TOWN OF PRESCOTT VALLEY
STONERIDGE COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICT MEETING
MINUTES
April 11, 2013

Library Auditorium
7401 E. Civic Circle
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86314

1. *CALL TO ORDER*

Vice Chairman Tjiema called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. *INVOCATION*

Vice Chairman Tjiema gave the invocation.

3. *PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE*

Board member Anderson led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. *ROLL CALL*

Present: Board Member Lasker, Board Member Nye, Board Member Mallory, Board Member Whiting, Vice Chairman Tjiema, and Board Member Anderson.
Absent: Chairman Skoog.

5. *STONERIDGE CFD POTENTIAL BOND REFINANCING*

Attorney Jared Parker presented the history of the StoneRidge CFD's issues experienced over the last few years and available recovery options followed up with a detailed overview of the process leading up to this refunding opportunity for the StoneRidge CFD.

District Counsel Ivan Legler expressed appreciation to Mr. Parker for his efforts in this whole multi-faceted process. Given the recent settlement, there is $1.175 million left that can be used in the refinancing.

Mr. Nick Dodd (RBC Capital Markets) focused his presentation on the bond refinancing. As a result of the Suncor bankruptcy plan approved on March 25, 2013 the developer will not make any future payments under the Standby Contribution Agreement and the funds held under the Depository Agreement for the District's Series 2001 Bonds ($2,960,000) plus an additional contribution as a result of the bankruptcy plan of $1,075,568 from the Developer's parent company, Pinnacle West, are available to be contributed to a potential refinancing of the District's Series 2001 Bonds. The new developer of the project has also contributed $100,000 towards the proposed bond refinancing. Roughly 35 percent of the outstanding bonds can be paid off with this cash. The balance would be refinanced into a new bond at a lower interest rate. In addition tax-exempt interest rates are favorable for the District to consider a potential refinancing of the Series 2001 Bonds either through a Non-Rated or Bank Private Placement of the bonds with a final maturity date in 2030. Dodd presented facts about the current outstanding debt service if the town does not refinance and comparison figures for each refinancing option. Under the Non-Rated refinancing plan the total debt service on the new bond would be $13,102,403 million. By refinancing the town with non-rated bonds could save $6,052,541over the life of the bonds at 5.35% with an estimated tax rate of $3.77 jumping up to $4.82 (last 4 years only) per $100 valuation. With Bank Private Placement the debt service would be $12,022,540 with a gross debt service savings of $7,132,404 at a 4.192 percent rate and estimated tax rate of $3.37 jumping up to $4.42 (last 4 years only) per $100 valuation. The detailed report is attached. Discussion ensued about bond placement.

District Manager Larry Tarkowski said staff is looking for direction this evening as to which option the Board prefers. The best deal to pursue appears to be the bank private placement. Board member Lasker said residents have expressed concern that the CFD Board may wish to issue new debt in the future. Vice Chairman Tjiema stated that the Board's stance has been all along that they would not approve any additional debt. Tarkowski again asked for direction from the Board. Board members Whiting, Anderson, Nye, Mallory, Lasker and Vice Chairman Tjiema said they favor the private placement option for the refinancing. With the advent of the payoff of the StoneRidge Community Center, ownership of the Community Center transfers to the HOA in 2026 (stated in the deed) as stressed by Legler. This accounts for the additional increase of the tax rate during the last four years (2026-2030) of the debt refinancing as the HOA revenues go away.

In visiting the additional debt question raised by Board member Lasker, Legler stated that in 2001, $33 million was the ceiling amount that was approved, but the plan submitted was for the $14.8 million dollars for the development as it was planned based on water and people that would move in. A future CFD Board could issue additional debt as no end date was put on the authorization of the $33 million in 2001. The current CFD Board could and likely will issue a Resolution stating that they will not issue additional bonds, but there is no legal basis (language) that would prevent additional financing from happening under a different CFD Board. The authority will still be there for additional bond financing. In order to issue additional debt it would have to go through a public process starting with the creation of a new official engineering study and feasibility study. The issue would have to be voted upon after notice of a public hearing. The Board would formally have to adopt a Resolution selling that bond and then approve that action. The public hearing could stop this whole process if the CFD Board did not agree with proceeding with an issuing of additional debt.

Vice Chairman Tjiema said that it appears the Board prefers the private bank placement option for the refinancing of the bonds. Anyone having an opposing viewpoint may address the Board for 3 minutes.

Several StoneRidge residents made public comments about the issue.

Public Comments:

1. Harry Ramsey said while he does not challenge the refinancing, but there is concern about the $4.2 million that was authorized but not released yet that Univest has said they would not ask for. The $14 million has not been addressed in any fashion at all. He believes there has to be a way that both those bonding elements are live and will remain live if we don't find a way of making them go away. He asked that we explore what it is going to take to make those go away. If they can't be made to go away then we need to understand what the statute situation or what is case law that is involved that would support that. Some of the homeowners are preparing to step into this to make it go away or challenge the ability so that it goes away. He expressed concern about potential actions of future Boards.

2. Cindy J. Stravin said she is not against any bond refinancing. She is concerned about the $4.2 and $14 million. It would be so easy for a developer to come in and activate that knowing that the property owners would have to pick up the cost. Having no drop dead date on that is a scary proposition. Without the developer contribution, the residents are now paying 100 percent. It makes no sense for them to move forward. She said she didn't think any of the residents would be against the refinancing of the bonds as long as that language is out of there and they don't have to be concerned that Mr. Lowe or another developer could change their mind. Mr. Lowe has threatened in prior meetings to activate the $4.2 million and leave. This is a real threat to them. People in her neighborhood can't afford to keep up their homes now and several rentals surround her. She doesn't want to see this turn into a blight neighborhood.

   Legler responded that it is important that the word 'activate' as there is no such thing. A developer could not unilaterally activate any amount of bonds. The unused portion of the $14.8 can be dealt with through the refinancing. What can't be dealt with is the vote in 2001 that set the ceiling at $33 million. That can't be changed, but that doesn't mean that bonds will ever be issued. The only way bonds could be issued in the future is for the developer to ask the Board to issue those bonds. The Board would then have to go through the formal public process described above. What bond counsel is telling us is we can take action that indicates the intention now not to issue bonds in the future. We cannot guarantee what will happen in the future if somebody challenges that. Only then will we have a clear picture in dealing with it in a legal situation. On the other hand, we would not fight additional bond issuance if the majority of the residents wanted it to go forward if the finances and the politics were such that they wanted some improvements to be built.

3. John Stazenski questioned whether the extra $4 million was taken into consideration for pay down? He believes the additional $4.2 million was required to be used for the widening of StoneRidge Drive and would that require a feasibility study? In the refinancing of the bond and in trying to eliminate the cloud hanging over the residents is it possible to dissolve the existing CFD and create a new one for the new bond issue? Is it based on a traffic study? Is it possible to dissolve the current CFD and create a new one for the new refinancing issue? At sometime the town is going to require that StoneRidge Drive be widened to four lanes. Is there a specific number of houses that is going to

require that widening? When that time comes the developer is going to ask, where are we going to get the money and then turn to the town for it? The residents don't want to have to pay for that widening. Let the developer pay for it.

Vice Chairman Tjiema asked that speakers keep their comments related to tonight's subject of refinancing of the bonds.

Nick Dodd responded that all the numbers shared tonight include the $2.9 million deposit plus the money left over from the Suncor bankruptcy is deposited and used to pay off the old bonds. Tarkowski stated if the CFD was expected to pay for the widening then a feasibility study would be needed. There is a trigger point to require that road widening be done based on the number of homes platted. It is a developer's responsibility, not the existing home owners. Legler responded that if the CFD is dissolved the bonds would still have to be paid regardless of dissolution.

4. Rick Duskey said he supports the private issue and thinks this is the only way to go. He also feels the majority of the residents in the room would agree. That is not the issue before the residents and they have been asked not to discuss it at this time. Duskey respectfully requests that the CFD Board consider additional comments regarding the bond probabilities and possibilities and recourses there are.

   Board member Lasker commented that she is definitely opposed to issuing any more money for StoneRidge and she is happy that the public process is involved in that as she firmly believes in grass roots and citizens and that they usually win. She is in favor of refinancing to save money.

5. Madge Johnson said she is a bit confused. Back when M3 expressed an interest into coming into StoneRidge she recalls that there was a trigger point where no more bonds could be issued and the Board did extend that in the Development Agreement.

   District Counsel Legler commented that the Board is not required to issue those bonds beyond $14.8 million. The refinancing will take care of the $4.2 million that is left that had been authorized of the $19 million. There is not a procedure whereby a developer can come in and activate that $4.2 million, unilaterally.

   Johnson continued that Board members can vote on matters regardless of what the residents say. They may not get elected the next time. This is not a place where the StoneRidge residents get to vote in the final analysis; the CFD Board will make the decision.

6. John Minahan expressed his concern about additional issuance of bonds in the future. He suggested the Board enter an enforceable agreement that would limit the ability of the CFD to issue further bonds while these are outstanding. The Board could adopt a Resolution to the new bond holders that the CFD that they cannot issue additional bonds until this new issue has been paid off.

Board member Lasker said this implies that the CFD Board could issue bonds afterwards which she does not like. She would rather that door not be opened.

Vice Chairman Tjiema attempted to close the comment period. Tarkowski pointed out that others wished to speak.

7. Linda Shimmin said that to stymie or stop public comment only further engenders in the mind of StoneRidge residents, we are supposed to be able to come to our Board. We are here because we are upset and we are in it up to our earlobes and although there is no P.C. after her name nor she is wearing a dunce cap. She has every confidence that the Board will select a private placement because it is the most responsible financial thing to do. On the other hand they need to be reassured that they would consider something like John's suggestion it is untoward to the max to say public comment would be closed before anyone who has come down with a pronounced financial interest to be disallowed their ability to speak to their representatives.

8. Pat Walsh thanked Mr. Jared Parker and the whole organization for his effort and bringing money back to the community. Sometimes we yell before we think, and we need to think. The feeling of the community is it is hanging over their head. If someone looked at this, they would ask, what is on the record today? If you look at the record, it is approval to spend the $4.2 million and the $14 million. For his comfort level he would like to see the Board make a recommendation so that there is at least a step in there that says, we don't want this right now. Vote on it and put it in there so that if sometime down the road it is now a wide open case. Anybody can use that money as it is now. If they pass something that says, no we don't want this and that is the intent of the community - that is what we want. Then that would be a great step in blocking any future action.

   Tarkowski said it is the intent that when the Board needs to vote on the decision of placement of the refinancing of the bonds, private placement is the direction the Board has given. At that time there will be Resolution of the Board addressing the resident's issue.

9. Sandy Whymans said there has been a lot of public comment going back and forth and acknowledges that they have been asked to stick to the issue. I asked to be allowed to have all those in favor of private placement of this bond to stand to get their recommendation. Vice Chairman Tjiema asked that all those StoneRidge residents in favor of the private bank placement stand. No one stood in opposition to it.

   Vice Chairman Tjiema asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

   Tarkowski and Dodd stated that staff will be bringing an action back to the Board after the paperwork for formal refunding approval in May with a goal to close the refunding bonds in late May or early June, well in advance of the redemption date and payment.

   Legler commented that the Board will be very transparent about the documents. Bond counsel has not said we can't do what we want, he simply warned us that it may not be effective. Legler said he is willing to circulate the draft documents, circulate them electronically, and hear from the HOA legal counsel. He is willing to share the written advice we have received from bond counsel. We will make this completely transparent in terms of trying to do what we can to make as iron clad as possible. He will send it to a clearing house at the HOA for distribution. He will also respond to any emails he receives at ilegler@pvaz.net.

Board member Lasker asked for confirmation from Tarkowski that a Resolution will be written to state additional debt will not be issued by the CFD Board. Legler added that the documents will be drafted so that a developer is going to be able to "activate" either $4.2 or $18.2 million in bonds. It would require an action of the Board.

No action was taken.

6. *ADJOURNMENT*

Vice Chairman Tjiema adjourned the meeting at 6:59 p.m.

ATTEST:

Diane Russell

Diane Russell, District Clerk

APPROVED:

Harvey C. Skoog

Harvey Skoog, Chairman

STATE OF ARIZONA)
COUNTY OF YAVAPAI) ss:
TOWN OF PRESCOTT VALLEY)

CERTIFICATE OF BOARD MINUTES

I, Diane Russell, District Clerk hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the StoneRidge Community Facilities District of the Town of Prescott Valley, held on Thursday, April 11, 2013.

I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this April 15, 2013

Diane Russell

Diane Russell, District Clerk

STONERIDGE

Stoneridge Community Facilities District

Overview of Refunding Opportunity

April 11, 2013

RBC

RBC Capital Markets®

Disclaimer

RBC Capital Markets, LLC ("RBC CM") is providing the information contained in this document for discussion purposes only in anticipation of serving as Underwriter to the Stoneridge Community Facilities District (the "Issuer") in which RBC CM would be acting solely as a principal in a commercial, arm's length transaction and not as a municipal advisor, financial advisor or fiduciary to the Issuer or any other person or entity. RBC CM will not have any duties or liability to any person or entity in connection with the information being provided herein. The information provided is not intended to be and should not be construed as "advice" within the meaning of Section 15B of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or of any rules or regulations adopted thereunder by the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board. The Issuer should consult with its own legal, accounting, tax, financial and other advisors, as applicable, to the extent it deems appropriate.

This presentation was prepared exclusively for the benefit of and internal use by the recipient for the purpose of considering the transaction or transactions contemplated herein. This presentation is confidential and proprietary to RBC Capital Markets, LLC ("RBC CM") and may not be disclosed, reproduced, distributed or used for any other purpose by the recipient without RBCCM's express written consent.

By acceptance of these materials, and notwithstanding any other express or implied agreement, arrangement, or understanding to the contrary, RBC CM, its affiliates and the recipient agree that the recipient (and its employees, representatives, and other agents) may disclose to any and all persons, without limitation of any kind from the commencement of discussions, the tax treatment, structure or strategy of the transaction and any fact that may be relevant to understanding such treatment, structure or strategy, and all materials of any kind (including opinions or other tax analyses) that are provided to the recipient relating to such tax treatment, structure, or strategy.

The information and any analyses contained in this presentation are taken from, or based upon, information obtained from the recipient or from publicly available sources, the completeness and accuracy of which has not been independently verified, and cannot be assured by RBC CM. The information and any analyses in these materials reflect prevailing conditions and RBC CM's views as of this date, all of which are subject to change.

To the extent projections and financial analyses are set forth herein, they may be based on estimated financial performance prepared by or in consultation with the recipient and are intended only to suggest reasonable ranges of results. The printed presentation is incomplete without reference to the oral presentation or other written materials that supplement it.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: RBC CM and its affiliates do not provide tax advice and nothing contained herein should be construed as tax advice. Any discussion of U.S. tax matters contained herein (including any attachments) (i) was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by you for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties; and (ii) was written in connection with the promotion or marketing of the matters addressed herein. Accordingly, you should seek advice based upon your particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

Stoneridge Community Facilities District

RBC Capital Markets®

Recent Actions

- As a result of the economic downturn and resulting real estate crash, SunCor Development Company (the "Developer") filed for Chapter 11 Bankruptcy in February 2012.
- In March of 2013, the bankruptcy plan that was submitted to the courts was approved and became effective on March 25, 2013.
- As a result of the event described above (a) the Developer will not make any future payments under the Standby Contribution Agreement and (b) the funds currently held under the Depository Agreement for the District's Series 2001 Bonds ($2,960,000) plus an additional contribution as a result of the approved bankruptcy plan of $1,075,568 from the Developer's parent company, Pinnacle West, are available to be contributed to a potential refinancing of the District's Series 2001 Bonds.
- The new developer of the project has also contributed $100,000 towards the proposed bond refinancing.
- In addition to the funds described above, tax-exempt interest rates are near historical lows resulting in a favorable funding environment for the District to consider a potential refinancing of the Series 2001 Bonds.

Current Outstanding Debt Service Requirements

Stoneridge Community Facilities District
(Prescott Valley, Arizona)

Current Debt Service Requirements and Estimated District Revenues

Fiscal Year Ending June 30	Net Secondary Assessed Value (1)	% Change in Existing Net SAV	Outstanding Debt Service: Principal	Outstanding Debt Service: Interest	Outstanding Debt Service: Total Debt Service	Estimated District Revenues at 95% Tax Collection Rate (2)	Estimated Debt Tax Rate Without HOA Revenue (2)	Total Debt Service Net of $168,000 HOA Revenues (3)	Estimated Debt Tax Rate With HOA Revenues (3)
2012	$19,297,516	-20.12%	$535,000	$865,938	$1,400,938	$679,504	$3.6000		
2013	16,656,624	-13.69%	565,000	833,838	1,398,838	659,852	4.1700		
2014	16,884,052	1.37%	600,000	797,113	1,397,113	1,397,113	7.8610	1,229,113	$6.9157
2015	16,884,052	0.00%	640,000	758,113	1,398,113	1,398,113	7.8666	1,230,113	6.9214
2016	16,884,052	0.00%	680,000	716,513	1,396,513	1,396,513	7.8576	1,228,513	6.9124
2017	16,884,052	0.00%	730,000	670,613	1,400,613	1,400,613	7.8807	1,232,613	6.9354
2018	16,884,052	0.00%	775,000	621,338	1,396,338	1,396,338	7.8566	1,228,338	6.9114
2019	16,884,052	0.00%	830,000	569,025	1,399,025	1,399,025	7.8718	1,231,025	6.9265
2020	16,884,052	0.00%	885,000	513,000	1,398,000	1,398,000	7.8660	1,230,000	6.9207
2021	16,884,052	0.00%	945,000	453,263	1,398,263	1,398,263	7.8675	1,230,263	6.9222
2022	16,884,052	0.00%	1,010,000	389,475	1,399,475	1,399,475	7.8743	1,231,475	6.9290
2023	16,884,052	0.00%	1,075,000	321,300	1,396,300	1,396,300	7.8564	1,228,300	6.9112
2024	16,884,052	0.00%	1,150,000	248,738	1,398,738	1,398,738	7.8702	1,230,738	6.9249
2025	16,884,052	0.00%	1,225,000	171,113	1,396,113	1,396,113	7.8554	1,228,113	6.9101
2026	16,884,052	0.00%	1,310,000	88,425	1,398,425	1,398,425	7.8684	1,230,425	6.9231
Totals			$12,420,000	$7,151,863	$19,571,863				

(1) Fiscal years 2012 and 2013 are actual; FY 2014 is based on the February 2013 Preliminary Abstract. FY 2015 and thereafter are assume no change.
(2) Represents estimated tax collections based on 95% tax collection rate; excludes annual HOA contribution of $168,000.
(3) Represents debt service requirements net of the annual HOA contribution of $168,000. Debt tax rate is based on a 95% tax collection rate.

Refinancing Opportunity

Stoneridge Community Facilities District
(Prescott Valley, Arizona)

Comparative Refunding of Series 2001 Bonds [1]

	Non Rated	Bank Private Placement	Comparison
Total Debt Service	$13,102,403	$12,022,540	**($1,079,863)**
Gross Debt Service Savings	$6,052,541	$7,132,404	**$1,079,863**
Net Present Value Savings $	$874,396	$1,798,566	**$924,170**
Net Present Value Savings %	7.040%	14.481%	**7.44%**
True Interest Cost (TIC)	5.350%	4.192%	**-1.16%**
Maximum Annual Debt Service	$773,538	$709,600	**($63,938)**
Average Life (Years)	10.28	10.03	
Estimated District Tax Rate			
FY 2014 to 2026	$3.77	$3.37	**($0.40)**
FY 2027 to 2030	$4.82	$4.42	**($0.40)**

(1) Assumes refunding transaction is dated June 18, 2013; structured with 10-year par call and final maturity in 2030; assumes liquidation of $2.960 million cash depository; $1.175 million cash contribution from settlement. For purposes of the comparison, the analysis assumes Secondary Assessed Valuation remains constant based on the fiscal year 2014 preliminary valuation.

Stoneridge Community Facilities District
(Prescott Valley, Arizona)

Estimated $8,550,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds

Scenario 1: Assumes Non Rated; Level Debt Service; Extend Amortization 4 Years; No DSRF; Additional HOA Revenues; Liquidation of Existing $2.96 Million Cash Depository; $1,075,568 Cash Contribution from Settlement; $100,000 Developer Cash Contribution; No Annual Growth on Existing SAV and No Future Absorptions

					Outstanding Debt Service			Less: Refunded Debt Service (2)			$8,550,000 Series 2013 Refunding Bonds Dated: 6/18/2013											
Fiscal Year Ending June 30	Net Secondary Assessed Value (1)	% Change in Existing Net SAV	Net SAV Attributable to Annual Absorptions (1)	Total Combined Net SAV	Principal	Interest	Total Debt Service	Principal	Interest	Total Debt Service	Principal	Estimated Interest (3)	Total Debt Service	Total Estimated Net Debt Service	Estimated District Revenues at 95% Tax Collection Rate (4)	Debt Tax Rate (4)	Estimated Additional Revenues (5)	Estimated Total Combined Revenues	Tax Revenues Excess (Shortfall) (6)	Comparative Debt Service	Est. Annual CFD Tax on $200,000 Home	Additional Tax over $3.60 Rate
2012	$19,297,516	-20.12%		$19,297,516	$535,000	$865,938	$1,400,938							$1,400,938	$679,504	$3.6000	$168,000	$847,504	($553,433)	$0	$720	$0
2013	16,656,624	-13.69%		16,656,624	565,000	833,838	1,398,838	$565,000	$416,919	$981,919				416,919	659,852	4.1700	168,000	827,852	410,933	981,919	834	114
2014	16,884,052	1.37%		16,884,052	600,000	797,113	1,397,113	600,000	797,113	1,397,113	$300,000	$471,428	$771,428	771,428	603,428	3.7621	168,000	771,428	0	625,685	752	32
2015	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	640,000	758,113	1,398,113	640,000	758,113	1,398,113	350,000	423,538	773,538	773,538	605,538	3.7752	168,000	773,538	0	624,575	755	35
2016	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	680,000	716,513	1,396,513	680,000	716,513	1,396,513	365,000	406,038	771,038	771,038	603,038	3.7596	168,000	771,038	0	625,475	752	32
2017	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	730,000	670,613	1,400,613	730,000	670,613	1,400,613	385,000	387,788	772,788	772,788	604,788	3.7705	168,000	772,788	0	627,825	754	34
2018	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	775,000	621,338	1,396,338	775,000	621,338	1,396,338	400,000	368,538	768,538	768,538	600,538	3.7440	168,000	768,538	0	627,800	749	29
2019	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	830,000	569,025	1,399,025	830,000	569,025	1,399,025	420,000	348,538	768,538	768,538	600,538	3.7440	168,000	768,538	0	630,488	749	29
2020	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	885,000	513,000	1,398,000	885,000	513,000	1,398,000	445,000	327,538	772,538	772,538	604,538	3.7690	168,000	772,538	0	625,463	754	34
2021	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	945,000	453,263	1,398,263	945,000	453,263	1,398,263	465,000	305,288	770,288	770,288	602,288	3.7549	168,000	770,288	0	627,975	751	31
2022	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,010,000	389,475	1,399,475	1,010,000	389,475	1,399,475	490,000	282,038	772,038	772,038	604,038	3.7659	168,000	772,038	0	627,438	753	33
2023	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,075,000	321,300	1,396,300	1,075,000	321,300	1,396,300	515,000	257,538	772,538	772,538	604,538	3.7690	168,000	772,538	0	623,763	754	34
2024	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,150,000	248,738	1,398,738	1,150,000	248,738	1,398,738	540,000	231,788	771,788	771,788	603,788	3.7643	168,000	771,788	0	626,950	753	33
2025	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,225,000	171,113	1,396,113	1,225,000	171,113	1,396,113	565,000	203,438	768,438	768,438	600,438	3.7434	168,000	768,438	0	627,675	749	29
2026	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,310,000	88,425	1,398,425	1,310,000	88,425	1,398,425	595,000	173,775	768,775	768,775	600,775	3.7455	168,000	768,775	0	629,650	749	29
2027	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							630,000	142,538	772,538	772,538	772,538	**4.8164**		772,538	0	(772,538)	963	243
2028	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							660,000	109,463	769,463	769,463	769,463	4.7972		769,463	0	(769,463)	959	239
2029	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							695,000	74,813	769,813	769,813	769,813	4.7994		769,813	0	(769,813)	960	240
2030	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							730,000	38,325	768,325	768,325	768,325	4.7901		768,325	0	(768,325)	958	238
Totals					$12,420,000	$7,151,863	$19,571,863	$12,420,000	$6,734,944	$19,154,944	$8,550,000	$4,552,403	$13,102,403	$13,519,322						$6,052,541		$1,488

(1) Fiscal years 2011 through 2013 are actual, as provided by the Yavapai County Assessor's Office; FY 2014 is based on the February 2013 Preliminary Abstract. FY 2015 and thereafter are assume no change.
(2) Represents all outstanding bonds which are currently callable at par.
(3) Interest is estimated at "AAA" MMD plus 275 basis points. Assumes liquidation of $2.96 million cash depository; $1.175 million additional cash contribution.
(4) District tax revenues based 95% tax collection rate. Fiscal year 2012 District Revenues, based on $3.60 debt tax rate, are actual through 12/4/12 (pro-rata for debt portion), as reported by the Yavapai County Treasurer's Office. Fiscal year 2013 is based on debt tax rate of $4.17.
(5) Represents estimated dedicated source of annual revenues collected pursuant to a Lease Agreement with the HOA. The agreement expires 7/1/2026 (original term of Series 2001).
(6) Represents excess or (shortfall) in tax revenues at the current year debt tax rate.

Refunding Summary	
Series 2001 Depository	$2,960,000
Additional Cash Contribution	1,040,000
District Cash on Hand	400,000
Total Cash Requirement	$4,400,000
Gross Debt Service Savings	$6,052,541
Net PV Savings from Cashflow	5,409,965
Less: Cash Contributions	(4,535,568)
Net PV Savings/(Cost) $	$874,396
Net PV Savings/(Cost) %	7.04%

Stoneridge Community Facilities District
(Prescott Valley, Arizona)

Estimated $8,580,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds

Scenario 2: Assumes Private Placement at 4.0%; Level Debt Service; Extend Amortization 4 Years; No DSRF; Additional HOA Revenues; Liquidation of Existing $2.96 Million Cash Depository; $1,075,568 Cash Contribution from Settlement; $100,000 Developer Cash Contribution; No Annual Growth on Existing SAV and No Future Absorptions

					Outstanding Debt Service			Less: Refunded Debt Service (2)			$8,580,000 Series 2013 Refunding Bonds Dated: 6/18/2013											
Fiscal Year Ending June 30	Net Secondary Assessed Value (1)	% Change in Existing Net SAV	Net SAV Attributable to Annual Absorptions (1)	Total Combined Net SAV	Principal	Interest	Total Debt Service	Principal	Interest	Total Debt Service	Principal	Estimated Interest (3)	Total Debt Service	Total Estimated Net Debt Service	Estimated District Revenues at 95% Tax Collection Rate (4)	Debt Tax Rate (4)	Estimated Additional Revenues (5)	Estimated Total Combined Revenues	Tax Revenues Excess (Shortfall) (6)	Comparative Debt Service	Est. Annual CFD Tax on $200,000 Home	Additional Tax over $3.60 Rate
2012	$19,297,516	-20.12%		$19,297,516	$535,000	$865,938	$1,400,938							$1,400,938	$679,504	$3.6000	$168,000	$847,504	($553,433)	$0	$720	$0
2013	16,656,624	-13.69%		16,656,624	565,000	833,838	1,398,838	$565,000	$416,919	$981,919				416,919	659,852	4.1700	168,000	827,852	410,933	981,919	834	114
2014	16,884,052	1.37%		16,884,052	600,000	797,113	1,397,113	600,000	797,113	1,397,113	$340,000	$368,940	$708,940	708,940	540,940	3.3725	168,000	708,940	0	688,173	674	0
2015	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	640,000	758,113	1,398,113	640,000	758,113	1,398,113	380,000	329,600	709,600	709,600	541,600	3.3766	168,000	709,600	0	688,513	675	0
2016	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	680,000	716,513	1,396,513	680,000	716,513	1,396,513	395,000	314,400	709,400	709,400	541,400	3.3753	168,000	709,400	0	687,113	675	0
2017	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	730,000	670,613	1,400,613	730,000	670,613	1,400,613	410,000	298,600	708,600	708,600	540,600	3.3704	168,000	708,600	0	692,013	674	0
2018	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	775,000	621,338	1,396,338	775,000	621,338	1,396,338	425,000	282,200	707,200	707,200	539,200	3.3616	168,000	707,200	0	689,138	672	0
2019	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	830,000	569,025	1,399,025	830,000	569,025	1,399,025	440,000	265,200	705,200	705,200	537,200	3.3492	168,000	705,200	0	693,825	670	0
2020	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	885,000	513,000	1,398,000	885,000	513,000	1,398,000	460,000	247,600	707,600	707,600	539,600	3.3641	168,000	707,600	0	690,400	673	0
2021	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	945,000	453,263	1,398,263	945,000	453,263	1,398,263	475,000	229,200	704,200	704,200	536,200	3.3429	168,000	704,200	0	694,063	669	0
2022	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,010,000	389,475	1,399,475	1,010,000	389,475	1,399,475	495,000	210,200	705,200	705,200	537,200	3.3492	168,000	705,200	0	694,275	670	0
2023	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,075,000	321,300	1,396,300	1,075,000	321,300	1,396,300	515,000	190,400	705,400	705,400	537,400	3.3504	168,000	705,400	0	690,900	670	0
2024	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,150,000	248,738	1,398,738	1,150,000	248,738	1,398,738	535,000	169,800	704,800	704,800	536,800	3.3467	168,000	704,800	0	693,938	669	0
2025	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,225,000	171,113	1,396,113	1,225,000	171,113	1,396,113	560,000	148,400	708,400	708,400	540,400	3.3691	168,000	708,400	0	687,713	674	0
2026	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052	1,310,000	88,425	1,398,425	1,310,000	88,425	1,398,425	580,000	126,000	706,000	706,000	538,000	3.3541	168,000	706,000	0	692,425	671	0
2027	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							605,000	102,800	707,800	707,800	707,800	4.4128		707,800	0	(707,800)	883	163
2028	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							630,000	78,600	708,600	708,600	708,600	4.4177		708,600	0	(708,600)	884	164
2029	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							655,000	53,400	708,400	708,400	708,400	4.4165		708,400	0	(708,400)	883	163
2030	16,884,052	0.00%		16,884,052							680,000	27,200	707,200	707,200	707,200	4.4090		707,200	0	(707,200)	882	162
Totals					$12,420,000	$7,151,863	$19,571,863	$12,420,000	$6,734,944	$19,154,944	$8,580,000	$3,442,540	$12,022,540	$12,439,459						$7,132,404		$765

(1) Fiscal years 2011 through 2013 are actual, as provided by the Yavapai County Assessor's Office; FY 2014 is based on the February 2013 Preliminary Abstract. FY 2015 and thereafter are assume no change.
(2) Represents all outstanding bonds which are currently callable at par.
(3) Interest is estimated at 4.0%. Assumes liquidation of $2.96 million cash depository; $1.175 additional cash contribution.
(4) District tax revenues based 95% tax collection rate. Fiscal year 2012 District Revenues, based on $3.60 debt tax rate, are actual through 12/4/12 (pro-rata for debt portion), as reported by the Yavapai County Treasurer's Office. Fiscal year 2013 is based on debt tax rate of $4.17.
(5) Represents estimated dedicated source of annual revenues collected pursuant to a Lease Agreement with the HOA. The agreement expires 7/1/2026 (original term of Series 2001).
(6) Represents excess or (shortfall) in tax revenues at the current year debt tax rate.

Refunding Summary	
Series 2001 Depository	$2,960,000
Additional Cash Contribution	1,040,000
District Cash on Hand	400,000
Total Cash Requirement	$4,400,000
Gross Debt Service Savings	$7,132,404
Net PV Savings from Cashflow	6,334,134
Less: Cash Contributions	(4,535,568)
Net PV Savings/(Cost) $	$1,798,566
Net PV Savings/(Cost) %	14.48%

Questions / Notes

RBC Capital Markets®