GORDON SILVER GERALD M. GORDON, ESO.				
Nevada Bar No. 229				
TALITHA GRAY KOZLOWSKI, ESQ.				
CANDAČE C. ČLARK, ESQ.				
Nevada Bar No. 11539 E-mail: cclark@gordonsilver.com				
3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor Las Vegas Nevada 89169				
Telephone (702) 796-5555				
Attorneys for Debtor				
UNITED STATES BAI	NKRUPTCY COURT			
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
In re:	Case No.: 11-21034-MKN Chapter 11			
HORIZON VILLAGE SQUARE LLC,				
Debtor.	Confirmation Hearing: Date: April 28, 2015			
	Time: 9:30 a.m.			
I, Todd Nigro, hereby declare as follows:				
1. I am over the age of 18 and am me	entally competent and I make this declaration in			
support of confirmation of Debtor's Amended	Plan of Reorganization [ECF No. 403] (the			
" <u>Plan</u> "). ¹				
2. My role with Horizon Village	Square LLC ("Debtor") is set forth with			
particularity below; however, in summary, I have	e been involved with Debtor since its inception			
as the co-manager of Nigro Development LLC ('Nigro Development"), which manages Debtor.			
As such, except as otherwise indicated, all of the	facts set forth in this declaration are based upon			
my personal knowledge of Debtor's operations ar	nd finances, information gained from my review			
of relevant documents, and information supp	olied to me by other members of Debtor's			
¹ Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have	the same meaning as set forth in the Plan.			
	GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 229 E-mail: ggordon@gordonsilver.com TALITHA GRAY KOZLOWSKI, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9040 E-mail: tgray@gordonsilver.com CANDACE C. CLARK, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 11539 E-mail: cclark@gordonsilver.com 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone (702) 796-5555 Facsimile (702) 369-2666 Attorneys for Debtor UNITED STATES BAN FOR THE DISTRI In re: HORIZON VILLAGE SQUARE LLC, Debtor. DECLARATION OF TODD NIGRO IN DEBTOR'S AMENDED PLA I, Todd Nigro, hereby declare as follows: 1. I am over the age of 18 and am me support of confirmation of Debtor's Amended "Plan"). 1			

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

of this declaration, I could and would do so.

3

4

Horizon Village Square Shopping Center. Α.

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

3. Debtor owns and operates the Horizon Village Square Shopping Center located near the intersection of the I-95 and Horizon Ridge Parkway, and having local street addresses of 25, 35, 55, 65, and 75 East Horizon Ridge Parkway, Henderson, Nevada, 89012, APNs 179-30-

management and Debtor's business and legal advisors. If called upon to testify as to the content

214-002 and 179-30-114-008 (the "Real Property").

- 4. Constructed in 2006, the Horizon Village Square Shopping Center is comprised of five multi-tenant retail buildings and is anchored by a Vons, which is under separate ownership. The Horizon Village Square Shopping Center, which is situated on 6.43 net acres and consists of approximately 42,845 sq. ft. of net rentable building area, is located in a largely residential neighborhood and provides the only grocery store within a several mile radius, thereby resulting in the Horizon Village Square Shopping Center being heavily utilized by the surrounding residents.
- 5. Due to its superior quality and location, the fact that it is anchored by Vons, the quality of the other tenants, the Horizon Village Square Shopping Center is 88.5% leased, with twenty tenants. The tenants are GNC, Weight Watchers, Sloppy Kisses, Wells Fargo Bank, Liberty Tax, PostNet, Kailey Smokes & Gifts, Al Phillips the Cleaner, Valerie's Paw Spa, Dr. Robert Pham DDS, Great Clips, Meehan, Inc. (dba Koko Fit Club), Avenue Nails, Blazing Wings, Inc., Simple Computer Repair, Café Rio, Family ATA Martial Arts, Grand China, Cold Stone Creamery, and Subway.
- 6. Pre- and post-petition, the rental income from these tenants generated sufficient monthly revenue to permit Debtor to satisfy not only it operating expenses, but also its monthly debt service to Secured Lender.
 - 7. On the Petition Date, Debtor had \$1.04 Million in available cash.
- 8. As of the filing of this declaration, Debtor has increased its available cash to over \$1.8 Million (a +\$700,000 increase) after paying all of its post-petition operating expenses and tendering Adequate Protection Payments to Secured Lender.

9. Since the Petition Date, Debtor has tendered more than \$800,000 in Adequate Protection Payments to Secured Lender, which payments exceed the accrued post-petition interest at the contract rate.

B. <u>Debtor's Ownership and Management Bring a Wealth of Knowledge and Experience to Debtor.</u>

- 10. Debtor is a Nevada limited liability company owned by: (i) the 1990 Nigro Trust; (ii) Nigro Development, (iii) Omega Industries, Inc., (iv) Hi-Gear Development LLC; (v) Christopher J. Hukill Revocable Living Trust; (vi) Robert & Jennifer Munakash; and (vii) Aleco Enterprises, Inc.
- 11. Hi-Gear Development LLC, Christopher J. Hukill Revocable Living Trust, Robert and Jennifer Munakash and Aleco Enterprises, Inc. are all third-party investors unrelated to me or my family.
- 12. Prior to the Petition Date and throughout the Chapter 11 Case, Debtor has been managed by Nigro Development. My brother, Michael Nigro, and I are co-owners of Nigro Development, Nigro Construction, Inc. ("Nigro Construction"), and Nigro Management LLC dba Nigro Properties ("Nigro Management"), which we founded in 2000. For our entire adult lives, Michael and I have developed, constructed, and managed a wide-array of real estate projects in Nevada. We handle all aspects of development, including financing, design, construction, and management, with integrity and professionalism.
- 13. In 1990, I graduated from the University of Southern California with a degree in business administration. Following graduation, I worked for two years as a financial analyst in corporate finance for Salomon Brothers, an investment banking firm located in Los Angeles, California. I subsequently returned to Las Vegas to work with my father and my brother.
- 14. Prior to founding Nigro Development, Nigro Construction, and Nigro Management, I served as the Chief Financial Officer and Michael served as the Director of Construction for Nigro Associates, a commercial and residential development company founded by our father, Edward Nigro, in 1979. As Chief Financial Officer, I oversaw the financing and development of Nigro Associates' projects.

- 15. Nigro Development, together with its affiliates, specializes in developing, constructing, and managing commercial real estate primarily in the Las Vegas market, including residential developments, high rise, "flex" and industrial projects, retail buildings, hospitality projects, master planned business parks, professional office complexes, and medical centers. Detailed below are summaries of the recent developments completed by Nigro Development.
 - 16. Nigro Development's recent developments, in addition to Debtor, include:
 - a. Desert Canyon Business Park: The Desert Canyon Business Park is a 15 acre master-planned business park located on the corner of Russell Road and the I-215 beltway. Nigro Development has completed 180,000 square feet with an estimated value in excess of \$35 Million. Nigro Development has been able to create an efficient, architecturally diverse, investment grade environment that has a broad appeal. The Desert Canyon Business Park includes the corporate headquarters for the following companies: Bank of George, Anthem Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Beazer Homes, Cannery Resorts, JW Advisors, and Nigro Development.
 - b. Rhodes Ranch Town Center: Rhodes Ranch Town Center is a 250,000 square foot Von's anchored shopping center situated on 25 acres of property located on Durango Drive and Warm Springs Road at the entrance to the Rhodes Ranch Master Planned Community. The shopping center was opened in 2004 at a cost in excess of \$35 Million. The shopping center includes many national brands such as Bank of America, Buffalo Wild Wings, Great Clips, AAA, and American Family Insurance.
 - c. Siena Town Center: Siena Town Center is a 120,000 square foot Smith's anchored shopping center situated on 15 acres of property located on Tropicana Avenue and Hualapai Way at the entrance to the Siena Master Planned Community. The shopping center opened in 2002 at a cost in excess of \$20 Million. In addition to Smith's Food and Drug, the center includes Wells Fargo, Great Harvest Bread Co., and State Farm, among others.
 - d. Park Central Plaza Shopping Center: Park Central Plaza Shopping Center is a 200,000 square foot Wal-Mart anchored shopping center situated on 30 acres located

on Ann and Losee Roads. The shopping center opened in 2008 at a cost in excess of \$25 Million. In addition to Wal-Mart, the center includes, among others, Wells Fargo, McDonald's, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and Checker Auto Parts.

- e. Desert Canyon Rehabilitation Hospital: The Desert Canyon Rehabilitation Hospital is a state of the art medical facility featuring technically advanced equipment and customized physical therapy techniques. The facility is over 50,000 square feet and is situated on 4 acres of property located on Oquendo Road, one-half mile west of Russell Road and the I-215 beltway. The facility was completed in 2007 at a cost in excess of \$20 Million.
- f. The Place @ Seven Hills: The Place @ Seven Hills is a mixed use retail and hospitality development situated on 9 acres at the corner of St. Rose Parkway and Seven Hills Drive in Henderson. The development includes two hotels, a Hampton Inn & Suites by Hilton and a Fairfield Inn & Suites by Marriott, with 250 total rooms, two multi-tenant retail buildings totaling approximately 20,000 square feet, the Bank of George Henderson headquarters, and Remedy's, an upscale restaurant/tavern. The development was completed in 2009 with a value in excess of \$50 Million.
- g. Siena Suites: Siena Suites is a 600 room upscale extended stay hotel located on the corner of Russell Road and Boulder Highway. The property includes one and two bedroom suites, two pools, and exercise facility and a conference room. The success of Siena Suites is its appeal to business, leisure, and military travelers.
- 17. In all of the foregoing developments, Nigro Development was responsible for the following:
 - a. Creation of the concept for each of the properties. The focus is always on the highest and best use, which has resulted in architecturally diverse projects with a high probability of success.
 - b. All developments activities. This includes site selection, coordination of architecture and engineering, estimating/budgeting, entitlements, and securing the necessary equity and debt financing.

- c. Design/Build Construction Services. Nigro Construction is responsible for constructing the developments. This includes administering the architecture and engineering contracts, providing construction management services, and contracting with all sub-contractors
- d. Operations. Nigro Development, through its wholly owned affiliates, including Nigro Management, and through contracts with third party management companies, oversees all management activities for the properties it develops. Nigro Development, through Nigro Management and its other affiliates, only provides operational and management services to properties it owns thus always maintaining its focus on developing and maintaining the value of the projects it creates.
- e. Nigro Management currently provides property management services for all of Nigro Development's existing projects, except the two hotels, which engage third-party property management companies that specialize in hotel operations.
- 18. Michael and I, thus, bring to Debtor knowledge regarding: (i) all facets of construction and development of real estate in the Las Vegas area; (ii) the Las Vegas residential and commercial real estate industries; (iii) property valuations in the Las Vegas area real estate market; (iii) the financing obtained for our prior and existing projects; (iv) property management and leasing; and (v) successful management strategies within the unique Las Vegas area market. In addition, as natives and lifelong businessmen in Las Vegas, I believe that we have developed strong relationships with local government, the Las Vegas business community, other real estate developers, brokers, investors, and lending institutions that provide incomparable value to Debtor.
- 19. Testament to the knowledge, skill, experience, and relationships that my brother and I, through Nigro Development, and the other individuals comprising Debtor's management team, have brought specifically to Debtor, are the facts that:
 - a. As set forth herein in more detail, Debtor generated sufficient revenue to make each and every monthly payment due under the Secured Note prior to its maturity

date despite the global economic recession that, by 2009, had severely affected the Las Vegas economy and decimated the local real estate market.

b. As also set forth herein in more detail, since the commencement of the Chapter 11 Case, Debtor has not only generated sufficient revenue to tender monthly adequate protection payments to Secured Lender in accordance with its monthly payment obligations under the Secured Note, but, as of the Confirmation Hearing, Debtor will have in excess of \$1.8 Million after tendering all of its post-petition operating expenses and Adequate Protection Payments.

- c. All seven tenants whose leases terminated in 2011 renewed their leases for an additional five-year term. Additionally, despite Debtor's pending Chapter 11 Case, I have successfully increased the occupancy of the Real Property with excellent tenants.
- 20. For the corporate management services that Nigro Development provides Debtor, other than the development fee, which was paid years prior to the Petition Date, Nigro Development does not receive any compensation for its services beyond expense reimbursements. Nigro Development's compensation as manager of Debtor was initially set forth in the terms of the *Operating Agreement of Horizon Village Square, LLC*, as amended (the "Operating Agreement"), which provides as follows:

The Managers^[2] shall not be entitled to any compensation for their services to the Company except as set forth in this Section 3.3 hereinbelow and except that the Managers shall be reimbursed or have paid directly by the Company all direct out-of-pocket expenses incurred by either of them respectively for the benefit of the Company; provided, however, that except to the extent provided for under the agreement referred to in clause (ii) of this Section 3.3 hereinbelow, the Operations Manager^[3] and its Affiliates shall not be reimbursed by the Company for its overhead expenses or for salaries paid to their respective personnel. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, the Operations Manager shall receive the Development Fee of 2.5% of the Development Costs and may: (i) from time to time designate an Affiliate of its to serve as the Property Manager in respect of which services in managing the Property such Affiliate shall receive fees equal to

² Under the terms of the Operating Agreement, Nigro Development initially shared the management responsibilities with Nigro Inc. Pursuant to the terms of the *First Amendment to Operating Agreement of Horizon Village Square, LLC* dated February 5, 2008, Nigro Development assumed the role as sole manager of Debtor.

³ Under the terms of the Operating Agreement, the "Operations Manager" is Nigro Development.

15% of all Triple-Net Charges⁴ incurred by the Company, whether or not reimbursement for such Triple-Net Charges is collected by the Company; (ii) designate an Affiliate to serve as the contractor in developing the Property pursuant to an agreement substantially in the form of Exhibit "C" attached hereto; (iii) from time to time designate a duly licensed Affiliate to serve as the leasing and sales broker for the Property, in respect of which activities such Affiliate shall receive brokerage commissions equal to \$4.00 per square foot of leased space in respect of the Company's leases if no co-broker is utilized or \$2.00 per square foot of leased space if a co-broker is utilized and 5% of the gross amounts of the Company's sales (as the case may be) if no co-broker is utilized in a sale transaction or 2.5% of the gross amounts of the Company's sales (as the case may be) if a co-broker is utilized in a sale transaction; provided, however, that the payment schedule for any such brokerage commissions to Affiliates of the Operations Manager shall be consistent with customary practice, except that commissions to such Affiliates in connection with sales shall only be paid upon consummation of such sales; and (iv) directly itself or from time to time through an Affiliate maintain the Company's books and records, in respect of which services the Company shall monthly pay a fee of \$250.

- 21. Following the execution of the Operating Agreement, Debtor adjusted the compensation that would be paid to a Property Manager to make the rates consistent with market conditions, which changed dramatically since Debtor's inception. Instead of 15% of the Triple Net Charges contemplated under the Operating Agreement, Debtor is authorized to compensate a Property Manager the equivalent of 4% of Debtor's gross revenues, which amount is commensurate with the commercially standard management fee for similar properties.
- 22. In accordance with the Operating Agreement, Nigro Development has engaged its affiliate, Nigro Management, to provide the property management services for Debtor for which Nigro Management receives 4% of Debtor's gross revenues. Additionally, Nigro Management provides leasing services to Debtor, among other of Nigro Development's projects, and receives the leasing commissions authorized in the Operating Agreement.
- 23. As disclosed in the Disclosure Statement, after the Effective Date, Debtor will continue to be managed by Nigro Development, which is authorized to engage and will continue to engage Nigro Management to provide the property management services, with all

⁴ Under the terms of the Operating Agreement, the "Triple Net Charges" means all real property taxes, insurance premiums, common area maintenance costs, and like costs or expenses related to the Property (and/or any other real property of the Company) incurred by the Company.

6

8

11

12

13 14

15

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

compensation to be paid in accordance with the terms of the Operating Agreement as set forth above.

24. Thus, Debtor's pre-petition, post-petition, and post-Effective Date management, and the compensation paid by Debtor for such corporate and property management, will remain the same.

Pre-Petition and Post-Petition, Debtor Has Been, and Remains, Able to Service Its C. Monthly Debt Obligations.

25. Debtor's Chapter 11 Case is solely predicated upon a maturity default. Despite Debtor's ability to service its monthly payment obligations to Secured Lender, as well as to all of Debtor's other creditors, upon the February 13, 2011 maturity of the Secured Note, Secured Lender refused to extend the maturity date to provide Debtor with additional time to obtain refinancing or to sell the Real Property. Instead of negotiating in good faith to reach a workable solution for both Debtor and Secured Lender, Secured Lender commenced foreclosure proceedings, thereby necessitating the commencement of this Chapter 11 Case in order to preserve the value of Debtor's assets for the benefit of all of its creditors and equity, not just Secured Lender.

1. The Secured Loan.

- 26. A Term Loan Agreement was entered into between Debtor and Wachovia Bank, N.A. ("Wachovia") effective as of February 13, 2008, pursuant to which Wachovia agreed to lend Debtor the principal amount of \$11.35 Million (the "Secured Loan").
- 27. Consistent therewith, Debtor executed the Secured Note in favor of Wachovia, in the principal sum of \$11.35 Million.
- 28. The Secured Note provides that "[i]nterest shall accrue on the unpaid principal balance of this Note during each Interest Period from the date hereof at a rate per annum equal to the Wachovia 1-month LIBOR plus 1.50%." To the best of my knowledge and belief, since the Petition Date, the interest rate under the Secured Note has not exceeded 1.8% per annum.
- 29. As security for the repayment of the Promissory Note: (i) Debtor and Wachovia entered into the Deed of Trust; (ii) Wachovia filed a UCC-1 Financing Statement with the

26

28

27

Gordon Silver

Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

Nevada Secretary of State; and (iii) Debtor granted Wachovia an Assignment of Permits, Licenses and Approvals.

- 30. As further security for the Loan, I, along with Ryanne Nigro, Michael Nigro, and Margaret Nigro guaranteed the repayment of the Secured Loan.
- 31. On August 19, 2008, Debtor and Wachovia entered into a swap agreement, which was terminated automatically on the February 13, 2011 maturity date.
- 32. I have been advised, but I have no personal knowledge and thus cannot testify to the fact that effective December 31, 2008, Secured Lender acquired Wachovia.

2. The Events Necessitating the Bankruptcy Filing.

- 33. Despite having received all monthly payment obligations, on May 18, 2010, Secured Lender issued to Debtor and the guarantors notices of default premised solely on an alleged loan-to-value ratio covenant default. Specifically, based on appraisal prepared by Eva Zupkova and Steven Gragg of Cushman & Wakefield dated January 10, 2010, Secured Lender alleged that the value of the Real Property was \$11.7 Million as stabilized on August 1, 2011, which valuation exceeded the then-outstanding balance of the Secured Loan. Therefore, purportedly in order to comply with the covenant requiring a loan-to-value ratio of less than 80%, Secured Lender demanded that Debtor immediately tender a payment of \$1.64 Million in order to reduce the Secured Loan balance to \$9.36 Million. Debtor was not able to satisfy the demand.
- 34. Able to fully service its monthly payment obligations under the Secured Note, Debtor contacted Secured Lender and sought to reach a consensual resolution with Secured Lender to extend the term of the Loan. Despite many months of negotiations and Debtor's ability to service its monthly debt obligations, Secured Lender refused to reach a consensual resolution with Debtor unless a consensual resolution was also reached with regard to a separate loan obligation between Ten Saints LLC and Secured Lender, to which Debtor was not a party.
- 35. As a global resolution as required by Secured Lender could not be reached, on or about July 7, 2011, Secured Lender recorded its Notice of Trustee's Sale and advised Debtor that it would be filing a complaint and seeking the appointment of a receiver the following week,

1	thereby leaving Debtor with no other option but to seek Chapter 11 relief in order to protect				
2	Debtor	's unse	ecured creditors and equity.		
3	D.	The P	<u>lan.</u>		
4		36.	I believe that the Plan provides adequate means for its implementation through: (i)		
5	the crea	ation a	nd continued existence of Reorganized Debtor and the vesting of Debtor's Assets in		
6	Reorga	nized	Debtor; (ii) the execution and delivery to Secured Lender of the Amended and		
7	Restated Note and the amendment and continued effectiveness of the Loan Documents; and (iii)				
8	the continuation of pre-Effective Date management and operations after the Effective Date.				
9		37.	All U.S. Trustee fees due as of the filing of this declaration have been paid.		
10		38.	Debtor is not required by a judicial or administrative order or by statute to pay		
11	domest	tic supp	port obligations.		
12		39.	There are no retirement benefits in controversy in the Chapter 11 Case as that		
13	term is	define	ed in Section 1114 of the Bankruptcy Code. As such, the Plan does not provide for		
14	the con	ıtinuati	on after the Effective Date of payment of any retiree benefits.		
15		40.	The Plan has been proposed in good faith in order to restructure Debtor's		
16	obligat	ions fo	or the benefit of all Debtor's creditors and equities. I believe that the Plan provides		
17	fundamental fairness to all of Debtor's creditors as it contemplates the full repayment of all pre-				
18	petition	n Allov	ved Claims within a reasonable amount of time.		
19		41.	Specifically, Debtor estimates that on the Effective Date, it will have:		
20			(i) One Class 1 Secured Lender Claim, which claim will receive a principal repayment of \$585,000 within one month after the Effective Date, followed by		
21			monthly principal and interest payments in accordance with Section 4.1 of the Plan, and a final balloon payment within five years of the Effective Date;		
22			(ii) No Class 2 Other Secured Claims;		
23			(iii) No Class 3 Other Priority Unsecured Claims; and		
24			(iv) Class 4 General Unsecured Claims of approximately \$16,500, which will		
25			receive repayment in full, together with interest at the rate of 5.5% per annum on or about the sixtieth (60 th) Business Day after the Effective Date.		
26			of acout the strateth (oo) Business Day after the Effective Date.		
27	•••				
28	•••				

Case 11-21034-mkn Doc 414 Entered 04/22/15 21:25:07 Page 12 of 21

- 42. Moreover, to my knowledge, to date, no party has formally or informally expressed an objection to confirmation of the Plan based upon it being proposed in a manner contrary to the Bankruptcy Code's good faith requirement or by a means forbidden by law.
- 43. In fact, Section 2.9 of the Stipulation [ECF No. 390] provides that "[f]or purposes of the Final [Confirmation] Hearing only, whether Debtor has satisfied Section 1129(a)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code (good faith) will not be challenged by Wells Fargo."
- 44. All payments to professionals during the administration of the Chapter 11 Case or other administrative costs that require Court approval have been made only with prior approval of the Court. Debtor will continue to obtain Court approval prior to the payment of any preconfirmation charges of professionals or other such administrative expenses that require prior Court approval.
- 45. There is sufficient cash on hand to pay all anticipated Allowed Administrative Claims, as well as all other Effective Date payments. Specifically, as of the submission of this declaration, Debtor's unpaid professionals' fees total less than \$30,000. Debtor has the ability to satisfy its Allowed Administrative Claims, as well as the anticipated cure payments of less than \$10,000. Debtor's post-Effective Date performance is sufficient to assure payment to the Allowed General Unsecured Claims.
- 46. Under the Plan, all Allowed Claims will be paid in full and the Allowed Claims that are not paid on the Effective Date will receive interest of 5.5% for the General Unsecured Claims and 4.25% for the Secured Lender Claim. As such, each Holder of an Allowed Claim or Equity Security in an impaired Class will receive or retain under the Plan property of a value, as of the Effective Date of the Plan, that is equal to or greater than the amount that such Holder would receive or retain if Debtor were liquidated under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code.

24 | ...

25 | .

26 ...

47. Notably, in Section 2.4 of the Stipulation [ECF No. 390], Secured Lender stipulated as follows:

For purposes of applying section 1129(b) (2) (A)(i), the Court ruled in the Memorandum Decision that the appropriate rate of interest applicable to Wells Fargo's secured claim was 4.25%. For purposes of the Final [Confirmation] Hearing only, the Parties agree that this same rate (4.25%) satisfies the 'market rate of interest' requirement of section 1129(b)(2)(A)(i).

- 48. The Plan does not impose, and does not intend to impose, a post-Effective Date third-party injunction.
- 49. The Plan preserves all of Debtor's Litigation Claims, including Avoidance Actions, for the benefit of the estate. While I have not undertaken an exhaustive analysis, I have reviewed with Debtor's counsel the payments tendered during the applicable preference periods and have discussed additional payments during the applicable fraudulent transfer periods and, based on the advice of Debtor's counsel, have determined that the payments were in the ordinary course of business and were not on account of an antecedent debt. In addition, all pre-Petition Date creditors will be paid in full; as such, as explained by Debtor's counsel, no legal basis exists to pursue certain of the pre-petition Avoidance Actions. As such, I do not anticipate that Debtor will be pursing any pre-petition Avoidance Actions or Litigation Claims. However, for the avoidance of doubt, if, upon further post-Effective Date analysis and review with Debtor's counsel, it is determined that there are viable and collectable Litigation Claims, Debtor will pursue them.

1. The Plan is feasible.

- 50. In my capacity as Debtor's manager, I prepared the financial projections (the "<u>Projection Summary</u>") for the period of the Effective Date through December 31, 2019, as well as the supporting analysis and assumptions (the "<u>Projection Analysis and Assumptions</u>," and together with the Projection Summary, the "<u>Plan Projections</u>").
- 51. I believe that the Plan Projections are feasible and that Debtor has more than a reasonable probability of success such that confirmation of the Plan is not likely to be followed by Debtor's liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization.

⁵ <u>See</u> Stipulation § 2.6, ECF No. 390.

52. As more fully set forth in the Plan Projections and as summarized in the following chart, Debtor will generate sufficient funds to meet its monthly debt service to Secured Lender and the balance of its operating and debt obligations.

	FYE 2015	FYE 2016	FYE 2017	FYE 2018	FYE 2019
Revenue	\$1,185,744.43	\$1,287,729.36	\$1,338,965.71	\$1,381,162.00	\$1,418,599.61
Total	\$278,298.55	\$289,616.33	\$298,809.00	\$307,854.37	\$316,930.11
Operating					
Expenses					
Total Non-	\$182,632.00	\$106,252.56	\$63,813.06	\$68,377.05	\$73,289.92
Operating					
Expenses					
Principal and	\$640,210.57	\$640,210.57	\$640,210.57	\$640,210.57	\$640,210.57
Interest					
Payments to					
Secured Lender					
Net Cash Flow	\$84,603.31	\$251,649.90	\$336,133.07	\$364,720.01	\$388,169.00
Estimated	\$1,384,896.55	\$1,636,546.45	\$1,972,679.51	\$2,337,399.52	\$2,725,568.53
Ending Cash					
Balance					

- 53. Debtor's revenue projections are modest and obtainable and derived from its current leases, which include annual rent escalators as set forth on the rent roll. As previously discussed, as of the submission of this declaration, Debtor is 88.5% leased. For the last five years, Debtor has consistently maintained an occupancy rate of at least 82%. Additionally, eleven of Debtor's twenty tenants have been tenants since the Real Property was built in 2006, further establishing the stability of its tenancy.
- 54. Based on my extensive experience in obtaining financing and purchasing and selling real estate, I am confident that on or before the Maturity Date, Debtor will be able to obtain replacement financing or sell the Real Property for a sum sufficient to repay the balance of the Amended and Restated Note.
- 55. Not only has Secured Lender stipulated that it is oversecured as of the Confirmation Hearing,⁵ but Debtor will have repaid in excess of \$1.3 Million in principal under the Amended and Restated Note.

- 56. Furthermore, within the last year, Debtor was approached by an interested purchaser who provided a letter of intent to purchase the Real Property for \$14.9 Million,⁶ further establishing that Debtor will be able to sell the Real Property for in excess of the thenoutstanding principal balance under the Amended and Restated Note, which is expected to be less than \$10 Million as of the Maturity Date.
- 57. Thus, Debtor's Plan has more than a reasonable probability of success such that confirmation of the Plan is not likely to be followed by Debtor's liquidation or need for further financial restructuring.
- Moreover, in Section 2.8 of the Stipulation, Secured Lender stipulated that for 58. purposes of Plan Confirmation, "whether the Debtor has satisfied section 1129(a)(11) of the Bankruptcy Code (feasibility) will not be challenged by Wells Fargo."

2. The Plan fairly and equitably treats the Secured Lender Claim.

- 59. Foremost, in accordance with Section 1129(b)(2)(A)(i), Section 4.1.1(b) of the Plan provides for Secured Lender's retention of its Lien in its Collateral until the Amended and Restated Note is repaid.
- 60. Secured Lender has further stipulated that the Secured Interest Rate of 4.25% satisfies the "market rate of interest" requirement of Section 1129(b)(2)(A)(i). See Stipulation § 2.4, ECF No. 390.
- 61. Additionally, among other reasons, the Plan fairly and equitably treats the Secured Lender Claim as: (i) Debtor timely tendered every monthly payment due under the Secured Note prior to the February 13, 2011 maturity date; (ii) the Chapter 11 Case was solely filed because Secured Lender refused to extend the maturity date of the Secured Loan despite being oversecured and despite Debtor's history of timely payments; (iii) Debtor began making monthly Adequate Protection Payments of \$18,500 immediately after the Petition Date; (iv)

27

28

⁶ Upon receipt, I contacted Secured Lender to see if it would accept the full repayment of the outstanding principal, accrued interest at the contract rate, and attorney's fees in satisfaction of the Secured Lender Claim if the sale was consummated and the Secured Lender Claim was repaid by December 2014 (i.e., only excluding the default interest asserted by Secured Lender); Secured Lender indicated its unwillingness to support the sale unless the disputed default interest was also paid and so the transaction was not pursued.

Case 11-21034-mkn Doc 414 Entered 04/22/15 21:25:07 Page 16 of 21

Debtor continued making the \$18,500 Adequate Protection Payments throughout the Chapter 11
Case, which payments exceed \$800,000 as of the filing of this declaration; (v) the Secured
Lender Claim will be fully repaid within five years; (vi) the 4.25% Secured Interest Rate is over
2.45% greater than the floating interest rate set forth in the Secured Note, which has not
exceeded 1.8% since the Petition Date; (vii) Secured Lender will receive a principal reduction
payment of \$585,000 within one month of the Effective Date; and (viii) Debtor will have over
\$1.8M as of the Effective Date, as well as revenues that exceed its expenses, and thus, Secured
Lender has a very low risk of non-payment.

- 62. In accordance with Section 4.1.1(h) of the Plan, the Amended and Restated Note will include all of the covenants that were included in the original Loan Documents, except the following, which covenants are being removed because they will jeopardize Debtor's ability to successfully reorganize:
 - (i) Section 7.4 of the Loan Agreement, which requires Secured Lender's approval of leases or terms that are not reflective of the current commercial leasing market (the "Lease Covenant");⁷
 - (ii) Section 7.7 of the Loan Agreement, which provides as follows: "Cross **Default.** Default in payment or performance of any obligation under any other loans, contracts or agreements of Borrower, or any general partner of or the holder(s) of the majority ownership interests of Borrower with Bank or its affiliates" (the "Cross Default Covenant");

⁷ Section 7.4 provides as follows: "**Leases.** Borrower will comply with the terms and conditions of, and deliver leased premises at the time and in the condition required by any Bank-approved or other tenant lease. Bank approval of leases under 5,000 square feet will not be required provided: (i) the lease confirms to a Lender-approved standard lease form (with Bank hereby acknowledging that it has approved the form lease that Borrower has used for the current tenants of the Project); (ii) provided that the lease is on then current commercially reasonable terms to a third-party unrelated to Borrower or Guarantor, and (iii) after giving effect to such lease, the average rental rate for the leased space in the Project after executing the lease in question must be equal to or greater than \$2.33/SF NNN and the lease in question must have a lease term of 3 years or greater. Bank shall not unreasonably withhold, condition or delay its consent of any other lease. Bank's consent may be conditioned upon receipt of such documents and agreements, including without limitation subordination and attornment agreements and tenant estoppel certificates, as Bank may require."

(iii) Section 7.13 of the Loan Agreement, which provides as follows: "Loan-To-Value. At all times during the term of the Loan, the unpaid principal balance of the Loan shall not exceed 80% of the appraised stabilized market value of the Project, as determined by Bank in its sole discretion. If for any reason the loan-to-value ratio exceeds the applicable percentage, then Borrower shall, within 30 days of Bank's demand, immediately reduce the unpaid balance of the Loan, or deposit sufficient sums with Bank to reduce the loan-to-value and/or the loan-to-cost ration to at or below said percentage, and Bank may, at its option, withhold or refuse to make any Loan balances until Borrower has fully complied with this requirement" (the "Loan-to-Value Covenant"); and

(iv) Section 15(f) of the Loan Agreement, which provides unless cured within the applicable cure period, the following is an event of default: "Material Adverse Change. Bank determines in good faith, in its sole discretion, that the prospects for payment or performance of the Obligations are materially impaired or there has occurred a material adverse change in the business or prospects of Borrower, financial or otherwise" (the "Material Adverse Change Covenant").

- 63. With regard to the Lease Covenant, as a result of the post-recession economic commercial leasing market in Las Vegas, eleven of Debtor's leases are less than the \$2.33 per square foot rate set forth in the Lease Covenant. As Debtor did not obtain Secured Lender's approval of these leases, if this provision is not stricken from the Loan Agreement, upon the Effective Date, Debtor would be in default. As such, the Lease Covenant must be stricken from the Loan Agreement in order to ensure Debtor's ability to consummate its Plan and to repay all of the Allowed Claims, including the Allowed Secured Lender Claim, in accordance with the terms of its Plan.
- 64. Additionally, since the Secured Loan was originated, Debtor has used its business judgment to obtain the best possible leases and has never sought, nor obtained, Secured Lender's approval of such leases. Despite this, until now, Secured Lender has never formally objected to Debtor's ability to lease the Real Property without its approval.

65. Moreover, when the Secured Loan was originated in 2008, Secured Lender's motivation was to be repaid upon the maturity date. Today, Secured Lender has made clear that its desire is to foreclose on the Real Property, not to repaid pursuant to the Plan terms. As such, I believe that Debtor and Secured Lender's interests are in conflict. Debtor desires to achieve the best possible leases to ensure the value of the Real Property is maximized and that Debtor is able to refinance or sell the Real Property prior to the Maturity Date. Secured Lender desires to find a means of forcing a default so that it can foreclose on the Real Property. Given this conflict, it would unduly impair Debtor's operations to allow Secured Lender to have any approval rights over its current and future leases.

- 66. Finally, with respect to the Lease Covenant, the language of the provision itself renders compliance with the covenant difficult to establish. Specifically, the leases must conform to the "then current commercially reasonable terms" in order to obtain Secured Lender's approval. Such language will be open to wide interpretation and thus, ripe for disagreement between Debtor and Secured Lender. Especially in light of Secured Lender's desire to find a default, as mentioned above, such highly subjective determinations of compliance with the covenant would likely require future, and perhaps multiple instances of, judicial intervention.
- 67. The Cross Default Covenant unduly impairs Debtor's ability to reorganize as it places Debtor at risk of a default even if it is fully performing in accordance with the terms of its Plan.
- 68. If the Loan-to-Value Covenant is not stricken, Debtor could arguably be placed in default immediately after the Effective Date and therefore such covenant unduly impairs Debtor's ability to reorganize. The Loan-to-Value Covenant allows Secured Lender, *in its sole discretion*, to obtain an appraisal and to call a default if the balance of the Allowed Secured Claim exceeds 80% of the appraiser's stabilized value. There is no mechanism for Debtor to challenge the validity of the valuation or to obtain its own valuation. It is certainly possible, if not likely, that if Secured Lender could find at least one appraiser to value the Real Property at a value that would place Debtor in default on the Effective Date. And, as discussed above,

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

Secured Lender has a history of calling a default under the Loan-to-Value Covenant even when Debtor is otherwise in full compliance with the terms of the Secured Loan.

- 69. The Material Adverse Change Covenant likewise allows Secured Lender to call a default "in its sole discretion" if it believes that the prospects for repayment are materially impaired. Secured Lender's opposition to confirmation itself evidences that Secured Lender believes that Debtor is in violation of the Material Adverse Change Covenant. Debtor's ability to reorganize will be unduly impaired if Secured Lender can call a default at any time because it believes, in its sole discretion, that there has been a material adverse change, which default could be called by Secured Lender even if Debtor were in compliance with all of its payment obligations under the Plan and in compliance with all of the remaining covenants.
- 70. Notably, the Plan does *not* remove the following affirmative convents in the Loan Agreement: (i) Section 6.1 titled "Access to Books and Records"; (ii) Section 6.2 titled "Business Continuity"; (iii) Section 6.3 titled "Compliance with Other Agreements"; (iv) Section 6.4 titled "Estoppel Certificate"; (v) Section 6.5 titled "Insurance"; (vi) Section 6.6 titled "Maintain Properties"; (vii) Section 6.7 titled "Non-Default Certificates From Borrower"; (viii) "Section 6.8 titled "Notice of Default and Other Notices"; (ix) Section 6.9 titled "Permanent Financing"; or (x) Section 6.10 titled "Bank's Costs."
- 71. Additionally, the Plan does *not* remove the following negative covenants in the Loan Agreement: (i) Section 7.1 titled "Change in Fiscal Year"; (ii) Section 7.2 titled "Change of Control"; (iii) Section 7.3 titled "Encumbrances"; (v) Section 7.5 titled "Guarantees"; (vi) Section 7.6 titled "Investments"; (vi) Section 7.8 titled "Default on Other Contracts or Obligations"; (vii) Section 7.9 titled "Government Invention; (vii) Section 7.10 titled "Judgment Entered"; (viii) Section 7.11 titled "Prepayment of Other Debt"; or (ix) Section 7.12 titled "Retire or Repurchase Capital Stock."
- 72. Similarly, the Plan does *not* remove Sections 8.1 or 8.2, which set forth the financial reporting that must be provided by Debtor and the Guarantors to Secured Lender.

. . .

- 4

- 11
- 15
- 18
- 19
- 23
- 26
- 28

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

(702) 796-5555

- 73. Thus, the Plan solely removes the four financial covenants that would preclude Debtor from successfully reorganizing. The balance of the covenants set forth in the Loan Agreement will remain in place after the Effective Date.
- 74. The Plan's treatment places Secured Lender in a better position than it was in prepetition. Specifically, Secured Lender will receive a pay down of nearly \$600,000 and an increased interest rate of over 2.45% above the contract rate.
- 75. Additionally, Debtor will retain nearly the same cash position it was in prepetition (\$1.04 Million on the Petition Date and approximately \$1.3 Million after the Effective Date and pay down to Secured Lender), thereby giving Debtor the needed flexibility to complete tenant improvements and property maintenance and repairs to ensure the value of the Real Property is maintained and continues to increase and to ensure that Debtor can effectuate a sale or refinancing prior to the Maturity Date.
- 76. As the manager, I, together with my brother Michael Nigro, in our capacities as the managers of Nigro Development, the manager of Debtor, determine whether to make equity distributions. In making that determination, we are foremost focused on ensuring the viability and success of Debtor. This includes ensuring that there are sufficient funds to pay any tenant improvements (which can exceed hundreds of thousands of dollars), as well as repairs and maintenance that necessarily occur in a project approaching ten years old. We additionally consider what cash reserves will place Debtor in the best position to facilitate a refinancing or a sale. This is the same distribution analysis we undertake for all of the projects we manage through Nigro Development.
- 77. As evident by the fact that Debtor was holding over \$1 Million on the Petition Date and that Beltway One Development Group, LLC was holding approximately \$1.3 Million on the Petition Date and is holding approximately \$1.6 Million today, we are very conservative in our analysis and only make distributions where we are entirely confident that such distribution will not harm the viability of the project and/or the ability to refinance or sell the project.
- 78. Our conservative approach to distributions is further evidenced by the fact that after the Secured Loan was originated, other than distributions to reimburse Debtor's members

1	for the taxes incurred as a result of Debtor's positive revenue, Debtor has not tendered
2	distributions to Debtor's members.
3	79. I have handled the financing for all of the Nigro Development projects, which
4	includes over twenty commercial loans with numerous lending institutions. In my experience,
5	the lenders do not place a restriction on the ability of the borrower to make distributions to equity
6	if the loan is otherwise performing. In fact, none of Secured Lender's Loan Documents impose
7	any such restriction. Stated otherwise, while Secured Lender now complains that there is no
8	Plan restriction on Debtor's ability to make distributions to equity, Secured Lender's own Loan
9	Documents never imposed any such restriction on Debtor's ability to make distributions to
10	equity.
11	80. Moreover, as Debtor's manager, my responsibility is to ensure the viability of the
12	project. I take this responsibility seriously and would never take any action that would
13	jeopardize the ability to successfully refinance or sell the Real Property.
14	81. Beyond my responsibility as manager, my brother, my wife, and my brother's ex-
15	wife, and I are all Guarantors of the Secured Loan. Thus, we are further incentivized to ensure
16	that Secured Lender is repaid in accordance with the terms of the Plan as Secured Lender has
17	repeatedly expressed its intent to sue the Guarantors should there be a breach.
18	82. My brother and I, as manager, have always acted, and will continue to act, in the
19	best interest of Debtor to ensure the viability of the project and the consummation of the Plan,
20	including the repayment of Secured Lender's claim prior to the Maturity Date.
21	83. I reserve my right to expound upon the testimony set forth herein as appropriate at
22	the Confirmation Hearing.
23	I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that these facts are true
24	to the best of my knowledge and belief.
25	DATED this 22 nd day of April, 2015.
26	_/s/ Todd Nigro TODD NIGRO
27	אסוא עעטו
28	