

**Table 2 – EAV Analysis**

	TY 2010	TY 2011	TY 2012	TY 2013	TY 2014	TY 2015
<b>Total EAV of RPA</b>	48,875,557	42,002,948	37,700,192	34,127,836	34,733,424	34,246,012
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>-14.1%</b>	<b>-10.2%</b>	<b>-9.5%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>
Has the Total EAV of RPA declined?		YES	YES	YES	no	YES

	TY 2010	TY 2011	TY 2012	TY 2013	TY 2014	TY 2015
<b>Total EAV of RPA</b>	48,875,557	42,002,948	37,700,192	34,127,836	34,733,424	34,246,012
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>-14.1%</b>	<b>-10.2%</b>	<b>-9.5%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>
<b>Village EAV</b>	1,605,591,119	1,440,254,090	1,337,599,518	1,224,202,737	1,239,548,988	1,199,235,559
<b>Balance of Village</b>	1,556,715,562	1,398,251,142	1,299,899,326	1,190,074,901	1,204,815,564	1,164,989,547
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>-10.2%</b>	<b>-7.0%</b>	<b>-8.4%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>-3.3%</b>
Was the Total EAV of RPA less than the balance of Village?		YES	YES	YES	no	no

	TY 2010	TY 2011	TY 2012	TY 2013	TY 2014	TY 2015
<b>Total EAV of RPA</b>	48,875,557	42,002,948	37,700,192	34,127,836	34,733,424	34,246,012
<b>Percent Change</b>		<b>-14.1%</b>	<b>-10.2%</b>	<b>-9.5%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>
<b>CPI</b>		<b>3.2%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
Was the Total EAV of RPA less than the CPI?		YES	YES	YES	no	YES

Although only one is required, all three measurements of EAV indicate that EAV is lagging in the parcels of the Redevelopment Project Area. Therefore, this criterion applies.

**Note:** EAV data for Tax Year 2016 was not yet available from Cook County at the time the research for this section was completed. Assuming the Village were to pursue adoption of the TIF, the new data would need to be incorporated into the analysis for this criterion. It is likely that the 2016 data will still support the use of this criterion as a contributing factor.