000 |


| Total | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Calculation of Assessed Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  | - | - | - | 18,125 | 36,431 | 76,051 | 115,331 | 168,367 | 219,604 | 287,688 |
| 1,096,102 |  | - | - | 18,125 | 18,306 | 38,891 | 39,280 | 50,729 | 51,237 | 63,691 | 64,328 |
| 243,199 | . | - | - | . | . | 729 | . | 2,307 | . | 4,392 | . |
| 1,339,300 | . | - | - | 18,125 | 36,431 | 76,051 | 115,331 | 168,367 | 219,604 | 287,688 | 352,016 |
|  | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% |
|  | . | . | . | 1,443 | 2,900 | 6,054 | 9,180 | 13,402 | 17,480 | 22,900 | 28,020 |
|  | - | - | - | 2,000 | 2,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 61,647 |  | $\cdot$ | - | - | . | - | - | . |  |  | . |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
|  |  | - | 2,000 | - | 2,000 | . | 1,000 | - | 1,000 | - | - |
| 11,164 | . | . | . | - | . | - | . | - | . | . | . |
| 72,811 | . | - | 2,000 | 2,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
|  | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% |
|  | - | - | 580 | 580 | 1,160 | 1,160 | 1,450 | 1,450 | 1,740 | 1,740 | 1,740 |
|  | . | . | 580 | 2,023 | 4,060 | 7,214 | 10,630 | 14,852 | 19,220 | 24,640 | 29,760 |


| 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 |
| :---: |
| Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash |
| For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 through 2045 |



| 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 |
| :---: |
| Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash |
| For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 through 2045 |



Debt Service Fund

| Beginning cash available | \$ | 5,037,438 | \$ | 4,905,592 | \$ | 5,301,893 | \$ | 4,974,829 | \$ | 5,131,274 | \$ | 5,537,061 | \$ | 5,987,068 | \$ | 7,758,180 | \$ | 8,741,220 |  | 10,354,134 | \$ | 9,957,951 | \$ | 9,258,218 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property taxes |  | 1,242,240 |  | 1,425,061 |  | 1,656,785 |  | 2,111,967 |  | 2,341,349 |  | 2,531,592 |  | 2,773,152 |  | 2,988,636 |  | 3,558,589 |  | 3,756,557 |  | 3,969,518 |  | 3,969,518 |
| Specific ownership taxes |  | 101,864 |  | 108,305 |  | 125,916 |  | 160,510 |  | 177,943 |  | 192,401 |  | 210,760 |  | 227,136 |  | 270,453 |  | 285,498 |  | 301,683 |  | 301,683 |
| Tap Fees |  | 2,400,000 |  | 3,444,643 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 3,530,357 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer from Capital Project Fund Interest income |  | 74,683 |  | 66,959 |  | 77,987 |  | 76,298 |  | 81,865 |  | 90,338 |  | 101,138 |  | 139,598 |  | 165,301 |  | 201,110 |  | 190,259 |  | 176,305 |
|  |  | 3,818,787 |  | 5,044,968 |  | 4,260,688 |  | 4,748,775 |  | 5,001,157 |  | 5,214,331 |  | 6,615,407 |  | 5,755,370 |  | 6,394,343 |  | 4,243,165 |  | 4,461,460 |  | 4,447,506 |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt service - Series 2011 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 2,030,000 |  | 2,030,900 |  | 2,028,650 |  | 2,028,250 |  | 2,029,350 |  | 2,031,600 |  | 2,029,650 |  | 2,028,500 |  | 2,032,800 |  | 2,031,850 |  | 2,030,650 |
| Debt service - Series 2015 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 1,680,000 |  | 2,200,000 |  | 2,198,600 |
| Debt service - Series 2018 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 865,000 |  | 868,450 |  | 865,850 |  | 867,550 |  | 868,200 |  | 867,800 |  | 866,350 |
| Water lease payments |  | 150,000 |  | 215,290 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 220,647 |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paying agent / trustee fees |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |
| County treasurer fees |  | 18,634 |  | 21,376 |  | 24,852 |  | 31,680 |  | 35,120 |  | 37,974 |  | 41,597 |  | 44,830 |  | 53,379 |  | 56,348 |  | 59,543 |  | 59,543 |
|  |  | 3,950,634 |  | 4,648,666 |  | 4,587,752 |  | 4,592,330 |  | 4,595,370 |  | 4,764,324 |  | 4,844,294 |  | 4,772,330 |  | 4,781,429 |  | 4,639,348 |  | 5,161,193 |  | 5,157,143 |
| Ending cash available | \$ | 4,905,592 | \$ | 5,301,893 | \$ | 4,974,829 | \$ | 5,131,274 | \$ | 5,537,061 | \$ | 5,987,068 | \$ | 7,758,180 | \$ | 8,741,220 |  | 10,354,134 | \$ | 9,957,951 | \$ | 9,258,218 | \$ | 8,548,581 |
| Reserve Fund included above |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |  | 4,900,000 |
| Capitalized Interest included above |  | . |  | . |  |  |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . |
| Surplus Fund included above |  | 5,592 |  | 401,893 |  | 74,829 |  | 231,274 |  | 637,061 |  | $\underline{1,087,068}$ |  | 2,858,180 |  | 3,841,220 |  | 5,454,134 |  | 5,057,951 |  | 4,358,218 |  | 3,648,581 |
| Mill Levy |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |  | 35.000 |
| Total Mill Levy |  | 41.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |  | 38.000 |


| 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 |
| :---: |
| Forecasted Sources and Uses of Cash |
| For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 through 2045 |





|  | 2034 | 2035 | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 | 2040 | 2041 | 2042 | 2043 | 2044 | 2045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Calculation of Assessed Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market values - residential homes (000's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning <br> Increases (see Exhibit III) | 1,189,260 | 1,213,046 | 1,213,046 | 1,237,307 | 1,237,307 | 1,262,053 | 1,262,053 | 1,287,294 | 1,287,294 | 1,313,040 | 1,313,040 | 1,339,300 |
| Increases (see Exhibit III) <br> Biennial reassessment (1\% per annum) | 23,785 |  | 24,261 |  | $24,746$ |  | $25,241$ | . | 25,746 |  | $26,261$ | . |
| Ending market values | 1,213,046 | 1,213,046 | 1,237,307 | 1,237,307 | 1,262,053 | 1,262,053 | 1,287,294 | 1,287,294 | 1,313,040 | 1,313,040 | 1,339,300 | 1,339,300 |
| Residential assessment ratio | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% | 7.96\% |
| Assessed value - residential (000's) | 96,558 | 96,558 | 98,490 | 98,490 | 100,459 | 100,459 | 102,469 | 102,469 | 104,518 | 104,518 | 106,608 | 106,608 |
| Market values - lots \& commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning | 64,654 | 65,947 | 65,947 | 67,266 | 67,266 | 68,611 | 68,611 | 69,984 | 69,984 | 71,383 | 71,383 | 72,811 |
| Increases - commercial (see Exhibit III) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjust to actual for 2009 <br> Increase (decrease) finished lots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biennial reassessment ( $1 \%$ per annum) | 1,293 | . | 1,319 | . | 1,345 | . | 1,372 | . | 1,400 | . | 1,428 |  |
| Ending market values | 65,947 | 65,947 | 67,266 | 67,266 | 68,611 | 68,611 | 69,984 | 69,984 | 71,383 | 71,383 | 72,811 | 72,811 |
| Commercial assessment ratio | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% | 29.00\% |
| Assessed value - commercial (000's) | 19,125 | 19,125 | 19,507 | 19,507 | 19,897 | 19,897 | 20,295 | 20,295 | 20,701 | 20,701 | 21,115 | 21,115 |
| Total assessed valuation (000's) | 115,683 | 115,683 | 117,997 | 117,997 | 120,357 | 120,357 | 122,764 | 122,764 | 125,219 | 125,219 | 127,723 | 127,723 |


| 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 |
| :---: |
| Forecasted Schedule of General Obligation Debt • Series 2011 |
| For the Years Ended December 31, 2011 through 2041 |


| Year | Principal | Coupon | Interest | Annual <br> Total | Outstanding Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2011 |  |  | 700,000 | 700,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2012 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2012 |  |  | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2013 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2013 |  |  | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2014 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2014 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2015 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2015 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2016 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2016 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2017 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2017 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2018 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2018 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2019 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2019 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2020 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2020 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2021 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2021 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2022 |  |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2022 |  | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 1,400,000 | 20,000,000 |
| 2023 | . |  | 700,000 |  | 20,000,000 |
| 2023 | 630,000 | 7.000\% | 700,000 | 2,030,000 | 19,370,000 |
| 2024 |  |  | 677,950 |  | 19,370,000 |
| 2024 | 675,000 | 7.000\% | 677,950 | 2,030,900 | 18,695,000 |
| 2025 |  |  | 654,325 |  | 18,695,000 |
| 2025 | 720,000 | 7.000\% | 654,325 | 2,028,650 | 17,975,000 |
| 2026 |  |  | 629,125 |  | 17,975,000 |
| 2026 | 770,000 | 7.000\% | 629,125 | 2,028,250 | 17,205,000 |
| 2027 | . |  | 602,175 |  | 17,205,000 |
| 2027 | 825,000 | 7.000\% | 602,175 | 2,029,350 | 16,380,000 |
| 2028 | . |  | 573,300 |  | 16,380,000 |
| 2028 | 885,000 | 7.000\% | 573,300 | 2,031,600 | 15,495,000 |
| 2029 |  |  | 542,325 |  | 15,495,000 |
| 2029 | 945,000 | 7.000\% | 542,325 | 2,029,650 | 14,550,000 |
| 2030 | - |  | 509,250 |  | 14,550,000 |
| 2030 | 1,010,000 | 7.000\% | 509,250 | 2,028,500 | 13,540,000 |
| 2031 |  |  | 473,900 |  | 13,540,000 |
| 2031 | 1,085,000 | 7.000\% | 473,900 | 2,032,800 | 12,455,000 |
| 2032 |  |  | 435,925 |  | 12,455,000 |
| 2032 | 1,160,000 | 7.000\% | 435,925 | 2,031,850 | 11,295,000 |
| 2033 | . |  | 395,325 |  | 11,295,000 |
| 2033 | 1,240,000 | 7.000\% | 395,325 | 2,030,650 | 10,055,000 |
| 2034 | . |  | 351,925 | . | 10,055,000 |
| 2034 | 1,325,000 | 7.000\% | 351,925 | 2,028,850 | 8,730,000 |
| 2035 |  |  | 305,550 |  | 8,730,000 |
| 2035 | 1,420,000 | 7.000\% | 305,550 | 2,031,100 | 7,310,000 |
| 2036 | . |  | 255,850 | . | 7,310,000 |
| 2036 | 1,520,000 | 7.000\% | 255,850 | 2,031,700 | 5,790,000 |
| 2037 |  |  | 202,650 | . | 5,790,000 |
| 2037 | 1,625,000 | 7.000\% | 202,650 | 2,030,300 | 4,165,000 |
| 2038 |  |  | 145,775 | . | 4,165,000 |
| 2038 | 1,740,000 | 7.000\% | 145,775 | 2,031,550 | 2,425,000 |
| 2039 |  |  | 84,875 | . | 2,425,000 |
| 2039 | 2,425,000 | 7.000\% | 84,875 | 2,815,425 |  |
|  | 20,000,000 |  | 31,180,450 | 51,401,125 |  |


| Year | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2 <br> Forecasted Schedule of General Obligation Debt - Series 2015 <br> For the Years Ended December 31, 2015 through 2044 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Principal | Coupon | Interest | Annual <br> Total | Outstanding Balance |
|  |  |  |  |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2015 |  |  | 840,000 | 840,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2016 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2016 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2017 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2017 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2018 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2018 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2019 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2019 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2020 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2020 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2021 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2021 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2022 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2022 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2023 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2023 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2024 | - |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2024 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2025 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2025 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2026 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2026 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2027 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2027 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2028 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2028 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2029 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2029 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2030 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2030 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2031 |  |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2031 |  |  | 840,000 | 1,680,000 | 24,000,000 |
| 2032 | . |  | 840,000 |  | 24,000,000 |
| 2032 | 520,000 | 7.000\% | 840,000 | 2,200,000 | 23,480,000 |
| 2033 |  |  | 821,800 |  | 23,480,000 |
| 2033 | 555,000 | 7.000\% | 821,800 | 2,198,600 | 22,925,000 |
| 2034 |  |  | 802,375 |  | 22,925,000 |
| 2034 | 595,000 | 7.000\% | 802,375 | 2,199,750 | 22,330,000 |
| 2035 |  |  | 781,550 |  | 22,330,000 |
| 2035 | 635,000 | 7.000\% | 781,550 | 2,198,100 | 21,695,000 |
| 2036 |  |  | 759,325 |  | 21,695,000 |
| 2036 | 680,000 | 7.000\% | 759,325 | 2,198,650 | 21,015,000 |
| 2037 | - |  | 735,525 |  | 21,015,000 |
| 2037 | 725,000 | 7.000\% | 735,525 | 2,196,050 | 20,290,000 |
| 2038 |  |  | 710,150 |  | 20,290,000 |
| 2038 | 780,000 | 7.000\% | 710,150 | 2,200,300 | 19,510,000 |
| 2039 |  |  | 682,850 |  | 19,510,000 |
| 2039 | 835,000 | 7.000\% | 682,850 | 2,200,700 | 18,675,000 |
| 2040 |  |  | 653,625 |  | 18,675,000 |
| 2040 | 2,590,000 | 7.000\% | 653,625 | 3,897,250 | 16,085,000 |
| 2041 | - |  | 562,975 |  | 16,085,000 |
| 2041 | 2,770,000 | 7.000\% | 562,975 | 3,895,950 | 13,315,000 |
| 2042 | - |  | 466,025 |  | 13,315,000 |
| 2042 | 3,265,000 | 7.000\% | 466,025 | 4,197,050 | 10,050,000 |
| 2043 | . |  | 351,750 |  | 10,050,000 |
| 2043 | 3,495,000 | 7.000\% | 351,750 | 4,198,500 | 6,555,000 |
| 2044 | - |  | 229,425 |  | 6,555,000 |
| 2044 | 6,555,000 | 7.000\% | 229,425 | 7,013,850 |  |
|  | 24,000,000 |  | 44,514,750 | 68,514,750 |  |



| Year | Principal | Coupon | Interest | Annual <br> Total | Outstanding Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2018 |  |  | 350,000 | 350,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2019 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2019 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2020 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2020 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2021 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2021 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2022 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2022 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2023 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2023 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2024 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2024 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2025 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2025 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2026 |  |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2026 |  |  | 350,000 | 700,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2027 | - |  | 350,000 |  | 10,000,000 |
| 2027 | 165,000 | 7.000\% | 350,000 | 865,000 | 9,835,000 |
| 2028 |  |  | 344,225 |  | 9,835,000 |
| 2028 | 180,000 | 7.000\% | 344,225 | 868,450 | 9,655,000 |
| 2029 |  |  | 337,925 |  | 9,655,000 |
| 2029 | 190,000 | 7.000\% | 337,925 | 865,850 | 9,465,000 |
| 2030 | . |  | 331,275 |  | 9,465,000 |
| 2030 | 205,000 | 7.000\% | 331,275 | 867,550 | 9,260,000 |
| 2031 | . |  | 324,100 |  | 9,260,000 |
| 2031 | 220,000 | 7.000\% | 324,100 | 868,200 | 9,040,000 |
| 2032 | . |  | 316,400 |  | 9,040,000 |
| 2032 | 235,000 | 7.000\% | 316,400 | 867,800 | 8,805,000 |
| 2033 | . |  | 308,175 |  | 8,805,000 |
| 2033 | 250,000 | 7.000\% | 308,175 | 866,350 | 8,555,000 |
| 2034 | . |  | 299,425 |  | 8,555,000 |
| 2034 | 265,000 | 7.000\% | 299,425 | 863,850 | 8,290,000 |
| 2035 | . |  | 290,150 |  | 8,290,000 |
| 2035 | 285,000 | 7.000\% | 290,150 | 865,300 | 8,005,000 |
| 2036 | . |  | 280,175 |  | 8,005,000 |
| 2036 | 305,000 | 7.000\% | 280,175 | 865,350 | 7,700,000 |
| 2037 | . |  | 269,500 |  | 7,700,000 |
| 2037 | 325,000 | 7.000\% | 269,500 | 864,000 | 7,375,000 |
| 2038 | . |  | 258,125 |  | 7,375,000 |
| 2038 | 350,000 | 7.000\% | 258,125 | 866,250 | 7,025,000 |
| 2039 | . |  | 245,875 |  | 7,025,000 |
| 2039 | 375,000 | 7.000\% | 245,875 | 866,750 | 6,650,000 |
| 2040 | - |  | 232,750 |  | 6,650,000 |
| 2040 | 370,000 | 7.000\% | 232,750 | 835,500 | 6,280,000 |
| 2041 | . |  | 219,800 |  | 6,280,000 |
| 2041 | 395,000 | 7.000\% | 219,800 | 834,600 | 5,885,000 |
| 2042 | . |  | 205,975 |  | 5,885,000 |
| 2042 | 355,000 | 7.000\% | 205,975 | 766,950 | 5,530,000 |
| 2043 | . |  | 193,550 |  | 5,530,000 |
| 2043 | 280,000 | 7.000\% | 193,550 | 667,100 | 5,250,000 |
| 2044 | - |  | 183,750 |  | 5,250,000 |
| 2044 | 100,000 | 7.000\% | 183,750 | 467,500 | 5,150,000 |
| 2045 | . |  | 180,250 |  | 5,150,000 |
| 2045 | 5,150,000 | 7.000\% | 180,250 | 5,510,500 |  |

$10,000,000 \quad 16,292,850 \quad 26,292,850$

| Property Descrition |  | Prior | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2Forecasted Schedules of Absorptionand Market Values |  |  |  |  | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | Exhibit III <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Schedulue of Absorftion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 1 |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Filing 2 |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 50 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 50 |  |  |  | 200 |
| Filing 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 25 |  | 200 |
| Filing 12Filing 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 50 | 100 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75 | 75 | 50 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 125 | 125 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 2,500 |
| Commercial - Suuare feet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcel 1 Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{90,000}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{90,000}$ |
| Parcel 10 ffice Warehouse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |
| Parcel 1 Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55,000 |
| Parcel 2 Big Box |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70,000 |  |  | 70,000 |
| Parcel 2 Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 |  |  | 60,000 |
| Parcel 2 Medical Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26,000 |  |  | 26,000 |
| Parcel 6 Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55,000 |  |  | 55,000 |
| Total Commercial |  |  |  |  | . |  |  | . | . |  |  |  |  |  | 195,000 |  |  |  |  | 211,000 | . |  | 406,000 |
| Undeveloped Land \& Finished Lots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 1 to 13 |  |  |  |  | 50 |  | 25 | . | 25 |  | . | . | . |  | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | (150) |  |
| Commercial (sq feet) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | . |  |  |  |  | 195,000 | $(195,000)$ |  |  |  | 211,000 | (211,000) |  | . |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tap Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Prior | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | Total |
| Filings 1.13 | 16,000 |  |  | 800,000 | 800,000 | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 40,000,000 |
| Commercial (135.9375 SFE's) Less $\$ 11$ per SfE | 16,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (150,000) | (150,000) | $\begin{gathered} 1,044,643 \\ (015,290) \end{gathered}$ |  | (150,000) | (150,000) | (150,000) | $\begin{gathered} 1,130,357 \\ (220,647) \end{gathered}$ | (150,000) | (150,000) | $\begin{aligned} & 2,175,000 \\ & (2,635,938) \end{aligned}$ |
| Less STK per Ste |  |  |  | 750,000 | 750,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,875,000 | 1,875,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | $3.229,353$ | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 3,309,710 | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | ${ }_{\text {(2, } 2,535,938,063}$ |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Market } \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Prior | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 4 Way Ranch Metropolitan District No. 2Forecasted Schedules of Absorptionand Market ValuesFor the Years Ended December 31,2011 through 2030 |  |  |  |  | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | Exhibit III |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Schedu | le of Market $\mathrm{V}_{\text {a }}$ | alues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Residential Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 1 | 350,000 |  |  | 8,750,000 | 8,837,500 | 8,925,875 | 9,015,134 |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35,528,509 |
| Filing 2 | 375,000 |  |  | 9,375,000 | 9,468,750 | 9,563,438 | 9,659,072 | 19,511,325 | 19,706,438 | . | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 77,284,023 |
| Filing 3 | 400,000 |  |  | . |  | 10,201,000 | 10,303,010 | 20,812,880 | 21,020,201 | 21,230,403 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 83,566,694 |
| Filing 4 | 400,000 |  |  | - | . | 10,201,000 | 10,303,010 | 10,406,40 | 10,510,101 | 21,230,403 | 21,422,707 |  |  | , | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 84,093,261 |
| Filing 5 | 400,000 |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 10,615,202 | 21,422,707 | 21,657,134 | 21,873,705 | 11,046,221 | $\checkmark$ | , | , | - | , | - |  | - | 86,634,969 |
| Filing 6 | 400,000 |  |  | - | . | . | . | . |  | 10,615,202 | 10,721,354 | 21,657,134 | 21,873,705 | 22,092,443 |  |  |  |  |  | . |  | - | 86,959,837 |
| Filing 7 | 400,000 |  |  | - | - | - | . | - |  |  | 10,721,354 | 10,828,567 | 10,936,853 | 22,092,443 | 22,313,367 | 11,268,250 |  | - |  | . |  | - | 88,160,833 |
| Filing 8 | 400,000 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - |  | 10,828,567 | 10,93, 85 | 11,046,221 | 22,313,367 | 22,536,501 | 11,380,933 | . |  | . |  | - | 89,042,441 |
| Filing 9 | 400,000 |  |  |  | - | . | . | . | - | - | - | . |  | . | 11,156,683 | 22,536,501 | 22,761,866 | 22,989,484 | 11,609,690 | . |  | - | 91,054,223 |
| Fiiling 10 | 400,000 |  |  | - | - | - | . | . | . | - |  | - | - | - | 11,156,883 | 11,268,250 | 22,761,866 | 22,989,484 | 23,219,379 |  |  | - | 91,395,663 |
| Filing 11 | 400,000 |  |  | . | - | . | . | . | . | . |  | . | . | . | . |  | 11,380,933 | 22,989,484 | 23,219,379 | 23,451,573 | $11.843,044$ |  | 92,884,413 |
| Filing 12 | 400,000 |  |  | . |  | . | . |  |  | . | . | . |  | . |  | - |  |  | 11,609,690 | 11,725,786 | 23,886,089 | 47,845,899 | 94,867,464 |
| Filing 13 | 400,000 |  |  | . |  | . | . | . |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |  |  | 35,177,359 | 35,52, 133 | 23,922,950 | 94,629,442 |
|  |  |  |  | 18,125,000 | 18,306,250 | 38,891,313 | 39,280,226 | 50,72,445 | 51,236,740 | 63,691,209 | 64,328,121 | 64,971,402 | 65,621,116 | 66,277,328 | 66,940,101 | 67,60,502 | 68,285,597 | 68,968,453 | 69,658,137 | 70,354,719 | 71,058,266 | 71,768,849 | 1,096,101,773 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cormercial - Square feet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcel 1 Retail | 135 |  |  | - |  | - | - | - | , | - | - | - | - | - | 13,555,370 | - | - | - | - | - | . | . | 13,555,370 |
| Parcel 10 Ofice Warehouse | 106 |  |  | - | . | . | . | . |  | - | . | - | - | - | 5,913,042 | - | - | - | . |  | . | - | 5,913,042 |
| Parcel 1 Retail | 146 |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - |  | - | - |  | 8,953,238 | - | - |  | - |  | - | $\cdot$ | 8,953,238 |
| Parcel 2 Big Box | 126 |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | . | - | - | - |  | 10,377,321 | - | - | 10,377,321 |
| Parcel 2 Retail | 132 |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | 9,263,371 | - | - | 9,263,371 |
| Parcel 2 Medical Office | 174 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | . | . | . | - | . | . | - | - | - |  | 5,300,055 | . | - | 5,300,055 |
| Parcel 6 Retail | 128 |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | 8,284,268 | . | . | 8,284,268 |
| Total Commerial |  |  | . | . |  | . | . | . |  | . | . | . |  |  | 28,421,651 | . |  | . |  | 33,225,016 |  | . | 61,646,667 |
| Undeveloped Land \& Finished Lots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Filing 1 to 13 | 40,00 |  | 2,00,000 | - | 2,000,000 | - | 1,000,000 | . | 1,000,000 | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | - |  |  | - | . | $\cdot$ |  |  |  | (6,000,000) |  |
| Commercial (sq feet) | 10 |  |  | . |  | . |  | . |  | . | . | . | . | 1,950,000 | (1,950,000) | . | . | . | 2,110,000 | $(2,110,000)$ | . |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2,000,000 | . | 2,000,000 | . | 1,000,000 | - | 1,000,000 | . | . | . | . | 1,950,000 | $(1,950,000)$ | - | . | . | 2,110,000 | $(2,110,000)$ | . | (6,000,000) |  |

## EXHIBIT C

UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF DISTRICTS' FACILITIES \& COSTS

Overall Water Facilities Spreadsheet 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Improvement |  | Build when SFE= |  | Capital Cost 2009 Dollars | Distribution/ Transmission |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase One |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 Central Water (Existing) Stage 2 Central Water Treatment | 120 GPM |  | \$ | 2,100,000 | \$ | - | Existing includes distribution/transmisson |
|  | 300 GPM | 200 |  | \$1,928,948 |  |  | Note: In order to simplify anlysis, we allocated an average cost of raw water line |
|  | Well Site \#2 | 200 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | extension to each well site. As we worked through the raw water lines, it appears that |
|  | Well Site \#3 | 400 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | it is a very reasonable estimate |
|  | Well Site \#4 | 600 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$7,465,394 | \$ | 3,668,621 |  |
| Phase Two |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 3 Central Water Treatment Storage 1.75 MG | 650 GPM | 700 |  | \$3,389,068 |  |  | Superstructure for Stage 4 is constructed at this time. A separate site is an option for FP 3 |
|  |  | 700 |  | \$1,347,306 |  |  | Storage may be most dependent on commercial fire need-could go sooner depending |
|  | Well Site \#5 | 800 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | on the exact nature of commercial development in Phase One |
|  | Well Site \#6 | 1000 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | Options for recharge/exchange start becoming considerations |
|  | Well Site \#7 | 1260 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 | At well sites 7 and up, an additional well into Denver or Dawson would be drilled |
|  | Well Site \#8 | 1520 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
| Stage 4 Central Water Treatment | 1000 GPM | 1700 |  | \$3,219,614 |  |  | Equipment Only with some external. Superstructure in place with Stage 3 |
|  | Well Site \#9 | 1780 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#11 | 2040 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#12 | 2300 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#13 | 2560 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#14 | 2820 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#15 | 3080 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#16 | 3340 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$23,442,906 | \$ | 16,753,368 |  |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Overall Wastewater Facilities Spreadsheet
4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Improvement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Build when } \\ & \text { SFE= } \end{aligned}$ | Capital Cost 2009 Dollars |  | Collection/ Trunk Sewers |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase One Lift Station/Force Main \#1 | 0 | \$ | 1,333,007 | \$ | - |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 0 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 | Note: In order to simplify anlysis, we allocated an average cost of collection and |
| Pump Upgrades | 175 | \$ | 322,465 |  |  | trunk mains per 350 SFE |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 350 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
|  | Phase One | \$ | 1,655,472 | \$ | 3,717,431 |  |
| Phase Two |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lift Station Force Main \#2 | 700 | \$ | 2,851,818 |  |  | Lift Station Number 2 |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 700 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 1050 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 1400 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 1750 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 2100 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 2450 |  |  |  | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 2800 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 3150 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
|  | Phase Two | \$ | 2,851,818 | \$ | 14,869,725 |  |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Cost Breakdown

## Cost Estimate for Phase I Local Roads / Overall Site Improvements <br> Project: 4-Way Ranch




* Refers to "Local" improvements for which financing is subject to prior approval of the County

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Cost Breakdown

## Cost Estimate for Phase I Major Roads / Collector Roads

## Project: 4-Way Ranch




[^0]Cost Breakdown
Cost Estimate for Phase II Local Roads / Overall Site Improvements

## Project: 4-Way Ranch



| Item | Unit | Quant. | Unit Cost |  | Item <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall Site Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Grading - Creek \& Drainage Areas | L.S. | 1 | \$ 200,000.00 | \$ | 350,000 |
| 2 Creek \& Drainage Area Improvements | L.S. | 1 | \$ 750,000.00 | \$ | 550,000 |
| 3 Common Area Landscaping \& Irrigation | L.S. | 1 | \$ 550,000.00 | \$ | 750,000 |
| 4 Detention Ponds | L.S. | 1 | \$ 350,000.00 | \$ | 900,000 |
| 5 Trails | L.S. | 1 | \$ 125,000.00 | \$ | 150,000 |
| 6 Entry Features \& Signage * | L.S. | 1 | \$ 150,000.00 | \$ | 350,000 |
|  | Construction Total |  |  | \$ | 3,050,000 |
|  | 15\% Construction Contingency |  |  | \$ | 457,500 |
|  | Overall Site Improvements |  |  | \$ | 3,507,500 |

* Refers to "Local" improvements for which financing is subject to prior approval of the County

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cosi will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Cost Breakdown

## Cost Estimate for Phase II Major Roads / Collector Roads

## Project: 4-Way Ranch




Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over
competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Overall Cost Summary
Phases I and II
Project: 4-Way Ranch

| Item |  | District 1 (Phase I) |  | District 2 (Phase II) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Central | \$ | 7,465,394 | \$ | 23,442,906 |
|  | Distribution | \$ | 3,668,621 | \$ | 16,753,368 |
|  | Subtotal | \$ | 11,134,015 | \$ | 40,196,274 |
| Sewer |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Central | \$ | 1,655,472 | \$ | 2,851,818 |
|  | Collection | \$ | 3,717,431 | \$ | 14,869,725 |
|  | Subtotal | \$ | 5,372,903 | \$ | 17,721,543 |
| Roads |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Major | \$ | 4,884,338 | \$ | 6,180,963 |
|  | Collector | \$ | 4,355,050 | \$ | 7,443,663 |
|  | Local | \$ | 3,351,862 | \$ | 12,465,874 |
|  | Overall Site Improvements | \$ | 2,443,750 | \$ | 3,507,500 |
|  | Subtotal | \$ | 15,035,000 | \$ | 29,598,000 |
|  | Totals | \$ | 31,541,918 | \$ | 87,515,817 |
| Grant Total $\quad$ \$119,057,735 |  |  |  |  |  |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## EXHIBIT D

UPDATED MAP OF LOCATION OF THE PHASES I AND II ROADWAY FACILITIES


## EXHIBIT E

## UPDATED CENTRAL WATER AND WASTEWATER SYSTEM FACILITIES PLAN
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## Executive Summary

We estimated the necessary improvements to build-out roughly 3300 to 3500 single family equivalents within 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts 1 and 2. All water for full buildout is available through 4-Way Ranch.

## Water:

An existing system is in place which should not require any improvements until roughly 200 single family equivalent services are online. At that time, additional well sites and a second water treatment plant (WTP \#2) would be required. Well sites can be added as necessary (an additional well site is needed with roughly each 200 SFE ). To build out Phase One, the second water plant and a total of 4 well sites should be implemented.

When the District reaches about 700 SFE, a larger treatment plant, plant expansion, or $3^{\text {rd }}$ treatment plant site must be added. For estimation purposes we used the same utility site as Treatment Plant \#2. This plant would take the system through roughly 1700 SFE , at which time the last water plant expansion would be made. We made the assumption that the second treatment plant will be constructed so that upgrading its capacity will only require the addition of equipment. The final plant expansion would service up to about 3500 SFE. Well sites are master-planned to include about 4 future sites north of District \#2 but still within 4-Way Ranch holdings.

Although this outline relies solely on Denver Basin wells, we would expect that as some level of significant wastewater return flows become available, 4-Way may pursue recharge and exchange in the Upper Black Squirrel in order to reduce the reliance on Denver Basin groundwater.

## Sewer:

Wastewater treatment is expected to be provided through Woodmen Hills Metropolitan District. Although this is the preferred alternative and Woodmen Hills has committed to provide service, 4-Way Ranch has identified a treatment site if the Woodmen Hills option is unavailable.

Phase One wastewater requires a lift station at the southeast corner of District \#1. Because of the land geometry, we recommend that about 130 SFE in Phase Two are served by Phase One sewer and that roughly 20 units in Phase One flow through Phase Two sewer improvements. If this cannot be accommodated, a temporary lift station would be required.

Phase Two would be served by a lift station at a point near Highway 24 along the central east boundary of District \#2. This second site would serve the balance of the development, although pumping facilities might be phased.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

## SECTION 1 -STUDY AREA \& LAND USE

| 1.1 | Study Area |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.2 | Land Use |
| 1.3 | Growth Potential |
|  | Figure 1 - Overall Siteplan |

SECTION 2 - PROJECTION OF WATER NEEDS \& WASTEWATER LOADS

2.1 Analysis of Water Demands<br>Table 1 - Projected Water Demands<br>2.2 Projection of Wastewater Loads<br>Table 2 - Projected Wastewater Loads

2.3 Growth and Development

SECTION 3 - PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM FACILITIES
3.1 Water Rights
3.2 Source of Supply
3.3 Water Quality and Treatment
3.4 Water Storage

Table 3 - Probable Fire Flow Requirements
3.5 Distribution and Transmission Lines
3.6 Pumping for Service Pressures

SECTION 4 - PROPOSED WASTEWATER SYSTEM FACILITIES
4.1 Basins and Sewer Outfalls
4.2 Lift Stations and Force Mains
4.3 Wastewater Treatment
4.4 Potential for Reuse Recharge

SECTION 5 - IMPLEMENTATION OF FACILITIES
5.1 Cost of Facilities
5.2 Major Permitting Requirements
5.3 Implementation Timeline

## APPENDICES

Appendix A - Projected Water Demands

- Projected Wastewater Loads

Appendix B - Summary of Water Rights
Appendix C - Master Plan of Central Water System Major Improvements
Appendix D - Master Plan of Central Wastewater System Major Improvements
Appendix E - Summaries and Breakdowns of Costs for Central Systems

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to provide a preliminary outline of central water and wastewater system facilities that would be necessary to serve the 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts \#'s 1 and 2. The initial result of this effort is to provide approximate costs and construction timing of water and wastewater system development, as well as potential costs for the purpose of financial planning.

## SECTION 1-STUDY AREA \& LAND USE

1.1 Study Area: The comprehensive study area includes approximately 8100 acres known as the 4-Way Ranch. These lands are generally between Eastonville Road and Highway 24 north of Stapleton Drive, with a small portion being south of Stapleton. This study more specifically addresses the southern 1300 acres of the property that is being proposed for development. The areas are shown on the attached drawing entitled Figure 1.
1.2 Land Use: 4-Way Ranch has currently developed 42 large single family lots in the first filing of Phase One. While sewer service to these lots is primarily septic, two lots serving a church are on central sewer. The remaining filings in Phase One and all of Phase Two are proposed to have central sewer.

For the purpose of District planning, rough land uses have been estimated for the lands within District 1 and 2.

We would estimate that approximate build-out of the two Districts will include up to 3500 single family equivalents. Figure 1 on the following page is a very rough land use plan on which very initial planning has been based.
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## SECTION 2 - PROJECTION OF WATER NEEDS \& WASTEWATER LOADS

2.1 Analysis of Water Demands: It is expected that the future single family residential lots will be developed with turf grass landscaping of 1500 to 3000 square feet per lot. Appendix A presents a more detailed breakdown of projected water use. Based on these estimates, a summary of potential water demands is as follows:

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF PROJECTED WATER DEMANDS

| Land Use | Annual <br> Water <br> Demand <br> (AF/Year) | Average <br> Daily <br> Flow <br> (GPD) | Max Daily <br> Flow <br> (GPD) | Peak <br> Hour <br> Demand <br> (GPM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District \#1 (Phase One) <br> (Approx 674 Equivalent Taps) | 208 | 186,000 | 456,000 | 475 |
| District \#2 (Phase Two) <br> (Approx 2607 Equivalent Taps) | 834 | 745,000 | $1,825,000$ | 1900 |
| Totals <br> (with 5\% for Planning Cushion) | 1094 | 978,000 | $2,395,000$ | 2494 |

2.2 Projection of Wastewater Loads: With the exception of two lots being a church, the existing 42 large acreage lots are served by septic systems. Appendix $A$ presents a more detailed breakdown of projected wastewater loads. Following is a summary of wastewater loads:

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF PROJECTED WASTEWATER LOADS

| Land Use | Average Daily <br> Flow <br> (GPD) | Max Daily <br> Flow <br> (GPD) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District \#1 (Phase One) <br> (Approx 674 Equivalent Taps) <br> District \#2 (Phase Two) <br> (Approx 2607 Equivalent Taps) | 117,130 | 134,700 |
| Totals <br> (with 5\% for Planning Cushion) | 680,200 | 552,200 |

2.3 Growth and Development: It should be noted that we have added a 5\% cushion to our estimates as final land uses and exact locations are not currently known. We would like to plan for up to about 3500 single family equivalents for the study area in order to have some certainty that our estimates will be adequate. Obviously, if lower densities develop, we can adjust figures downward to meet those needs.

## SECTION 3 - PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM FACILITIES

3.1 Water Rights: The 4-Way Ranch has a substantial holding of Denver Basin Groundwater rights. There are four water right determinations in 4-Way Ranch: $510-\mathrm{BD}, 511-\mathrm{BD}$, $512-\mathrm{BD}$, and $513-\mathrm{BD}$. Currently this water may be used anywhere within the 8100 acre parcel. Both the Arapahoe and Laramie Fox Hills aquifers are determined to be fully non-tributary. The Denver and Dawson include a mix of non-tributary and not nontributary water. A summary of the water rights within the 8100 acre Ranch are located in Appendix $B$.

The total determination allows for 8509 acre-feet of annual withdrawal on a 100-year basis and a 3708 annual acre-foot withdrawal on the El Paso County 300-year basis. Based on the needs summarized in Section 2, there are more than adequate water rights to serve all of the currently anticipated needs.
3.2 Source of Supply: Domestic water demand would be met using primarily Arapahoe (A) and Laramie-Fox Hills (LFH) wells. It is recommended that well sites be located with the intent of drilling two to four wells on each site based on final recommendations by the groundwater hydrogeologist, Curt Wells. At each site, a single well would be planned for each aquifer, although all wells may not necessarily be drilled at the same time. This report proposes sites for initial wells, but these sites should be confirmed by Mr. Wells.

Appendix $C$ depicts a layout of expected facilities including potential well sites. Based on history of well yield on adjacent properties, it can be assumed that each LFH well would produce about 90 gpm and each Arapahoe would produce about 35 gpm .

Well site \#1 has already been drilled and a treatment plant has been located at the site. The existing water facilities will be adequate through the first 200 single family equivalent taps. To complete Phase One of development, well sites 2,3 , and 4 will be added along with an additional treatment plant located at the existing water storage tank site. This site has been planned for these future facilities, and will be adequate for all of Phase One development.

The Denver and Dawson wells would probably not be developed, initially. However, the decision to provide for recreational/irrigation needs may suggest that the shallower but less productive Denver and Dawson wells be used. Again, this final determination should be made by Mr. Wells.

Upon commencement of development into District \#2 (Phase Two), well sites will be added as needed, and treatment will be further built-out adjacent to the existing water tank site. We would plan for the second water treatment plant to easily accept a major expansion, but additional lands may need to be set aside for other treatment sites.

It is possible that up to 14 well sites will be needed to serve the entire build-out of 4-Way Ranch. While we have based this plan on that eventuality, we expect that future source options will include Denver Basin exchanges on return flows and alluvial wells.
3.3 Water Quality and Treatment: Historical use of the Denver basin water in this area suggests that high iron and manganese levels will require treatment. The most prevalent type of treatment system employed for this purpose is a pressure filter system which is fairly easily operated and easily automated. We expect to continue to develop treatment in the manner already used at 4-Way and adjacent areas.
3.4 Water Storage: A 430,000 gallon storage tank already exists in 4-Way Ranch, which will suffice for expected domestic needs throughout Phase One development, unless a large commercial user would necessitate higher fire-flow storage. We recommend water storage measures be based on two different criteria: (a) storage should equal at least required fire supply plus necessary equalizing storage, and (b) storage should exclude the bottom two feet of water in the tank. It is also recommended that the storage criteria above should not be less than the maximum daily need for domestic supply.

Probable fire requirements are as follows:
TABLE 3
PROBABLE FIRE-FLOW REQUIREMENTS

| Land Use | Flowrate <br> (GPM) | Duration <br> (Hrs) | Required <br> Storage <br> (Gallons) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural Residential Development* | 1,000 | 2 | 120,000 |
| General Commercial** | 2,500 | 2 | 300,000 |
| "Big Box" Commercial | 4,500 | 4 | $1,080,000$ |

* Minimum 2.5 Acre Lots
** Great variability based on actual use

The tank site is located on a knoll in the northwest corner of the Phase One. Depending on actual final build-out, we would anticipate approximately 2.0 MG of water storage to be required for build-out. This could occur as multiple tanks in series or a single unit adjacent to the existing tank which would bring total storage to between 2.0 and 2.5 MG . An option might exist to site the second tank north of the existing tank site in order to create a gravity feed option. If used, this site is still within 4-Way Ranch, but roughly two (2) miles north of the development area.
3.5 Distribution and Transmission Lines: For the purpose of fire protection, we recommend eight inch ( 8 ") water piping throughout the residential subdivision. The lines should be looped wherever street layout allows. A few larger loops are noted on the master plan which will be required as the area develops.
3.6 Pumping for Service Pressures: Ground elevations within the development service area range from 6860 to 7020 . Adequate service pressures are generally considered 55 psi for residential service. The existing tank site is at an elevation of approximately 6990, which would not be capable of supplying acceptable service pressures to most of the service area. Consequently, an alternate tank site would be required at a minimum elevation of 7150 . A site of 7150 elevation is available within the 4 -Way Ranch holdings, but the site is nearly 2 miles north of the proposed development. For Phase One, we suggest utilizing the existing storage site as is.

## SECTION 4 - PROPOSED WASTEWATER SYSTEM FACILITIES

4.1 Basins and Sewer Outfalls: A layout of the major wastewater facilities is located in Appendix D. A major basin line cuts through the site roughly diagonal to the phasing line. Each of the major basins would require a lift station in the approximate locations depicted in the layout. It would be most cost effective to provide service to about 138 homes in Phase Two through the Phase One Basin and there would be between 15 and 25 homes in Phase One that might be better served through the Phase Two Basin. Consequently, we would recommend not building out a small portion of Phase One until Phase Two major facilities are underway. This would avoid a temporary lift station.

Appendix $D$ also shows the anticipated force mains from each lift station linking into Woodmen Hills.

For the master planning purposes, we have shown only the larger main trunk sewers. We understand that final location of these and local collection lines will be based on actual ultimate land use and road alignments.

For the sake of estimation, assuming that local collection lines will equal road lengths is a reasonable level of planning at this point. We do recommend a minimum line size of eight inches ( 8 ") which is the industry standard.
4.2 Lift Stations and Force Mains: While the sewer load calculations are based on actual phasing lines, we recommend that roughly 118 equivalent taps be transferred from the Phase Two Basin to Phase One. This results in estimating a slightly larger lift station in Phase One than the actual phasing line indicates. A notation at the bottom of the detailed wastewater projection in Appendix $A$ notes this adjustment.

Lift Station \#1 planned for the southern utility site has been sized to pump at a flow rate of about 175 GPM through a 6" line, while Lift Station \#2 in the northern part of the site is planned to pump at a rate of approximately 500 GPM through either an 8 " force main. These force mains are planned to be extended along Stapleton, then west to the Paint Brush Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). Dual conduits have already been placed under the intersection of Stapleton and Eastonville to avoid future cutting of pavement.
4.3 Wastewater Treatment: 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan Districts have negotiated with Woodmen Hills Metropolitan District to provide wastewater treatment via the Paint Brush Hills WWTP. Woodmen Hills is in the process of making certain upgrades to the existing facility for the near term need with long term needs anticipated to be constructed in roughly 2013. 4-Way already has an initial connection to the Woodmen Hills system which will serve the new church being constructed at the intersection of Stapleton and Eastonville.

As an alternative, 4-Way Ranch Metro has held back a possible treatment plant site on the property if for some reason the Woodmen Hills option cannot be implemented. 4Way has previously submitted and received Preliminary Effluent Limitations (PELs) from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) for a possible plant at this site. The PELs were obtained with the intent to include reuse and recharge if it is ever necessary to implement this option. The site is noted in Figure 1 in this report.
4.4 Reuse and Recharge Options: The Denver basin water rights, on which the water supply is based for 4-Way Ranch, are fully consumable rights. This means that 4-Way can use and reuse the water to extinction. As wastewater discharges increase over time, 4-Way would have the opportunity to look at either re-using some of their wastewater effluent or recharging that effluent in exchange for alluvial withdrawals.

The reuse option is being contemplated in future years by WHMD so 4-Way would have the option to participate if and when that occurs.

Recharge and withdrawal would require a court filing, but the Upper Black Squirrel has been studying opportunities for recharge in the upper parts of the basin for some time.

## SECTION 5 - IMPLEMENTATION OF FACILITIES

5.1 Cost of Water Facilities: The District already has a functioning water system in the ground and is not likely to need any central system facilities until the point at which roughly 200 single family equivalent taps are online. Appendix $E$ has a summary of expected system costs for both water and sewer facilities. Breakdowns of the major components are also attached. Some elements such as water wells and distribution lines are plugged in as unit costs. While each well site will have slightly different development costs, the sites will be somewhat similar. We have shown a well site, associated raw water line budget, and associated power budget as a unit cost associated with roughly every 200 SFE.

We have planned treatment facilities in 3 stages of the development through build-out. We outlined storage expansion with Phase Two, but we realize that this might happen earlier depending on final commercial site uses which will mandate expanded storage for fire flow.

Breakdowns for costs as allocated to the two Districts are noted in the summary as Phase One and Phase Two. All costs are presented in 2009 dollars.
5.2 Cost of Wastewater Facilities: Like water, the cost of major system components are broken down in Appendix E. A major lift station and force main will be provided at each phase. As is noted in Section 4, the geographical wastewater division line between Phase One and Phase Two is slightly different than the political line.

Also, like water, we have allocated a budget for collection lines based on incremental build-out of filings. This budgetary figure is reasonable for the densities proposed.

With a notable exception, breakdowns for costs as allocated to the two Districts are clear and noted in the summary as Phase One and Phase Two. It is most conducive to serve approximately 138 SFE of Phase Two through Phase One facilities, and it is most effective to serve about 10 to 20 units of Phase One through Phase Two facilities. This discrepancy is relatively minor, and we can provide some sort of judgmental allocation of costs if and when necessary. All costs are presented in 2009 dollars.
5.3 Implementation Timeline: At this time, we do not have a build-out schedule, but we have organized costs based on actual needs' triggers relative to phasing or tap build-out.

We have updated the original Operation and Maintenance budget and have attached it within the cost analysis Appendix.

Appendix A

Appendix A: 4-Way Ranch Overall Projected Water Demand for Phases I \& II

| Parcel Description | \# of Lots | Land Use | Land Area (Acres) | Commercial (SF Indoor) | Single Family Equivalent (SFE) | Projection/Allocation (AF/Year) | Average Daily Flow (GPD) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max Daily Flow } \\ & \text { (GPD) } \end{aligned}$ | Peak Hour Demand (GPM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Filing 1 <br> Residential Lots - Tract A | 42 | Residentail Commercial | $\begin{gathered} 135.12 \\ 0.57 \end{gathered}$ | 3,000 | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.64 \\ 0.23 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15,747 \\ 205 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38,580 \\ 503 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| Filing 2 <br> Parcel 1 <br> Parcel 2 <br> Parcel 3 <br> Parcel 4 <br> Parcel 5 <br> Parcel 6 | 200 SFE's | Commercial <br> Multifamily <br> Commercial <br> Warehouse/Utility Commercial <br> Medical Professional Office <br> Neighborhood Commercial | $\begin{gathered} 27.73 \\ \\ 3.79 \\ 1.45 \\ 13.48 \\ 7.60 \\ 5.59 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43,400 \\ \\ 17,000 \\ 18,000 \\ 156,300 \\ 53,100 \\ 50,600 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 200 \\ 4 \\ 4 \\ 37 \\ 13 \\ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.33 \\ 52.00 \\ 1.30 \\ 1.38 \\ 11.99 \\ 4.07 \\ 3.88 \end{gathered}$ | 2,973 <br> 46,420 <br> 1,164 <br> 1,233 <br> 10,706 <br> 3,637 <br> 3,466 | $\begin{gathered} 7,283 \\ 113,728 \\ 2,853 \\ 3,021 \\ 26,229 \\ 8,911 \\ 8,491 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 118 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 27 \\ 9 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| Filing 3 Filing 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 175 \\ & 175 \end{aligned}$ | Residentail Residentail | $\begin{aligned} & 127.82 \\ & 136.45 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 175 \\ & 175 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56.00 \\ & 56.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49,990 \\ & 49,990 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122,476 \\ & 122,476 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128 \\ & 128 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | Subtotals | 459.60 | 341,400 | 674 | 207.83 | 185,531 | 454,551 | 473 |
| PHASE II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcel Description | \# of Lots | Land Use | Land Area (Acres) | Commercial (SF Indoor) | Single Family Equivalent (SFE) | Projection/Allocation (Acre-ft) | Average Daily Flow (GPD) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max Daily Flow } \\ & \text { (GPD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Peak Hour Demand (GPM) |
| Residential Lots | 2531 | Residentail | 0.00 |  | 2531 | 809.92 | 723,003 | 1,771,358 | 1,845 |
| Commercial Commercial | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Commercial Commercial | $\begin{aligned} & 23.80 \\ & 22.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134,950 \\ & 125,877 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.35 \\ 9.66 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9,243 \\ & 8,622 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,646 \\ & 21,123 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| Treatment Facility | 1 | Utility | 10.40 |  | 1 | 0.42 | 375 | 919 | 1 |
| Parks | 2 | Recreation |  |  | 13 | 4.00 | 3,571 | 8,748 | 9 |
|  |  | Subtotals | 56.40 | 260,827 | 2607 | 834.35 | 744,814 | 1,824,794 | 1,901 |
|  |  |  |  | TOTALS 3281 |  | 1042.2 | 930,345 | 2,279,345 | 2,374 |
|  |  |  |  | TOTALS plus 5\% 3445 |  | 1094.3 | 976,862 | 2,393,312 | 2,493 |

Residential Demand for Filing $1=0.42$ AF/SFE
Residential Demand for Filings 2, 3, 4, and Phase II $=0.32$ AF/SFE
Multifamily Demand $=0.26$ AF/SFE
Commercial Demand $=25 \mathrm{GPY} /$ sf Indoor
(3.5 Acre Lots)
(0.19 AF/sf Indoor $+0.13 \mathrm{AF} / \mathrm{sf}$ Indoor for Irrigation)
(0.19 AF/sf Indoor $+2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sf}$-vegetation/Year with 300,000 sf vegetation)
( $20 \mathrm{GPY} / \mathrm{sf}$ Indoor $+5 \mathrm{GPY} / \mathrm{sf}$ Indoor for Irrigation)
Commercial Demand in Phase II is based
on Density of Commercial in Phase

## Appendix A: 4-Way Ranch Overall Projected Wastewater Loads for Phases I \& II



Notes:
Residential Demand for Filings 2, 3, 4, and Phase II $=\quad 185$ GPD/SFE
Commercial Demand $=$ SFE calculated from overall water demand
We recommend that for wastewater planning, a net addition of 118
equivalent taps be planned for in the Phase One lift station
equivalent taps be planned for in the Phase One lift station
The net phasing adjustment is as follows:


Appendix B

## Appendix B <br> Summary of Groundwater Determination and Findings of Water Supply 4 Way Ranch

| Aquifer | 100 Year Withdrawl | 300 Year Withdrawl | Augmentation Requirement | Reduced by Existing Well Permit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dawson NT (Area B) | 816 | 272 | None | Reduced by Existing permits |
| Dawson NNT ( Area A) | 1643 | 548 | Replacement Plan | Reduced by Existing permits |
| Dawson NNT( Area C) | 147 | 49 | Replacement Plan | Reduced by Existing permits |
| Denver NT (Area A) | 881 | 294 | None | None |
| Denver NNT (Area B) | 2593 | 864 | 4\% | Reduced by Existing permits |
| Laramie-Fox Hills NT | 2429 | 810 | None | None |
| Arapahoe | 2615 | 872 | None | None |
|  | 8509 | State Engineer 100 Year Finds |  |  |
|  | Tota | 3708 | El Paso County 300 Year Finds |  |

Appendix C


Appendix D


4-WAY RANCH METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
CENTRAL WASTEWATER SYSTEM MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS

Appendix E

Overall Water Facilities Spreadsheet 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Improvement |  | Build when SFE= |  | Capital Cost 2009 Dollars | Distribution/ Transmission |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase One |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 Central Water (Existing) Stage 2 Central Water Treatment | 120 GPM |  | \$ | 2,100,000 | \$ | - | Existing includes distribution/transmisson |
|  | 300 GPM | 200 |  | \$1,928,948 |  |  | Note: In order to simplify anlysis, we allocated an average cost of raw water line |
|  | Well Site \#2 | 200 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | extension to each well site. As we worked through the raw water lines, it appears that |
|  | Well Site \#3 | 400 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | it is a very reasonable estimate |
|  | Well Site \#4 |  |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$7,465,394 | \$ | 3,668,621 |  |
| Phase Two |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 3 Central Water Treatment Storage 1.75 MG | 650 GPM | 700 |  | \$3,389,068 |  |  | Superstructure for Stage 4 is constructed at this time. A separate site is an option for FP 3 |
|  |  | 700 |  | \$1,347,306 |  |  | Storage may be most dependent on commercial fire need-could go sooner depending |
|  | Well Site \#5 | 800 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | on the exact nature of commercial development in Phase One |
|  | Well Site \#6 | 1000 |  | \$1,145,482 | \$ | 1,222,874 | Options for recharge/exchange start becoming considerations |
|  | Well Site \#7 | 1260 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 | At well sites 7 and up, an additional well into Denver or Dawson would be drilled |
|  | Well Site \#8 | 1520 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
| Stage 4 Central Water Treatment | 1000 GPM | 1700 |  | \$3,219,614 |  |  | Equipment Only with some external. Superstructure in place with Stage 3 |
|  | Well Site \#9 | 1780 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#11 | 2040 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#12 | 2300 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#13 | 2560 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#14 | 2820 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#15 | 3080 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  | Well Site \#16 | 3340 |  | \$1,466,217 |  | 1,589,736 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$23,442,906 | \$ | 16,753,368 |  |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over
competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Overall Wastewater Facilities Spreadsheet
4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Improvement | $\begin{gathered} \text { Build when } \\ \text { SFE }= \end{gathered}$ |  | Capital Cost 2009 Dollars |  | ollection/ unk Sewers | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lift Station/Force Main \#1 | 0 | \$ | 1,333,007 | \$ | $1,858,716$ | Note: In order to simplify anlysis, we allocated an average cost of collection and trunk mains per 350 SFE |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pump Upgrades | 175 | \$ | 322,465 |  |  |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 350 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
|  | Phase One | \$ | 1,655,472 | \$ | 3,717,431 |  |
| Phase Two |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lift Station Force Main \#2 | 700 | \$ | 2,851,818 |  |  | Lift Station Number 2 |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 700 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 1050 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 1400 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 1750 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 2100 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 2450 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 2800 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
| Collection/Trunk Mains | 3150 |  |  | \$ | 1,858,716 |  |
|  | Phase Two | \$ | 2,851,818 | \$ | 14,869,725 |  |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## Appendix E

Cost Estimate for Phase I Stage 2 Central Water Facilities
Owner: 4 -Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s


Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over
competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## Appendix E

## Cost Estimate for Phase Two Stage 3 Treatment

Owner: 4 -Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Item | Unit | Quan. | Unit <br> Cost | Item <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stage 3 Treatment Treatment/Pumping |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Superstructure | LF | 3,750 | \$185.00 | \$693,750 |
| 2 Treatment 2) 325 GPM System | LS | 1 | \$842,000.00 | \$842,000 |
| 3 Concrete Contact Laborinth | LS | 1 | \$126,000.00 | \$126,000 |
| 4 Sodium Hypochlorite | LS | 1 | \$36,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 5 Ph Control | LS | 1 | \$25,500.00 | \$25,500 |
| 6 Interior Piping | LS | 1 | \$167,500.00 | \$167,500 |
| 7 Controls | LS | 1 | \$154,000.00 | \$25,000 |
| 8 Electrical | LS | 1 | \$205,000.00 | \$205,000 |
| 9 Open Concrete Backwash Tank | LS | 1 | \$135,000.00 | \$135,000 |
| 10 Direct feed VFD Booster System * | LS | 1 | \$152,000.00 | \$152,000 |
| 11 Control Valves/Meters | LS | 1 | \$53,000.00 | \$53,000 |
| 12 Yard Piping | LS | 1 | \$99,000.00 | \$99,000 |
| 13 Site Work | LS | 1 | \$66,000.00 | \$66,000 |
| 14 Miscellaneous | LS | 1 | \$75,000.00 | \$75,000 |
| 15 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
| 16 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$2,700,750 |
| * Expansion to Plant \#2 |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Total <br> 10 \% Construction Contingency |  |  |  | \$2,700,750 |
|  |  |  |  | \$270,075 |
| Design/Bidding Engineering |  |  |  | \$297,083 |
|  |  |  |  | \$38,500 |
| Construction Engineering |  |  |  | \$82,660 |
| PROJECT TOTAL |  |  |  | \$3,389,068 |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## Appendix E

## Cost Estimate for Phase Two Stage 4 Treatment

Owner: 4 -Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Item | Unit | Quan. | Unit <br> Cost | Item Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stage 4 Treatment Treatment/Pumping |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Superstructure* | LS | 1 | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000 |
| 2 Treatment 3) 350 GPM System | LS | 1 | \$1,210,000.00 | \$1,210,000 |
| 3 Expand Concrete Contact Laborinth | LS | 1 | \$225,000.00 | \$225,000 |
| 4 Sodium Hypochlorite | LS | 1 | \$36,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 5 Ph Control | LS | 1 | \$25,500.00 | \$25,500 |
| 6 Interior Piping | LS | 1 | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000 |
| 7 Controls | LS | 1 | \$195,000.00 | \$25,000 |
| 8 Electrical | LS | 1 | \$285,000.00 | \$285,000 |
| 9 Open Concrete Backwash Tank (double) | LS | 1 | \$135,000.00 | \$135,000 |
| 10 Direct feed VFD Booster System ** | LS | 1 | \$195,000.00 | \$195,000 |
| 11 Control Valves/Meters | LS | 1 | \$53,000.00 | \$53,000 |
| 12 Yard Piping | LS | 1 | \$35,000.00 | \$35,000 |
| 13 Site Work | LS | 1 | \$35,000.00 | \$35,000 |
| 14 Miscellaneous | LS | 1 | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000 |
| 15 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
| 16 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$2,609,500 |
| * Modifications only |  |  |  |  |
| ** Move system into P-3 $10 \%$ | Construction Total |  |  | \$2,609,500 |
|  | 0 \% Construction Contingency |  |  | \$260,950 |
|  | Design/Bidding Engineering |  |  | \$287,045 |
|  |  | Mi |  | \$38,500 |
|  | Construction Engineering |  |  | \$79,900 |
| PROJECT TOTAL |  |  |  | \$3,275,895 |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## Appendix E

## Cost Estimate for Phase Two--1.75 Million Gallon Tank

Owner: 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s

| Item | Unit: | Ouan, | Unit <br> Cost | Item <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Storage |  |  |  |  |
| 1 1.75 MGT Steel Butt-welded | LS | 1 | \$717,500.00 | \$717,500 |
| 2 Site Work | LS | 1 | \$55,000.00 | \$55,000 |
| 3 Yard Piping | LS | 1 | \$47,000.00 | \$47,000 |
| 4 Foundation | LS | 1 | \$210,000.00 | \$210,000 |
| 5 Miscellaneous | LS | 1 | \$25,000.00 | \$25,000 |
| 6 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
| 7 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
| 8 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
| 9 Unused | LS | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$1,054,500 |
| Construction Total |  |  |  | \$1,054,500 |
| 10 \% Construction Contingency |  |  |  | \$105,450 |
| Design/Bidding Engineering |  |  |  | \$115,995 |
|  |  | M |  | \$38,500 |
| PROJECT TOTAL Construction Engineering |  |  |  | \$32,861 |
|  |  |  |  | \$1,347,306 |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## Appendix E

## Cost Estimate for Transmission /Distribution

Owner: 4 -Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s


Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over
competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

## Appendix E

## Cost Estimate for Phase One Lift Station and Force Main

 Owner: 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s|  | Item | Unit: | Quan. |  | Cont |  | Ttem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lift Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Wet Well 8 ft . | LS | 1 | \$ | 53,000.00 | \$ | 53,000 |
| 2 | Pump Package | LS | 1 | \$ | 187,000.00 | \$ | 187,000 |
| 3 | Controls | LS | 1 | \$ | 18,500.00 | \$ | 18,500 |
| 4 | 500 Gallon Bioxide System | LS | 1 | \$ | 27,300.00 | \$ | 27,300 |
| 5 | Site Work | LS | 1 | \$ | 11,000.00 | \$ | 11,000 |
| 6 | Auxiliary Storage 40,000 Gallon | LS | 1 | \$ | 93,000.00 | \$ | 93,000 |
| 7 | Backup Power | LS | 1 | \$ | 27,500.00 | \$ | 27,500 |
| 8 | Meter Pit | LS | 1 | \$ | 9,500.00 | \$ | 9,500 |
| 9 | SCADA | LS | 1 | \$ | 17,000.00 | \$ | 17,000 |
| 10 | Miscellaneous | LS | 0 | \$ | 25,000.00 | \$ | 25,000 |
| 11 | Unused | LS | 0 | \$ | , | S | - |
|  |  |  |  | al C | onstruction | \$ | 468,800 |
|  | Lift Station Upgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Upgrade Pumps | LS | 1 | \$ | 90,000.00 | \$ | 90,000 |
| 2 | Controls Work | LS | 1 | \$ | 15,000.00 | \$ | 15,000 |
| 3 | Auxilliary Storage (80000) | LS | 1 | \$ | 135,000.00 | \$ | 135,000 |
| 4 | Miscellaneous | LS | 1 | \$ | 20,000.00 | \$ | 20,000 |
| 5 | Unused | LS | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 6 | Unused | LS | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | al C | onstruction | \$ | 260,000 |
|  | Force Main |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 inch | LF | 12500 | \$ | 39.00 | \$ | 487,500 |
| 3 | 6 inch Valves | LF | 8 | \$ | 950.00 | \$ | 7,600 |
| 4 | Eastonville Crossing * | LF | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | , |
| 5 | Stapleton Crossing | LS | 110 | \$ | 300.00 | \$ | 33,000 |
| 6 | North Channel Crossing | LS | 1 | \$ | 23,000.00 | \$ | 23,000 |
| 7 | Air Vacs | LS | 2 | \$ | 7,300.00 | \$ | 14,600 |
| 8 | Miscellaneous | LS | 1 | \$ | 25,000.00 | \$ | 25,000 |
| 9 | Unused | LS | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 10 | Unused | LS | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | Subtotal Construction |  |  | \$ | 590,700 |
| * Casing Installed |  | Construction Total |  |  |  | \$ | 1,319,500 |
|  |  | 10 \% Construction Contingency |  |  |  |  | \$131,950 |
|  |  | Design/Bidding Engineering |  |  |  |  | \$145,145 |
|  |  | Mise |  |  |  |  | \$18,500 |
|  |  |  | \$40,377 |
| PROJECT TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | Construction Engineering |  |  |  | \$1,655,472 |  |

Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgement as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Appendix E
Cost Estimate for Phase Two Lift Station and Force Main Owner: 4-Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s


Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgement as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

Appendix E
Cost Estimate for Wastewater Collection/Trunk Mains
Owner: 4 -Way Ranch Metropolitan District)s


Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.











## K01515 LLC (Metro District One)





[^0]:    Since the Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, or over the Contractor's method of determining prices, or over
    competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable construction cost provided for herein are made on the basis of his experience
    and qualifications. These opinions represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. However, the
    Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him.

