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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Sponsor Information:

Project Name:

2530 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street
Sponsors:

Borrower Entity for
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Borrower Entity for Predev
Take-Out and Additional
Predev Loan:

2530 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street (at Hampshire), 94110

Homeless Prenatal Program

Mercy Housing California (MHC)

2530 18th, LLC
Mercy Housing California 104, L.P.

## Project Summary:

Competitively selected for funding under the 2022 Homeless Families Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) issued jointly by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and MOHCD, $253018^{\text {th }}$ Street (Site) will be a new construction 74-unit affordable housing development with $50 \%$ (37) of the units set aside for families who have experienced homelessness (Project). The Site is currently owned by 2530 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, LLC, an affiliate of the Homeless Prenatal Program (HPP), which has partnered on the development with Mercy Housing California (MHC, and together Sponsor). After subdivision of the parcel, HPP will develop expanded office and services space (HPP Campus Expansion) to expand their program on the ground and second floor, which would connect to their existing adjacent programs and services hub at 2500 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street at Potrero, funded by New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) and private fundraising. MHC will develop the residential project in an air rights parcel above and adjacent to HPP's expanded campus space. Half of the units will be built as permanent supportive housing for families who have experienced homelessness, subsidized by the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) with residents referred through the Coordinated Entry system. The Project received a $\$ 16$ million preliminary gap commitment from MOHCD on June 24, 2022 in support of its application for funding to the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Multi-family Housing Program (MHP) and Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) programs. The Project did not receive a funding award from HCD in 2022 and reapplied for MHP and IIG in July 2023. Award notifications of the latest HCD round will be in Winter 2024.

HPP is requesting that MOHCD take out one of its two acquisition loans for the Site provided by First Republic Bank (FRB), which originally was due for repayment at the end of June 2023 and has been extended to September 25, 2023. The MOHCD loan would be considered repaid in full upon transfer of the new, yet to be created residential air rights parcel to the City at construction loan closing. In the event that the Project does not move forward, HPP would repay the MOHCD acquisition loan within five years from the date of the loan (September 2028). In addition, MHC is requesting $\$ 2,435,211$ to take out the existing San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund (SF HAF) predevelopment loan and \$2,511,689 in additional predevelopment funding to cover the Project through construction close.

The Project will have a mix of one, two- and three-bedroom units with half the units affordable to households at $30 \%$ of the San Francisco area median income (AMI), and the remainder of units restricted at $50 \%, 60 \%$ and $70 \%$ Area Median Income. HPP will provide case management services for the supportive housing units in the Project, funded under a separate contract with San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH).

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | Type I-B | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Stories: | 8 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 0.31 acres/ 13,504 sf |
| Number of Units: | 74 | Architect: | Mithun |
| Total Residential Area: | 50,714 sf | General Contractor: | Suffolk Construction Company |
| Total Commercial Area: | N/A - separate parcel | Property Manager: | Mercy Housing Management Group |
| Total Building Area: | 88,166 sf | Supervisor and District: | Ronen (Dist. 9) |
| Land Owner: | $253018{ }^{\text {th }}$, LLC |  |  |
| Total Development Cost (TDC) without acquisition: | \$81,151,064 | Total Acquisition Cost: | \$7,332,250 |
| TDC/unit: | \$1,195,720 | TDC less land cost/unit: | \$1,096,636 |
| Current Loan Amount Requested: | \$9,846,900 | Request Amount / unit: | \$133,066 |
| HOME Funds? | N | Parking? | N |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- Project feasibility: The Project as proposed is infeasible and requires additional operating subsidies. The Project's relatively small size of 74 units does not offer economies of scale for construction nor operations, which also impacts competitiveness for financing applications. The Sponsor is exploring options to increase Project feasibility and obtain additional rental subsidies. See Section 4.10 Project Feasibility.
- Competition for State Financing: HCD MHP funding has become increasingly competitive across the State. The Project did not secure an award in 2022, and will face stiff competition in the 2023 round. A bond allocation will also be competitive, especially since the Project has high per unit construction costs and is in a moderate resource area. While the Project will qualify for both the Homeless and Extremely Low Income (ELI) set-asides at CDLAC with a more favorable tiebreaker than in previous rounds, the high cost and resource area designation still pose a challenge to competitiveness. Please see Section 4.10 Project Feasibility and Section 6.5.2 Project Financing.
- Ownership Structure and dependency on HPP Campus Expansion readiness: The Site is currently owned by Homeless Prenatal Program, the services partner organization. The Site will be subdivided with an air rights parcel for the residential development, which will be transferred to the City at construction close and ground leased to the limited partnership. The HPP project will fund all of its development costs for its adjacent new program and services hub, including its shell, without MOHCD funds. The HPP project must be financially feasible with all financing commitments in place and an award of New Market Tax Credits before construction can start. Please see Section 4.4. HPP Campus Expansion.
- Construction Costs: Through intensive value engineering efforts, the project team has brought construction cost down significantly from earlier estimates; however, the current construction costs are approximately $7 \%$ more per square foot higher than to similar Type I buildings. Please see Section 4.5 Construction Representative Evaluation.


## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Predevelopment Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MOHCD - Take out of SFHAF Cost | $2,435,211$ | 32,908 | $3 \%$ at 55 Years / Res Rec | This Request |
| MOHCD - Acq. of FRB Loan | $4,900,000$ | 66,216 | Earlier of 5 years or parcel transfer at $0 \%$ | This Request |
| MOHCD - New Predev. Cost | $2,511,689$ | 33,942 | $3 \%$ at 55 Years / Res Rec | This Request |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 , 8 4 6 , 9 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 3 , 0 6 6}$ |  |  |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Committed/Not <br> Com |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MOHCD/OCII | $16,000,000$ | 216,216 | 55 years at 3\% / Res Rec | Committed |
| HCD-MHP | $28,320,125$ | 382,704 | 55 years at min int. pymt. / Res Rec | Not Committed |
| HCD-IIG | $6,048,992$ | 81,743 | 55 years at 3\% deferred | Not Committed |
| AHP | $1,000,000$ | 13,514 | 15 year grant 0\% | Not Committed |
| Investor Equity | $36,114,097$ | 488,028 | $\$ 0.96$ per Fed LIHTC / \$0.92 per State <br> LIHTC | Not Committed |
| Deferred Developer Fee | $1,000,000$ | 13,514 | $0 \%$ deferred |  |
| GP Equity | 100 | 1.35 |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 8 , 4 8 3 , 3 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 9 5 , 7 2 0}$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Acquisition | $7,389,712$ | 99,861 | 84 |
| Hard Costs | $58,547,274$ | 791,179 | 664 |
| Soft Costs | $18,365,277$ | 248,179 | 208 |
| Reserves | $1,038,514$ | 14,034 | 12 |
| Developer Fee | $3,500,000$ | 47,297 | 40 |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 8 , 8 4 0 , 7 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 0 , 5 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 8}$ |

## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1. Project History Leading to This Request.

The proposed Site, 2530 18th Street, is a 0.3 acre lot at the corner of 18th and Hampshire Streets in the Mission District. It is adjacent to the Homeless Prenatal Program's (HPP) main operational building at 2500 18th Street, with which it shares a property line. In June 2020, HPP purchased the Site for $\$ 7$ million, financed by a $\$ 4.9$ million loan from First Republic Bank, seller carryback financing and HPP funds, and HPP obtained a subsequent $\$ 2$ million loan with CommonSpirit Health Operating Investment Pool LLC to take out the seller financing and support their programs and services hub expansion. HPP intends to expand their program on the ground and
second level with affordable housing above. As MOHCD did not have funding available at the time of acquisition, the San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund (SF HAF) provided predevelopment financing to move it forward. The Site underwent a zoning map change through the Board of Supervisors in August 2021 that changed its zoning designation from Production, Distribution and Repair (PDR) to Urban Mixed-Use (UMU). The legislation (co-sponsored by Supervisors Walton, Ronen and Stefani) had over 80 letters of support. The designation allows for residential mixed-use projects and was unanimously approved, which allowed the Site to utilize SB35 for expedited entitlements.
The Sponsor applied for City funding under the joint MOHCD/HSH NOFA in 2022 and was awarded preliminary gap funding in the amount of $\$ 16,000,000$. The team has made good progress on the design since the last Loan Committee review, with a $60 \%$ Construction Drawing set (dated 3/24/23) and cost estimate, and the Site permit is nearly complete.

### 1.2. Applicable NOFA/RFQ/RFP. (See Attachment E for Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria)

NOFA for Affordable Rental Housing for Families Including Families Experiencing Homelessness, issued jointly by MOHCD and HSH on April 25, 2022. The project was the only qualifying application for the NOFA.
1.3. Borrower/Grantee Profile. (See Attachment B for Borrower Org Chart; See Attachment C for Developer Resume and Attachment D for Asset Management Analysis)
1.3.1. Borrower for acquisition takeout loan. HPP serves 3,500 families annually with a staff of $125+$ and an annual budget of around $\$ 16$ million. HPP has current contracts with MOHCD, HSH and HSA encompassing Housing Services, transitional housing programs, and child welfare. For HPP take out of the $\$ 4.9$ million site acquisition loan provided by FRB, 2530 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, LLC, and affiliate of HPP, will be the borrower, with the MOHCD loan repayment due at the earlier of transfer of residential air rights parcel to the City or September 25, 2028. The proposed interest rate is $0 \%$.
1.3.2. Borrower for predevelopment loan. For SFHAF predevelopment loan takeout and additional predevelopment expenses, the borrower will be Mercy Housing California 104, L.P., with Mercy Housing California 104 LLC as the general partner and Mercy Housing Calwest as the sole member/member thereof, and South of Market Mercy Housing as the initial limited partner. At construction closing, the limited partner will be replaced with the investor limited partner.
1.3.3. Joint Venture Partnership. MHC and HPP have partnered as co-developers for the development of $253018^{\text {th }}$ Street, collaborating on various aspects of the development of the vision and programming of the project. MHC is taking the lead role on the real estate development responsibilities including design, entitlements, engagement of community on development issues, permitting, budget, securing financing and operating subsidies, construction administration, lease-up, property management, services planning and implementation, and asset management
including regulatory and budget compliance. HPP is actively shaping the community engagement strategy for the overall development and is informing the service delivery. HPP will lead the development of its adjacent program and services hub, including renovating its existing building at $250018^{\text {th }}$ Street. HPP is not a part of the tax credit ownership entity but will be receiving \$200,000 of the developer fee to support its work on the Project.

### 1.3.4. Demographics of Board of Directors, Staff and People Served - HPP

- Board
- $100 \%$ straight
- $87.5 \%$ female / $12.5 \%$ male
- $62.5 \%$ white / $37.5 \%$ AAPI
- Staff of SF-based organization - HPP All Staff
- 40\% Latinx / 30\% Black/African American / 20\% white / 7\% API / 2\% Multiracial/Other
- Sexual orientation- we do not currently ask
- HPP Clients
- 52\% Latinx / 28\% - Black/African American / 11\% Multiracial/other / 5\% API / 4\% white
- Female staff - 91\% / Male staff - 9\%
- Staff of development team
- Martha Ryan- Founder
- Shellena Eskridge- Executive Director
- Kristin Hatch- Development Director
- Jessica Iniquez- Communications Manager
- Liz Gerber- Donor engagement \& stewardship officer
- Sharon Bechtol- Volunteer/Donations Manager
- Mauro Ruiz- Social and Digital Media Support Specialist
- Jodie Law- Assistant Volunteer/Donations Coordinator
- Wendy Trevino- Grant Writer
- Trace Carter- Development Operations Associate
1.3.5. Demographics of Board of Directors, Staff and People Served - MHC.

|  | Sexual Orientation | Gender Identity | Race |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mercy Housing California Board | Question not asked | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M}: 7 \\ & \mathrm{~F}: 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Asian: 2 <br> African American: 4 <br> Caucasian: 9 <br> Latinx: 2 <br> Biracial: 1 |
| Mercy Housing, Inc. Board | Question not asked | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M}: 10 \\ & \mathrm{~F}: 10 \end{aligned}$ | Asian: 1 <br> African American: 3 <br> Latinx: 1 <br> Caucasian: 15 |
| Mercy Housing, Inc. - All Staff | Question not asked | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female - } 58 \% \\ & \text { Male-42\% } \end{aligned}$ | 2 or More Races - 3\% <br> American Indian/Alaska Native - 1\% <br> Asian - 11\% <br> Black or African American - $24 \%$ <br> Hispanic or Latino - 22\% <br> Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander 1\% <br> Not specified - $1 \%$ <br> White-37\% |
| Mercy Housing California - All Staff | Question not asked | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female-57\% } \\ & \text { Male- } 43 \% \end{aligned}$ | American Indian/Alaska Native - $1 \%$ <br> Asian - 21\% <br> Black or African American - 17\% <br> Hispanic or Latino - 31\% <br> Native Hawailan/Other Pacific Islander 2\% <br> Not specified - $1 \%$ <br> White-22\% |
| Mercy Housing California - Development Staff | Question not asked | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female - } 50 \% \\ & \text { Male- } 50 \% \end{aligned}$ | Asian - 20\% <br> Not specified - 20\% <br> White-60\% |

1.3.6. Racial Equity Vision. MHC and HPP are committed to advancing racial equity. Racial equity is central to achieving MHC's mission and founding values of: Respect, Justice, and Mercy. Nationally, Mercy has established a Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (REDI) team to create Racial Equity Action Plans for all departments and Mercy Senior Vice President of REDI, Web Brown leads this work and coordinates concrete action across the organization. Mercy launched this REDI Initiative in early 2018, and held conversations about the fair and just inclusion of people of color throughout the organization and within Mercy's communities. Mercy has established a REDI Collaborative and REDI Steering Committee that are made up of members from all of their geographic areas and departments to guide their organizational REDI work and provide recommendations to senior leadership on concrete ways to achieve improved REDI within the organization. Mercy created a framework to evaluate their progress and growth that focuses on a variety of areas, including Recruitment and Resident Empowerment.
HPP is dedicated to racial equity both internally and externally. HPP recognizes that systems of white supremacy and privilege have negatively impacted their families, staff, and the community, and they are committed to dismantling those systems. HPP acknowledges institutional racism and oppression as a leading contributor to family poverty and homelessness. Beginning back in 2013, HPP staff members began meeting in the form of community meetings to show solidarity and support for staff members experiencing and being affected by community
violence and injustices in our community. The community meetings then transitioned into an Equity workgroup discussing various topics about police brutality, shootings against African Americans, and the racial hate against the Asian community. The workgroup has done All Staff presentations, All Staff equity surveys and unconscious bias training over the last 8 years

- HPP's Equity Task Force is comprised of staff members from across the agency, and continually works to develop action plans and implement initiatives in three staff-identified priority areas:
- Promote Racial Healing
- Share Decision Making
- Distribute Leadership

HPP's current task force just completed a 2-year term. HPP will prepare to on-board 9 new staff members on to the current racial equity task force.

- In 2020 HPP hired consultant RELAC to assist HPP in creating The Equity Task Force. RELAC led all staff in choosing 3 Equity priority areas. RELAC facilitated all of the Equity Task Force Meetings and helped HPP create policies, procedures, and a structure to ensure equity work would be on-going at HPP.

In the fall of 2022, HPP's board of directors also hired RELAC, to assist HPP's board of directors by leaning into Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion on the board level.
1.3.7. Relevant Experience. MHC will be the lead developer with the HPP as codeveloper advising on specific areas of the development approach and on the supportive services model. Mercy has developed over 50 properties in San Francisco over the past 35 years. The success of these developments is a result of strong affordable housing expertise used to innovate and leverage financial structures, construction delivery methods (to reduce cost and increase quality) and service delivery models to make affordable housing more responsive to diverse, vulnerable residents' needs.

MHC has decades of experience developing for low-income families and formerly homeless households. In San Francisco, MHC has developed 22 properties ( 1,837 units) for families and 20 properties ( 1,897 units) for formerly homeless households. In California, MHC has developed 81 properties ( 5,432 units) for families and 39 properties (1,897 units) that serve formerly homeless households. MHC is strong at partnering with other agencies, as demonstrated through many past projects.

The Homeless Prenatal Program is a nationally recognized family resource center in San Francisco that empowers homeless and low-income families, particularly mothers motivated by pregnancy and parenthood, to find within themselves the strength and confidence they need to transform their lives. The agency serves over 3,000 families in-need annually, providing a variety
of programs and services to help families become healthy, stable and selfsufficient. The first agency in San Francisco to hire former clients as staff, HPP's evolution has been guided by the community it serves. More than half of HPP's staff of 120+ is formerly homeless mothers and graduates of the agency's 16-month, paid Community Health Worker Apprenticeship Program, which trains women for careers in the nonprofit sector.
1.3.8. Project Management Capacity. 2580 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street is staffed by Mercy's Kion Sawney (40\% FTE) as Project Developer, Lilia Rohmann (25\% FTE) as Assistant Project Manager, with supervision by Ramie Dare, Director of Real Estate Development.

HPP's Development Director, Kristin Hatch (35\% FTE) and Rachel Stoltzfus, Director of Housing and Partnerships (60\% FTE), staffs bi-weekly project check-ins with MOHCD and coordinates on facility's needs as they relate to the programming through construction of the project, with supervision and support by Martha Ryan, Founder. The financing and development of the HPP addition at the Site is being staffed by Equity Community Builders. See individual staff resumes attached.

### 1.3.9. Past Performance.

1.3.9.1. City audits/performance plans. HPP has contracts with MOHCD, HSH and HSA. There have been no contract issues or performance issues identified by Citywide Monitoring nor by the MOHCD Community Development team for HPP. There are no performance issues for MHC.
1.3.9.2. Marketing/lease-up/operations. Recent marketing at Mercy projects has been overall successful and positive. Some issues have arisen due to reliance for some tasks on national staff for compliance and lease up, as national staff are not very familiar with San Francisco policies. Increased local staff participation in lease-ups will be required.

The below chart represents the number of people currently living in MHC owned properties in San Francisco, disaggregated by race. MHC owns 4,217 units of affordable housing in San Francisco.

| Race $\quad \overline{\text { F }}$ | Count 9 - |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 2995 | Ethnicity $\nabla$ | Count d ${ }^{\text {a }}$. |
| White | 1385 | Not-Hispanic or Latino | 5576 |
| Black or African American | 1155 | Hispanic or Latino | 1383 |
| Other | 1092 | Member did not specify | 180 |
| Member Did Not Specify | 212 | Blank | 32. |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific IsI | 173 |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 154 |  |  |
| Blank | 10 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 7176 |  | 7171 |

Through end of 2021 there were 5 evictions in Mercy's 4,217-unit portfolio. Mercy does not currently track move out reasons, including evictions, by race.

## 2. SITE (See Attachment E for Site map with amenities)

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \text { Site Description } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The Site is located in the Urban Mixed Use (UMU) zoning } \\
\text { district and the 58-X Height and Bulk District. The UMU district } \\
\text { is intended to promote a vibrant mix of uses while maintaining } \\
\text { the characteristics of this formerly industrially zoned area. } \\
\text { Within the UMU, permitted uses include, but are not limited to } \\
\text { retail, educational facilities, and housing, with family-sized } \\
\text { dwelling units encouraged. Under UMU, at least 40\% of all } \\
\text { dwelling units must contain two or more bedrooms or 30\% of all } \\
\text { dwelling units must contain three or more bedrooms. However, } \\
\text { this does not apply to the Project, as it is 100\% affordable. }\end{array}
$$ <br>

\hline The site underwent a zoning change in August 2021 from\end{array}\right\}\)| Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) to Urban Mixed Use |
| :--- |
| (UMU). It received a Notice of Final Approval of an SB 35 |
| Project on June 29, 2022. |


|  | The primary geotechnical concerns are: 1) the presence of <br> undocumented fill that is susceptible to erratic static settlement, <br> and 2) providing adequate vertical and lateral support for the <br> proposed building. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Environmental Review: | Harris and Lee Environmental Sciences, LLC completed a <br> Phase I report on December 15, 2021.The report found no <br> evidence of recognized environmental conditions on the <br> property. |
| Adjacent uses (North): | 2445 Mariposa Street is a 69-unit affordable housing building <br> managed by Mission Housing Development Corporation |
| Adjacent uses (South): | 626 Potrero is a parking lot |
| Adjacent uses (East): | 593 Potrero is a three story mixed use building with ground <br> floor commercial |
| Adjacent uses (West): | 2600 18'h Street is a 24-unit live/work condo building |
| Neighborhood Amenities within 0.5 <br> miles: | John O'Connell Technical High School is 0.4 miles away, <br> Safeway is 0.3 miles away, Franklin Square Park is .17 miles <br> away, Downtown High School is 0.2 miles away, Zuckerberg <br> SF General Hospital is 0.5 miles away |
| Public Transportation within 0.5 miles: | Bus lines 9, 22, 27, 55, 90, 292, 397 are within 0.5 miles |
| Article 34: | Article 34 Authority was obtained on July 8, 2022. |
| Article 38: | Not Exempt. Compliance with Article 38 is provided by all fresh <br> air being provided via mechanical ventilation with MERV-13 <br> filtration at the point of air intakes. |
| Accessibility: | Per updated TCAC minimum building standards, 15\% will be <br> mobility units, 10\% will be accessible for households with <br> hearing and/or visual impairments. All units will be adaptable. <br> Sponsor is working to meet a high-level of universal design <br> standards intended to include additional mobility features <br> within the residential units to ease modification to meet <br> residents' specific needs. |
| Will target GreenPoint Gold rating |  |
| Green Building: | Exempt |
| Recycled Water: | The stormwater management plan is under development and <br> has not yet been submitted to the PUC. |
| Storm Water Management: |  |

2.1 Description. The Site is a rectangular shaped parcel slightly sloped in an uphill eastern direction starting at Hampshire Street and along 18th Street. The Site is situated at the northeast corner of 18th Street and Hampshire Street in the Mission neighborhood and is currently a vacant warehouse.
The Sponsor is in the process of merging 2 lots and subdividing the vertical lot into 3 air rights parcels. The subdivision will ultimately create a separate commercial parcel for HPPs programs and service space, and residential air rights parcel. The existing warehouse will need to be demolished during the predevelopment phase before the air rights subdivision, and demolition costs are included in the predevelopment budget.
2.2 Zoning. The Project received its Notice of Final Approval of an SB 35 Project on June 29, 2022 from the Planning Department.
2.3 Local/Federal Environmental Review. A NEPA consultant has been engaged for this project and that cost is reflected in the predevelopment budget. There is no current requirement for NEPA review, but the project is structured to easily pivot towards a federal funding source, such as Continuum of Care operating subsidies, if they become available.
2.4 Environmental Issues.

- Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results. Phase I found no recognized environmental issues.
- Potential/Known Hazards. N/A
2.5 Green Building. Environmentally preferable products are prioritized for incorporation throughout the building including: materials which are sourced locally and/or high in recycled content; non-toxic paints, as well as coating and materials that are free of VOCS and phthalates. Prioritization of healthy, nontoxic materials will begin within the residential unit, where people spend the most time and have the highest levels of exposure.
Another area of emphasis is energy performance. In order to reduce energy \& fossil fuel usage, the Sponsor is proposing an all-electric building, with photovoltaic arrays on the roofs. Together with an upgraded envelope design, energy recovery ventilation units (ERVs) for fresh air within the residential units \& the use of electric heat-pump systems for hot water heating, this strategy is a cost effective way to meet the energy goals and low-maintenance needs of affordable housing projects. The project will target, at a minimum, GreenPoint Gold rating.


## 3 COMMUNITY SUPPORT

3.1 Prior Outreach. MHC and HPP began community outreach ahead of the zoning change on the Site. Two community meetings in 2021 and 2022 were hosted as well as a meeting with Supervisor Walton and numerous conversations with stake holders. The zoning change ultimately had 80 letters of support at the public hearing.
3.2 Future Outreach. The $253018^{\text {th }}$ Street development team has endeavored to communicate with the Project's neighbors through a combination of community mailing efforts and community meetings. The team has held four community meetings, occurring in August 2021, December 2021, July 2022, and February 2023. Additionally, the team has communicated the zoning change undergone for the project area to neighbors, as well as HPP building tour opportunities, by mailing letters to households. Mail communications on both community meeting dates and project updates have been made available in several languages so that the information is accessible and understandable to more of the neighbors. Future meetings will be held prior to start of construction. The development team
posts all community meeting materials and mailing/updates to the project's website https://www.2530-18th.org/
3.31998 Proposition I Citizens' Right-To-Know. Chapter 79 of the City's Administrative Code requires public noticing (Prop I) for initial City funding made to any new construction project. The Sponsor posted the Prop I sign on June 16, 2023.

## 4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

4.1. Acquisition and Site Control. HPP acquired the parcel on June 29, 2020, for $\$ 7$ million plus $\$ 37,000$ in closing costs. The acquisition was financed by First Republic Bank, Seller Takeback Financing and HPP funds. HPP took out the seller takeback financing with a low interest loan from CommonSpirit when SF HAF provided the predevelopment financing.

| Original Acquisition Sources | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| First Republic Bank | $\$$ | $4,900,000$ |
| Seller Take Back Financing | $\$$ | $1,250,000$ |
| HPP | $\$$ | 887,000 |
| Total Sources for acquisition and closing | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 0 3 7 , 0 0 0}$ |

Mercy Housing California 104, L.P. entered into an option agreement to purchase the Site from 2530 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, LLC, on December 1, 2021. The initial term of the option expires January 1, 2024, with an option to extend for 12-month period. The purchase price is sized at the residential project's allocation of a $\$ 7$ million purchase price $(\$ 6,020,000)$ based on square footage plus the residential project's allocation of the Seller's reasonable holding costs, currently estimated at $\$ 7.3$ million. This amount will cover $100 \%$ of entitlement costs, as they were required for the residential use only. The chart below represents currently estimated residential acquisition costs.


| Entitlement | \$ | 252,165 | \$ | 252,165 | \$0 | Entitlement cost will be fully covered by the residential project. At the time of the August 2023 Loan Evaluation submission, how these cost should be represented and reimbursed wasn't resolved by HPP and Mercy and therefore weren't included in the predevelopment budget submission. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | \$ | 8,433,103 | \$ | 7,287,772 | \$ 1,145,331 |  |

4.1.1.1. Proposed Property Ownership Structure. Prior to closing, HPP and MHC will conduct an air rights subdivision of the building, to separate the HPP Campus Expansion and limited partner's residential portions. The residential air rights parcel will be acquired by MOHCD and ground leased to Mercy Housing California 104, L.P. in exchange for loan forgiveness for the acquisition takeout loan plus residual amount needed to meet the final purchase price. The commercial parcel will be sold to the New Markets Tax Credit special purpose entity.
4.2. Proposed Design. The Project, located at the border of the Mission and Potrero Hill neighborhoods, will provide 74 affordable homes, $50 \%$ of which will be targeted for formerly homeless families. The approximately $88,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. 8 -story building includes a mix of 1,2 and 3 bedroom apartment homes, residential support and amenity spaces, and community serving social services parcel on the lower two floors owned by HPP, to enable expansion of the critical services and programs they provide to the community. Sited on a sloping urban infill site at the NE corner of Hampshire and 18th streets, the project provides accessible entries for both the residential and social service programs that are accessed via the relatively flat frontage along Hampshire Street. The building will have two elevators dedicated to the residential portion of the building, serving units and residential amenity spaces. No off-street parking is proposed but the project includes the requisite 73 fully compliant class 1 bicycle parking spaces.

| Residential SF: | 75,398 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Commercial SF: | 12,768 |
| Building Total SF: | $\mathbf{8 8 , 1 6 6}$ |


| UNIT TYPES | Avg Unit SF - This Project | CTCAC-Required Minimum SF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1BR: | 538 | 450 |
| 2BR: | 759 | 700 |
| 3BR: | 1086 | 900 |
| Do all units meet <br> CTCAC minimum SF? | Y |  |

4.3 Construction Supervisor/Construction Representative's Evaluation. The project comprises 74 units in a mix of 36 One-BR, 31 Two-BR and 6 Three-BR units, plus one, 2-BR manager unit, dedicated residential services, property management, developed above the HPP Campus Expansion that is financed separately. There are three landscaped courtyards and terraces. The HPP space is significant at 12,800 s.f. on levels $1 \& 2$, and there is a connecting HPP serving elevator with a bridged walkway from the new HPP Community Service space to their main building. The courtyard on floor 2 and terrace located over the existing utility shed will support HPP users and act as a natural connector for the HPP campus.

On level 1 is the entrance to the HPP Campus Expansion Space, the residential first floor lobby, mail, management, resident services, and utility spaces. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor consists of 5 residential units, HPP office space and an HPP courtyard which also provides access to the existing HPP campus through a secondary outdoor terrace. The Project has a unique vertical means of access necessary to connect HPP to its existing campus. Because of this, HPP will pay for the dedicated 3-stop elevator servicing their community service spaces, walkway connector to the existing HPP campus, and the connector staircase between levels 1 \& 2. Mercy is financially responsible for the two stairwells and elevators supporting resident access.

Floors 3 through 8 are stacked units in 1, 2 and 3 bedroom configurations, and each floor also features a "study" overlooking the courtyard. The interior space accessing the resident-only courtyard on floor 3 offers community space along with laundry and small porch overlooking $18^{\text {th }}$ Street.

The building façade up to the $6^{\text {th }}$ floor presents a "crinkled" design with a mixture of thin brick tile, metal panel cladding and glazing areas of varied sizes, while the $7^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ floors receive a cement plaster finish. The courtyard facades will also have an economical cement plaster finish and will have a storefront exterior at the study overhang.

The 60\% Construction Drawing set (dated 3/24/23) incorporates an HPP Expanded Campus space consisting of approximately 12,200 sf interior, 420 sf exterior covered space and 670 sqft of HPP garden space. The residential courtyard is 1,900 sf and one of the two proposed family childcare units includes a dedicated 170 sf patio.

Project team has navigated most issues through City review agencies and the Site Permit is nearing completion. The last design hurdle the team is navigating is the permitting of the connector walkway between the new building and HPP's existing building. This walkway will have to be under a separate building permit and will be submitted in parallel with the new building's Addenda 1, structural scope

A recent challenge the design team addressed was the enlargement of the north lightwell which will address the last major site permit concern from DBI. The team had initially planned on an easement with the neighboring affordable housing property to allow a reduced lightwell and have a larger three-bedroom unit. Unfortunately, DBI did not agree this was a correct interpretation of the code, so the team had to increase the lightwell size, reduce the unit size, and use shared light for one of the bedrooms. The design team did a good job maintaining the unit and bedroom counts and navigating the coordination efforts with city agencies.
Another change since schematic design was the addition of another unit to the $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor, enabled through HPP \& Mercy's development of shared spaces for their staff. Overall unit layouts are efficiently designed. The exterior design has been detailed significantly since 100\% Design Drawings, and the significant review of the finishes' costs will be needed as the project transitions to construction. The team is actively evaluating two million dollars in value engineering opportunities identified by Suffolk, with the objective of reducing overall cost of the building before the next milestone, 95\% Construction Drawings.
The Project faces challenges in cost containment in an environment of a highly volatile construction market combined with a unique set of program challenges. However, through VE over the past three months, the project team has removed approximately $\$ 900 \mathrm{k}$ from construction costs. The current construction budget is approximately $19 \%$ more per unit, and $17 \%$ more per bedroom than similar Type I buildings. This has significantly improved since the last loan evaluation but does not diminish the need for the project to incorporate savings wherever possible. Construction cost per square foot is $7 \%$ higher than projects of similar building type, Type 1, which is tolerable. The overall total development cost is similarly above average at approximately $36 \%$ per unit and $23 \%$ per square foot. This is primarily driven by acquisition and soft costs. An area for cost improvement is with soft costs, which are approximately $66 \%$ more per unit than similar projects. Soft costs have increased by over one million dollars to support the additional permit packages, additional value engineering work, and the potential of additional units to make the project financially viable for funding.

### 4.4 HPP Community Campus Expansion.

4.4.1. Space Description. The HPP Campus Expansion will be built in a separate commercial parcel on the lower two levels and will be financed entirely by HPP through New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) and other sources. The approximately 12,800 sf space will include flexible, multi-use office, program and training spaces along with other supportive spaces. This space will have own dedicated elevator. The commercial space will be an air rights parcel.
4.4.2. HPP Parcel Development Plan. Homeless Prenatal Program will be the tenant and equity partner of the NMTC partnership for the commercial air rights parcel.
4.4.3. Operating Pro Forma. The HPP Campus Expansion will be separately financed using New Markets Tax Credits and thus commercial income will not be included in the residential project financing.
4.4.4. Tenant Improvement Build Out. All tenant improvements will be separately funded by HPP, which will also cover a pro rata share of building envelope costs.
4.4.5. Capital Campaign to fund buildout. HPP began the Pre-Planning Phase of its capital campaign in 2021, with pro-bono support from the nationally recognized firm, CCS Fundraising. The agency then hired Theresa Nelson \& Associates to help the team design and execute the campaign's Planning Phase, which involved considerable policy planning, project development and leadership engagement.

HPP is currently conducting the campaign's Quiet Phase and is actively soliciting Board support and leadership gifts. The Quiet Phase is slated to be the longest and most involved phase, as HPP seeks to secure $\sim 75 \%$ of the goal before launching the Public Phase of the campaign, which promotes the project externally.

The Sponsor partners have agreed that HPP should have at least \$16M secured at groundbreaking, including secured pledges and bank financing. HPP currently has $\$ 5.5 \mathrm{M}$ in cash/pledges toward this total. While the agency is ramping up its capital campaign major donor strategy as part of the Quiet Phase, HPP does not anticipate having secured all funding by the anticipated start of construction if the Project receives State funding in the 2023 round. HPP is in conversation with its Board and financial institutions to be able to secure a capital campaign bridge loan if needed.
4.4.6. New Market's Tax Credits. HPP is working with Equity Community Builders (ECB) on securing New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) for the project. ECB/HPP are in conversation with various CDEs (Community Development Entities) that are interested in funding this project. The total anticipated NMTC equity of likely-awarded NMTCs would be $\sim \$ 4.6 \mathrm{M}$.

The CY2022 New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) Award is expected to be announced in Fall 2023. Several CDE's have included HPP in their applications and are very interested in funding the HPP commercial project should they receive allocation. Prospective CDE lenders include San Francisco Community Investment Fund (SFCIF), TELACU, Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC), Nonprofit Finance Fund (NFF), and Axion Opportunity Fund
(AOF). Prospective NMTC Investors include Capital One, JP Morgan Chase, PNC Bank, Wells Fargo and US Bank. We expect the project to require 2 CDE's for a total NMTC allocation of $\$ 20-25 \mathrm{M}$. The transaction will be ready to close Spring 2024, or the following year, depending on the overall Project schedule.

In the event that the Project does not move forward due to feasibility, HPP would repay MOHCD's acquisition loan within 5 years, and the loan will be secured by a deed of trust in first position.

### 4.4.7. Funding Overview

| FUNDING SOURCES | AMOUNT |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cash Received to Date | $\$ 5,183,500$ |
| Pledges Received | $\$ 407,000$ |
| Fundraising Remaining | $\$ 6,109,500$ |
| NMTC Equity | $\$ 4,600,000$ |
| TOTAL | $\$ 16,300,000^{*}$ |

* $\$ 16.3$ needed for groundbreaking; HPP will continue to fundraise toward the $\$ 20 \mathrm{M}$ total goal (which includes tenant improvements at the existing HPP hub on Potrero)
4.5. Service Space. Amenity and support spaces include a community room, kitchen, outdoor common space, common laundry, small on-floor lounges or studies, management offices, lobby, circulation, and supportive service spaces designed to serve the intended population. The ground-floor residential amenity space is intended for resident gathering, mail, stroller/bike storage, resident services, maintenance, and residential management.
4.6. Communications Wiring and Internet Access. The Project will comply with the MOHCD Communication Systems Design Standards, in conformance with the Fiber to Housing (FTH) program implemented by MOHCD and DTIS. Service to the building from Public Right of Way to a MPOE and to IDF is designed to adequately accommodate City fiber and cabling for City DTIS and multiple service providers. Owner, Property Manager and Services Provider(s) shall coordinate adoption of FTH services by residents to the greatest extent feasible to ensure residents receive high quality free internet service.

Temporary power service will be provided by PG\&E with permanent power service provided by SF PUC. A waiver has already been approved for the temporary power service.
4.7. $\quad$ Public Art Component. Public Art is required fand the development team is interested in introducing innovative and impactful artwork into the Project that will have a positive impact to the building's inhabitants, the Mission community and greater San Francisco. An important aspect of this process is the creation of a curatorial statement that will guide public art selection and potentially art within the property. The team is interested in exploring how art can advance the HPP Theory of Change and the project goal of ending the cycle of poverty for homeless families. The project team selected Denver based Nine Dot Arts as its consultant. The total public art budget is currently \$117,263.
4.8. Marketing, Occupancy, and Lease-Up. The $50 \%$ of the units funded with LOSP will be leased up through HSH's Coordinated Entry system. The remaining lottery units will be leased through the City's DALHLIA process with anticipated additional limitations on preferences due to HCD funds in the transaction. Mercy's final marketing plan should address specifically any challenges that may arise from the 70\% AMI units and large number of 1-bedroom units. Per Section 4.9 below, the Sponsor proposes that two of the $70 \%$ AMI units be Family Childcare Units operated as a pilot, benefiting from the higher income restriction.

Anticipated preferences in the DAHLIA units include

1) Certificate of Preference
2) Displaced Tenant Housing Preference Program for up to 20\% of lottery units
3) Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference assumed at 25\% given assumed HCD funding
4) Live or Work in San Francisco
4.9. Proposed Family Childcare (FCC) Units. The Sponsor proposes two family childcare units at the Project in the $70 \% \mathrm{AMI}$ units through a new partnership with Faces SF (Family and Childhood Empowerment Services), as a pilot initiative. For over 10 years, Faces SF has provided childcare, family, and workforce services, primarily in the Bayview/Hunter's Point, Excelsior, Portola, and Visitacion Valley communities. It operates four centers, but its network of 37 FCC units is spread across the City. The organization provides training and technical assistance to providers, and ensures high quality FCC environments that are compliant with health and safety codes by conducting team visits to FFCs. The organization invests in its providers' success and encourages the adoption of FCC best practices by providing one-on-one coaching services and free training. Faces SF was created through the merging of two
organizations with a long history of providing child and family services: Florence Critenton Services (est. 1882) and the Whitney Young Child Development Center (est. 1953).

Recognizing the challenges of leasing FCC units to qualified, licensed and income eligible households in affordable housing, the Sponsor proposal for the pilot is that Faces SF would select providers and refer them to a separate FCC lottery. Faces would provide technical assistance to the operators and ensure high quality services, as well as subsidies for the childcare slots. Families living at the Project would be prioritized, with a focus on $0-2$ years olds, where demand far exceeds the supply of licensed childcare providers. The goal of the pilot is to provide access to affordable, high quality childcare for families, increasing female labor force participation and driving economic growth and financial stability for families. MOHCD staff are reviewing the proposal with the MOHCD Marketing \& Lottery Manager on the merits and feasibility of this proposal.
4.10. Project Feasibility. The Sponsor is exploring multiple options to increase feasibility of the Project given the challenges of lack of economies of scale at 74 units, state financing competitiveness and operating cashflow. In the event that the Project is not selected for funding under the current HCD SuperNOFA application or continues to have a gap above and beyond the MOHCD preliminary gap commitment, the strategies include the following:

- The project submitted a 2023 SuperNOFA application for $\$ 34,369,117$. To fill any remaining financing gaps, the Sponsor is contemplating an application to the National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) upon NOFA release assumed for this summer. The Sponsor has another application pending with the Community Care Expansion program through the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) for \$13M and has not received a response.
- If the project is unable to secure funding through the 2023 SuperNOFA, the Sponsor is evaluating how to designate the residential parcel as HCD recognized surplus land, increase the unit count through varied methods and improve access to set aside categories within the NOFA.
- Alternatively, the Sponsor proposes that AHSC could provide an alternative path to feasibility due to the project's proximity to transit and high density of family units, and will provide the analysis to MOHCD.


## 5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consultant Type | Name | SBE/LBE | Outstanding Procurement Issues |
| Architect | Mithun | N | N |
| Landscape Architect | Mithun | N | N |
| General Contractor | Guzman-Suffolk JV LLC | Y | N |
| Owner's Rep/Construction Manager | Waypoint | Y | N |
| Financial Consultant | California Housing Partnership Corporation | N | N |
| Permit Expediter | Dale Durrett | N | N |
| EBM | Sitco | N | N |
| Special Inspections | CEL | N | N |
| PV | Cal Solar | N | N |
| Public Art | Nine dot Arts | Y | N |
| IT/Low Voltage | Salter | Y | N |
| Joint Trench | UDCE | Y | N |
| Legal | Gubb \& Barshay LLP | N | N |
| Property Manager | Mercy Housing Management Group | N | N |
| Services Provider | Homeless Prenatal Program | N | N |

5.1. Procurement Plan. Mercy met with Contracts Monitoring Division (CMD) to establish goals for the project, which were set at $20 \%$.
5.2. Opportunities for BIPOC-Led Organizations. HPP's vision for the project and key role in the development reflects Project impact and leadership by a BIPOC majority Board. HPP has a strong tradition of hiring and promoting from their clients whom are majority BIPOC resulting in the majority of their staff being BIPOC and clients.

To increase contracting with BIPOC-led firms, the Sponsor is doing the following:

- Partnering with the San Francisco National Organization of Minority Architects to identify opportunities for participation in projects, in this case for architect subcontracts.
-Creating a BIPOC-led or -owned professional firms list for distributing contracting opportunities (building on efforts from The Kelsey Civic Center project)
-Including meaningful scoring in RFQ and RFP procurements for professional services (i.e. Owner's Rep, Architect and Engineers, and General Contractor) for firms with racial and gender equity-centered initiatives in regards to advancement within the organization, hiring and
subcontracting.

6. FINANCING PLAN (See Attachment F for Cost Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments; See Attachment G and H for Sources and Uses)
6.1. Prior MOHCD/OCII Funding. There is no existing MOHCD Ioan.
6.2. Disbursement Status. The project has incurred costs dating back to December 1, 2019, with predevelopment costs funded by SF HAF. The Sponsor requests Loan Committee approval of payment of costs no earlier than December 1, 2019 so long as these costs are deemed acceptable and correspond to gap budget attached herein.
6.3. Fulfillment of Loan Conditions. Below is the status of Loan Conditions since this project was at Loan Committee for the preliminary gap request on June 24, 2022:
7. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with detailed monthly updates via the MOHCD Monthly Project Update, including on: Community outreach completed, Outcomes achieved related to racial equity goals, and Commercial-use programming.

Status: Ongoing and MOHCD Monthly Project Update reporting is in need of improvement
2. Sponsor must provide operating and development budgets that meet MOHCD Underwriting Guidelines and MOHCD Commercial Space Underwriting Guidelines.

Status: Completed for this request; the operating budget does no cashflow for 15 years without more rental subsidy, and is a work in progress; the Commercial Space Policy does not apply as the HPP Campus Expansion is not being financed with residential sources including the MOHCD loan.
3. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with a services plan and proposed staffing levels approved by HSH that meet MOHCD underwriting standards prior to gap loan approval. Any changes to the current proposed staffing will need to be presented to MOHCD at least 90 days prior to gap loan approval.
Status: Completed. Updated draft services plan was submitted to HSH and MOHCD in April 2023 and has incorporated HSH and MOHCD comments.
4. Sponsor must work with MOHCD staff and project's General Contractor to Value Engineer construction budget.
Status: In progress with MOHCD CR participation.
5. Sponsor must work with MOHCD staff to revise unit mix so that the project will include a higher number of units serving households at $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI.

## Status: In progress.

6. Sponsor must provide signed LOI from commercial tenant prior to MOHCD's gap loan closing. Status:
Status: Not applicable, as the HPP Campus Expansion is no longer contemplated to be structured as a commercial tenant of the residential; however, the development agreement between Mercy and the Homeless

Prenatal Program is being developed and will be shared, as well as a Reciprocal Easement Agreement.
7. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with information outlining cost containment, efficiencies and innovation strategies to reduce overall project costs and maximize efficiency of MOHCD gap loans.

## Status: In progress.

8. Sponsor must provide the Reciprocal Easement Agreement between the commercial and residential parcels to MOHCD no less than 90 days prior to Loan Committee date for gap loan.

## Status: In progress.

9. Sponsor to work with MOHCD and HSH to establish the LOSP budget and income restrictions for the referrals from Coordinated Entry.

## Status: In progress.

10. Sponsor must: a) provide for MOHCD review of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for equity investors and lenders before it is finalized and distributed; b) provide for MOHCD review of all raw financial data from developer or financial consultant prior to selection; c) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all selected investors and lenders; and, d) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all Letters of Intent from financial partners.

Status: Will be submitted at the appropriate time.
11. Sponsor must provide initial draft marketing plan within 12 months of anticipated TCO, outlining the affirmative steps they will take to market the project to the City's preference program participants, including COP Holders, Displaced Tenants, and Neighborhood Residents, as well as how the marketing is consistent with the Mayor's Racial Equity statement and promotion of positive outcomes for African American San Franciscans.

Status: Will be submitted at the appropriate time.
12. Sponsor must provide quarterly updated response to any letters requesting corrective action.

Status: Will be provided if letter requesting corrective action is received.
13. Sponsor must submit an updated $1^{\text {st }}$ year operating budget and 20-year cash flow - if any changes have occurred - by November $1^{\text {st }}$ before the year the project will achieve TCO so that MOHCD may request the LOSP subsidy.

Status: Will be submitted at the appropriate time.
14. Sponsor must apply for any other higher value rent and operating subsidies available including Continuum of Care contracts or Project Based Vouchers.

Status: Will be submitted at the appropriate time.
15. Sponsor to provide self-scores for all third party funding requests.

## Status: Ongoing.

16. Sponsor to work with MOHCD to find a land ownership and ground lease structure that complies with MOHCD policies. Land purchase will be contingent on MOHCD reviewing the appraisal and Purchase and Sale Agreement (PSA).

## Status: Complete.

### 6.4. Proposed Predevelopment Financing

### 6.4.1. Predevelopment Sources Evaluation Narrative. Predevelopment costs

 have been funded to date by the SFHAF loan that is being requested to be taken out, as well as $\$ 2.5 \mathrm{M}$ in additional MOHCD predevelopment financing that make up this request. MHC extended a Line of Credit (LOC) in amount of $\$ 250 \mathrm{~K}$ during the initial years of the Project, and were reimbursed at the SFHAF loan closing.| Predevelopment Budget |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? (Y/N) | Notes |
| Acquisition Cost is based on appraisal | Y | The entire site was acquired by HPP for $\$ 7 \mathrm{M}$ supported by an appraisal. <br> This request includes takeout of the FRB acquisition loan in the amount of $\$ 4.9$ million excluding interest; the loan terms are $3.25 \%$ fixed rate with loan term ending June 2023 with an extension until end of September 2023; interest paid on the loan will be included in project costs at construction loan closing. |
| Holding costs are reasonable | N/A | Holding costs are not included in the predevelopment budget and are currently covered by HPP, for reimbursement at construction loan closing for the residential housing portion; MOHCD will review and need to approve holding costs to be included as part of the acquisition cost, which is a proposed loan condition |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees are within standards | Y | Architect design fees are budgeted at $\$ 2.3$ million in predev which includes third party design consultants and $\$ 34 \mathrm{~K}$ for potential redesign to look at the option of increasing unit density. |
| Consultant and legal fees are reasonable | Y | Consultant and legal fees are reasonable |
| Entitlement fees are accurately estimated | Y | Entitlement fees reflect actual costs to get through zoning change and SB35 approval |
| Construction Management Fees are within standards | Y | Construction management fees are reasonable at $\$ 160 \mathrm{~K}$, reflecting 3.5 years of predevelopment work and assisting with the allocation of design and cost between the two projects |
| Developer Fee is within standards | Y | Requested developer fee is within UG standards at $\$ 550 \mathrm{~K}$, one half of Project Management Fee prior to construction loan closing |


| Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ per <br> standards | Y | Soft Cost Contingency is currently $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

### 6.4.2. Predevelopment Uses Evaluation:

6.4.2.1. Acquisition - First Republic Bank Acquisition Loan Takeout : $\$ 4.9$ million is proposed to take out the acquisition provided by First Republic Bank (FRB) to $253018^{\text {th }}$ Street, LP, an affiliate of HPP, dated June 25, 2020. The loan term expired on June 25, 2023 and was extended until September 25, 2023. While the loan has a low fixed interest rate of $3.25 \%$, negotiating a new term with the FRB takeover bank would have a far higher interest rate, which would increase the cost of the residential and HPP projects, as well as the future MOHCD gap for the residential project. The MOHCD Deed of Trust will be recorded in first position on the parcel and will be due and payable at the earlier of 5 years, or at transfer of the air rights parcel to the City to ground lease to the residential limited partnership.

CommonSpirit Health Operating Investment Pool, LLC provided a second loan to $253018^{\text {th }}$ LLC, managed by HPP, in the amount of $\$ 2$ million dated January 13, 2022, at $2 \%$ interest, to take out the original seller carryback financing. The loan term is five years, and HPP will keep these low cost funds in their HPP development project and it is not included in the request.
6.4.2.2. SF HAF Predev Loan Takeout: $\$ 2,435,211$ of the proposed MOHCD predevelopment loan is proposed for takeout of the SF HAF Predev Loan to the residential limited partnership, which funded architecture and engineering, legal, entitlements and financial consultants. This predevelopment loan has a fixed interest rate of $3.25 \%$; taking it out now with committed MOHCD funds will provide cost savings to the project by reducing interest carry. MHC will provide backup documentation demonstrating the eligibility of predevelopment costs for the MOHCD takeout loan prior to loan closing.
6.4.2.3. Other predevelopment costs to be funded by the MOHCD Ioan total $\$ 2,511,689$, and are lean and reasonable. These funds include standard architecture, engineering and environmental studies, legal and financing application costs.
6.5. Proposed Permanent Financing. The perm budget included is preliminary as the Sponsor is exploring options to increase feasibility given the challenges of economies of scale at 74 units, state financing competitiveness and operating cashflow (see Section 4.10, Project Feasibility).
6.5.1. Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative: The Borrower proposes to use the following sources to permanently finance the project.

- 4\% Tax Credit Equity (\$36,11,097): Investor TBD, Sponsor assumes $\$ 0.93$ per federal LIHTC and $\$ 0.85$ per State LIHTC. Considering the market and more recent projects in MOHCD pipeline that have closed, this equity amount appears conservative. Any increases in equity would assist in reducing the overall gap. See Section 9.2, Loan Conditions.
- MHP Loan (\$28,320,125): The sponsor applied for HCD MHP and IIG in 2023, and upon receiving an award, would apply for the next round of CDLAC / Tax Credit financing. The MHP loan terms are 55 years, $3 \%$ simple interest with a $0.42 \%$ mandatory payment, residual receipts, $\$ 500$ PUPA replacement reserve requirement, minimum of 6 months of operating reserves.

This Project does not meet the MHP scoring priorities of high resource area or surplus land. The Sponsor's Scoring Analysis for the 2023 application is a score of 105 out of 113 maximum points, and a tie breaker score of $153.72 \%$, which is not highly competitive. As outlined in Section 4.9 Project Feasibility, the Sponsor is exploring options to increase the Project's competitiveness for MHP, including making the air rights parcel surplus land and increasing density.

| Scoring Summary - MHP Round 2023 | Project <br> Points | Max <br> Points |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Affordability \| 30 points | 30 | 30 |
| State Policy Priorities \| 18 points | 10 | 18 |
| Sponsor Experience/ Applicant and Property Management experience \| 20 points | 20 | 20 |
| Project Readiness \| 20 points; negative 5 points | 20 | 20 |
| Financing Commitments (10 pt max) | 10 | 10 |
| Local \& Environmental Approvals (7 pt max) | 0 | 2 |
| Organizational Documents (3 pt max) | 3 | 3 |
| TCAC Hybrid Projects (-5 pts max) | 0 | 0 |
| Adaptive Reuse / Infill / Proximity to Amenities / Sust Bldng Methods \| 21 points | 20 | 20 |
| Infill Development \& Net Density(5 pt max) | 5 | 5 |
| Proximity to Amenities (6 pt max) | 5 | 5 |
| Broadband Access (5 pt max) | 5 | 5 |
| Sustainable Building Methods (5 pt max) | 5 | 5 |
| Cost Containment \| 5 points |  | 5 |
| TOTAL POINTS (85 minimum score required) | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ |

- IIG Sponsor Loan ( $\$ 6,048,992$ ): 55 years, $3 \%$ simple interest, deferred payment, $\$ 500$ PUPA replacement reserve requirement, minimum of 6 months of operating reserves; IIG will not be funded if MHP is not awarded.
- MOHCD/HSH Loan (\$16,000,000): 55 years, $3 \%$ simple interest, residual receipts, and committed under the Preliminary Gap Request in 2022.
- AHP ( $\$ 1,000,000$ ): Bank TBD, 15 years, $0 \%$ simple interest, disbursement into project in 2024
- Mercy expects to make a future request for a bridge loan from MOHCD for the AHP at the final gap request since the project will not score maximum points until permanent conversion.
- Deferred Developer Fee ( $\$ 1,000,000$ ): deferred developer in the amount of $\$ 1,000,000$ to be paid over 15 years if there is cashflow.
- Construction Loan ( $\$ 41,991,000$ ): While not a permanent source, the construction loan terms are lender TBD, 33 month term, projected all in rate with cushion $6.91 \%$. It would be funded through proceeds from a bond allocation.
- Other potential funding: As outlined in Section 4.9 Project Feasibility, MHC and HHP are pursuing other financing sources to increase the feasibility of both projects. The Sponsor applied for $\$ 13$ million in "Community Care Expansion Program" (CCE), a new state funding grant for construction of facilities / housing to address homelessness, in Spring 2023, and an award would be divided between the two projects.


### 6.5.2 CDLAC Tax-Exempt Bond Application:

The Project's basis boost from their previous DDA / QCT placeholder application with CMFA is expiring at the end of 2023, and CMFA has indicated that it is not possible to extend it. Nonetheless, if the Sponsor secures an MHP award, they would be somewhat competitive for a CDLAC allocation, although less competitive with the current inclusion of State tax credits. They would not apply until they have received an MHP award.

| CDLAC Self-Score |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Opportunity Map <br> Resource Level | TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map: Moderate |
| TCAC Housing Type <br> (new construction <br> only) | TCAC regs: Large Family |


| Bond Allocation <br> Request Amount | $\$ 40,725,663$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Self-Score (out <br> of 120 points) | 119 |
| Tiebreaker Score | 10.29 |

### 6.5.3 Residential Uses Evaluation:

|  | Development Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Meets } \\ \text { Standard? } \\ \text { (Y/N) }\end{array}$ | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit is within |  |  |
| standards |  |  |\(\left.\quad \begin{array}{c}\$791K /unit which is high compared to <br>

similar projects; this is due to size and <br>
site conditions, and the hard cost is 7\% <br>
higher per square foot than comparable <br>
projects (see\end{array}\right]\)
6.5.4 Developer Fee Evaluation: The milestones for the payment of the developer fee to the sponsor are specified below:

| Total Developer Fee: | $\$ 2,200,000$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Project Management Fee Paid to Date: | $\$ 494,000$ |  |
| Amount of Remaining Project <br> Management Fee: | $\$ 606,000$ |  |
| Amount of Fee at Risk (the "At Risk Fee"): | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that <br> portion of Developer Fee remaining and <br> payable for Project Management | Amount Paid at <br> Milestone | Percentage <br> Project Management <br> Fee |
| Acquisition/Predev |  |  |
| Predevelopment closing <br> Submission of HCD funding <br> application | $\$ 494,000$ (paid) |  |
| Submission of Joint CDLAC/TCAC <br> app post award of MHP | $\$ 100,000$ | $45 \%$ |
| Construction close | $\$ 225,000$ | $10 \%$ |
| Construction Completion | $\$ 225,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Project close-out | $\$ 56,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that <br> portion of Developer Fee defined as At <br> Risk Fee |  | 5 |
| 100\% lease up and draft cost <br> certification | $\$ 220,000$ | Percentage At Risk Fee |
| Permanent conversion | $\$ 550,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Project close-out | $\$ 330,000$ | $50 \%$ |

7. PROJECT OPERATIONS (See Attachment I and J for Operating Budget and Proforma)
7.1. Annual Operating Budget. The Project is currently estimating operating expenses of $\$ 1.2$ million, around $\$ 16.2 \mathrm{~K}$ PUPA, not including ground lease and minimum HCD debt payments. The Sponsor indicates that more revenue is needed to properly operate the property, and under the current budget, the Project cashflow goes negative in Year 5 and is not currently feasible. The Sponsor would like to discuss cost allocations with MOHCD in Fall 2023 to demonstrate the higher burden that PSH units place on operating budgets based on MHC comparable projects. The relatively small project with half PSH units, and 24 hour desk clerk coverage will result in higher than average operating costs. CoC for a portion or all of the PSH units, or SFHA project-based vouchers on non-PSH units, could help address this gap.

- The Project is requesting 37 LOSP subsidies
- LOSP subsidy is projected at $\$ 574 \mathrm{~K}$, or $\$ 7,800$ PUPA
- The preliminary operating budget assumes a per unit pro rata split for all operating costs except for:
- Security/Front Desk Coverage costs $75 \%$ to LOSP. This will need to be reviewed with MOHCD staff prior to approval.
- Staffing is assumed at 1 Senior Property Manager, . 5 Assistant Property Manager, . 33 Housing Support Specialist, 4.5 FTE Desk Clerk coverage for 24 hour presence, and 2 FTE janitor and maintenance staff.
- Insurance budgeted at \$155,000 and is reasonable
- Supportive services for the non-LOSP units is budgeted at $\$ 33,500$ ( 0.4 FTE) and is well within standards seen at other projects.
- Reserves
- Replacement reserves are set at $\$ 500$ per unit in line with HCD's requirement for MHP


### 7.2. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation.

| Operating Proforma |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Guidelines Standard | Meets Standard? (Y/N) <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio is minimum 1.1:1 in Year 1 and stays above 1:1 through Year 17 | N/A | No perm debt, but project goes negative in year 5 . |
| Vacancy rate meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy rate is $5 \%$ for all units, which is compliant with TCAC. |
| Annual Income Growth is increased at $2.5 \%$ per year or $1 \%$ for LOSP tenant rents | Y | Income escalation factor is $2.5 \%$ for non LOSP, $1 \%$ growth shown for LOSP units |
| Annual Operating Expenses are increased at 3.5\% per year | Y | Expenses escalation factor is 3.5\% |
| Base year operating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | Y | Total Operating Expenses are proposed at $\$ 15,500$ PUPA before reserves for project operating feasibility; however, the sponsor believes that accurate operating costs would be higher, that more project income is needed, and that LOSP needs to pay for a higher percentage of operating cost. Even this reduced operating budget goes negative in Year 5. <br> MOHCD's family PSH portfolio between 50 - 100 units with $30 \%$ - $70 \%$ homeless set-aside, new construction projects, built between 2003 - 2023, indicate an average per unit cost of $\$ 17,000$, escalated to 2023 (1036 Mission, Broadway Sansome, 1100 Ocean are excellent family project comps). However, the $3.5 \%$ cost escalation from 2020 will not capture big |


|  |  | jumps in operating cost that affordable projects have encountered over the last several years such as insurance and minimum wage compensation increases. <br> MOHCD and MHC will meet to review MHC's analysis for PSH unit costs, and this is addressed as a proposed loan condition. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is \$55,188 or \$63 PUPM |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | Proposed staffing: <br> 1 FTE Senior Property Manager (PM) <br> . 5 FTE Assistant PM <br> 0.33 FTE Housing Support Specialist <br> 4.5 FTE Desk Clerk/ Community Coordinator (24 hour coverage) <br> 1 FTE Maintenance Manager <br> 1 FTE Janitor |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Annual AM Fee is $\$ 24,270 / \mathrm{yr}$, and increases annually by $3.5 \%$. Annual PM Fee is $\$ 24,280 / \mathrm{yr}$ |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or exceed TCAC minimum standards | Y | Replacement Reserves are $\$ 500$ per unit per year as required by State MHP funding |
| Limited Partnership Asset Management Fee meets standards | Y | \$5,000 and does not escalate over time per Underwriting Guidelines |

### 7.3. Target population and Income Restrictions for All Sources. The Project is

 proposed at 74 units, with half of the units (37) as permanent supportive housing units for families. The remaining 37 DAHLIA units have income restrictions at 50\%-70\% MOHCD AMI. The Sponsor proposes that two of the 70\% AMI units serve as family childcare units, utilizing a new partnership with Faces SF.The table below summarizes the affordability restrictions from all funders, including those proposed to HCD in the recent MHP/IIG applications, and will be used at the time of marketing to determine the most restrictive income and rent levels.

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { UNIT SIZE }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| NON-LOTTERY | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}No. of <br>

Units\end{array}\right\}\)

| 3 BR - LOSP | 3 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sub-Total | 37 |  |  |  |
| LOTTERY |  |  |  |  |
| 1 BR | 10 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| 1 BR | 8 | 60\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | 18 |  |  |  |
| 2 BR | 6 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| 2 BR | 7 | 60\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI |
| 2 BR | 2 | 70\% MOHCD AMI | 80\% TCAC AMI | 80\% TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | 15 |  |  |  |
| 3 BR | 1 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| 3 BR | 2 | 70\% MOHCD AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | 3 |  |  |  |
| STAFF UNITS |  |  |  |  |
| 2 BR | 1 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 74 |  |  |  |

7.4. MOHCD Restrictions.

| Unit <br> Size | No. of <br> Units | Maximum Income <br> Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 B R$ | 28 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |
| $2 B R$ | 22 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |
| 3BR | 4 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |
| $1 B R$ | 8 | $60 \%$ of Median Income |
| $2 B R$ | 7 | $60 \%$ of Median Income |
| $2 B R$ | 2 | $70 \%$ of Median Income |
| 3BR | 2 | $70 \%$ of Median Income |
| $2 B R$ | 1 | Manager's Unit |

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

### 8.1. Services Plan.

This project seeks to assist families in maintaining independence, stability and functioning within a safe and affordable housing community, resulting in improved health and well-being while establishing and maintaining long-term housing. HPP will provide services for the 37 formerly homeless households
and MHC will provide services to the entire property, or 74 households. Both agencies will work together to provide client-centered services steeped in the Strengthening Factors Framework (parental resilience, social connections, knowledge of parenting and child development, concrete support in times of need, social and emotional competence of children).

HPP's main outcome for the project is that families will stabilize. HPP understands that families face unique challenges, and will join this housing community at different places along the spectrum of healing from the trauma of homelessness and/or any additional underlying stress and need. Using PSH best practices, such as harm reduction, de-escalation, and trauma-informed practices, the team will support residents throughout their tenancy. Larger building programming will be designed with residents and with consideration of the needs of the tenant population as a whole. Additional services will be individualized to meet specific family needs. Stabilization of households in an environment conducive to their success is core to this model.

HPP and MHC are proposing the following on-site support services staff to support the households referred from Coordinated Entry (funded by HSH) and the lottery units referred from the DAHLIA program (funded by building operations):

- Coordination with Property Management
- Housing Retention Services
- Service Coordination
- Social Engagement and Youth Programming

With HPP and MHC support, families will have comprehensive support. HPP will offer a layered program that provides continuity of care including individualized intensive case management; outreach and engagement; intake and assessment; benefits advocacy and assistance; referrals and coordination of services; wellness checks; support groups and social events; housing stability support; clinical services; and exit planning. Holistic services will be conducted collaboratively to integrate services/treatment, including with tenants' off-site case managers/care team. HPP will coordinate closely with MHC to ensure tenant stability. This project offers an innovative approach to family homelessness against HPP's track record for success: 95\% of families housed by HPP remain housed a year later.
8.2 Services Budget. The . 4 FTE Resident Services Coordinator (RSC) will be available to support the non-PSH households and will be funded from the
operating budget, which includes $\$ 43,500$ for RSC staffing in Year 1. This conforms to MOHCD's Underwriting Guidelines.

For the PSH units, the 2 FTE Case Management will be funded through a separate services contract between the Sponsor and HSH. The Project will receive HSH's Tier 5 annual services funding level, which is $\$ 12,900 /$ unit or $\$ 477 \mathrm{~K}$ total. The total supportive services budget including PSH and non-PSH units totals $\$ 531 \mathrm{~K}$ in Year 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL <br> HSH | TOTAL <br> Op Budg | TOTAL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Staffing | Manager | Dir of Hsg | Clinical <br> Sup. | CM | CM <br> (MSW) |  | RSCII |  |

8.3 HSH Assessment of Service Plan and Budget. $253018^{\text {th }}$ Street is a new construction affordable housing project with 74 units, expected to break ground in 2024. 37 of the units will be designated as Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
units which are set aside for families experiencing homelessness. Referrals into these units will be provided via the City and County of San Francisco's Coordinated Entry system. The project will be subsidized for ongoing operations and supportive services by the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP).
Through the MOHCD procurement process, Homeless Prenatal Program (HPP) was selected to be the Supportive Services provider, and Mercy Housing was selected to be the Property Management provider and to provide Resident Services coordination. HPP's services will be dedicated to serve the 37 households who will reside in the PSH units. The HSH will manage the contract and budget for these services to be provided.

HPP submitted a robust Supportive Services Plan that outlines the plan for coordination with Property Management and the Resident Services teams, to assist families in successfully adjusting to permanent housing, and help them to maintain housing for the long-term. The plan speaks to community building strategies and ongoing planning and coordination at the site level to ensure the needs of individual residents are balanced with the safety and security of the property. The plan also speaks to HPP's partnerships with community agencies to be able to bring services into the building to address food security, educational goals, mental health and financial goals, among other things. HPP also seeks to address the personal challenges and goals of individual families by conducting assessments prior to move-in, and conducting ongoing assessments and creating individualized service plans.

## 9 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

### 9.1 Proposed Loan/Grant Terms

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | $\$ 4,900,000$ acquisition take out loan |
| Borrower: | $\mathbf{2 5 3 0} \mathbf{1 8}^{\text {th, }}$ LLC |
| Loan Term: | 5 years |
| Loan Maturity Date: | Earlier of construction loan closing and transfer <br> or residential air rights parcel to City or <br> September 30, 2028 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Deferred |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $0 \%$ |
| Date Loan Committee approves prior expenses <br> can be paid: | $12 / 1 / 2019$ |


| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | $\$ 4,946,900$ Predevelopment Loan |
| Borrower: | Mercy Housing California 104, L.P. |


| Loan Term: | 5 years (to be wrapped into perm 55 year loan at <br> construction loan closing) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2078 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Residual Receipts |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $3 \%$ |
| Date Loan Committee approves prior <br> expenses can be paid: | $12 / 1 / 2019$ |

### 9.2. Recommended Loan Conditions

## Continuance of previous loan conditions that are in progress:

1. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with detailed monthly updates via the MOHCD Monthly Project Update, including on: Community outreach completed, Outcomes achieved related to racial equity goals, and Commercial-use programming.
2. Sponsor must provide operating and development budgets that meet MOHCD Underwriting Guidelines and MOHCD Commercial Space Underwriting Guidelines.
3. Sponsor must work with MOHCD staff and project's General Contractor to Value Engineer construction budget.
4. Sponsor must work with MOHCD staff to revise unit mix and affordability restrictions so that the project will include a higher number of units serving households at 50\% MOHCD AMI.
5. Sponsor must provide signed LOI from commercial tenant prior to MOHCD's gap loan closing.
6. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with information outlining cost containment, efficiencies and innovation strategies to reduce overall project costs and maximize efficiency of MOHCD gap loans.
7. Sponsor must provide the Reciprocal Easement Agreement between the HPP Campus Expansion and residential parcels to MOHCD no less than 90 days prior to Loan Committee date for gap loan.
8. Sponsor to work with MOHCD and HSH to establish the LOSP budget and income restrictions for the referrals from Coordinated Entry.
9. Sponsor must: a) provide for MOHCD review of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for equity investors and lenders before it is finalized and distributed; b) provide for MOHCD review of all raw financial data from developer or financial consultant prior to selection; c) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all selected
investors and lenders; and, d) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all Letters of Intent from financial partners.
10. Sponsor must provide initial draft marketing plan within 12 months of anticipated TCO, outlining the affirmative steps they will take to market the project to the City's preference program participants, including COP Holders, Displaced Tenants, and Neighborhood Residents, as well as how the marketing is consistent with the Mayor's Racial Equity statement and promotion of positive outcomes for African American San Franciscans. Increased local staff participation in the lease up will be required.
11. Sponsor must provide quarterly updated response to any letters requesting corrective action.
12. Sponsor must submit an updated $1^{\text {st }}$ year operating budget and 20-year cash flow - if any changes have occurred - by November $1^{\text {st }}$ before the year the project will achieve TCO so that MOHCD may request the LOSP subsidy.
13. Sponsor must apply for any other higher value rent and operating subsidies available including Continuum of Care contracts or Project Based Vouchers.
14. Sponsor to provide self-scores for all third party funding requests.

## New Conditions:

1.Increase equity pay in assumptions to $\$ 0.98$ for updated financial projections, pending discussions with financial advisor on current tax credit investment climate
2. MHC will provide updated operating budget and proposed LOSP Cost Split by November 1, 2023, to review with MOHCD and HSH.

## HPP Loan Conditions:

1.MOHCD Holding costs are not included in the predevelopment budget and are currently covered by HPP, for reimbursement at construction loan closing for the residential housing portion; MOHCD will review and need to approve them to be included as part of the acquisition cost
2. HPP to provide quarterly fundraising updates on the HPP Campus Expansion
3. In the event that the Project does not move forward within five years, HPP will repay MOHCD's acquisition loan within five years of recording the MOHCD Deed of Trust

## - LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Approval indicates approval with modifications, when so determined by the Committee.
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Eric D. Shaw, Director
Mayor's Office of Housing
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

## Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

## Anna Van Degna, Director

Controller's Office of Public Finance
Date: $\qquad$

Attachments: A. Project Milestones/Schedule<br>B. Borrower Org Chart<br>C. Developer Resumes<br>D. Asset Management Analysis of Sponsor<br>E. Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria<br>F. Site Map with amenities<br>G. Elevations and Floor Plans, if available<br>H. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments<br>I. Predevelopment Budget - N/A<br>J. Development Budget<br>K. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget<br>L. 20-year Operating Pro Forma

# RE: 2530 18th St ACQUISITION TAKE OUT AND PREDEVELOPMENT FINANCING 

Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Fri 8/25/2023 1:00 PM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
I approve

From: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2023 11:47 AM
To: Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) <Vanessa.Amaya@@sfgov.org>
Subject: ACQUISITION TAKE OUT AND PREDEVELOPMENT FINANCING
approve

Eric D. Shaw
Director/ Interim Director HopeSF
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor

## 2530 18th Street

## Menjivar, Salvador (HOM)

Fri 9/1/2023 3:18 PM
To:Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Cc:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
I conditionally approve Mercy Housing California (MHC) and Homeless Prenatal Program (HPP) request for acquisition and predevelopment take-out financing in support of 2530 18th Street, a new construction of 74 -unit of affordable housing development with $50 \%$ (37) of the units set aside for families who have experienced homelessness, in the total amount of $\$ 9,846,900$. The sponsors of the project have at times expressed that some of the PSH units will not be filled with referrals from the SF Coordinated Entry (CE) System. My approval of this loan is conditioned to the sponsors eventually agreeing that all PSH units will be filled with homeless families referred by CE.

Best,
salvador


Salvador Menjivar
Director of Housing
Pronouns: He/Him
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org | 415-308-2843
Learn: [dhsh.sfgov.org]hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

## 2530 18th Street Acquisition Take-Out and Predevelopment Loan Request Loan

## Colomello, Elizabeth (CII)

## Fri 8/25/2023 11:46 AM

To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
Cc:Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org);Kaslofsky, Thor (CII) [Thor.Kaslofsky@sfgov.org](mailto:Thor.Kaslofsky@sfgov.org)

## Hi Vanessa-

I approve the subject request on behalf of OCII.
Thanks-
Elizabeth

office of
and INFRASTRUCTUPE

Elizabeth Colomello
Housing Program Manager

- One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103
2 415.749-2488, Cell 415.407-1908
f www.sfocii.org

## 2530 18th Street

Van Degna, Anna (CON)
Fri 8/25/2023 11:46 AM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
Cc:Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Approved

Anna Van Degna (she/her/hers)
Director, Controller's Office of Public Finance
City \& County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 338
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5956
Email: anna.vandegna@sfgov.org

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

| No. | Performance Milestone | Estimated or Actual Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) | 6/16/2023 |  |
| 1 | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | 12/19/2019 | First Republic Bank provided initial land commitment to HPP |
| 2. | Site Acquisition | $\underline{12 / 19 / 2019}$ | Acquired by HPP |
| 3. | Development Team Selection |  |  |
| a. | Architect | 10/21/21 |  |
| b. | General Contractor | 10/21/21 |  |
| c. | Owner's Representative | 10/21/21 |  |
| d. | Property Manager | 10/21/21 |  |
| e. | Service Provider | 10/21/21 |  |
| 4. | Design |  |  |
| a. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Estimate | 4/11/22 |  |
| b. | Submittal of Design Development \& Cost Estimate | 8/8/22 |  |
| c. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | 12/16/22 |  |
| d. | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate } \\ (75 \%-80 \% \text { CDs }) \end{array}$ | 6/2/23 |  |
| 5. | Commercial Space |  |  |
| a. | Reciprocal Easement Agreement with commercial parcel Submission | 9/25/23 |  |
| b. | LOI/s Executed | n/a |  |
| 6. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | SB 35 Application Submission | 10/28/21 |  |
| b. | CEQA Environ Review Submission | n/a |  |
| c. | NEPA Environ Review Submission | n/a |  |
| d. | CUP/PUD/Variances Submission | n/a |  |
| 7. | PUC/PG\&E |  |  |


| a. | Temp Power Application Submission | 6/1/22 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b. | Perm Power Application Submission | 6/1/22 |  |
| 8. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | 10/28/21 |  |
| b. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | 4/10/23 |  |
| c. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | 9/25/23 |  |
| 9. | Request for Bids Issued | 6/5/23 |  |
| 10. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | 12/1/22 |  |
| b. | Final | 11/29/24 |  |
| 11. | Additional City Financing |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary Gap Financing Application | 12/1/22 |  |
| b. | Acquisition Take Out and Predev Financing Application <br> c. Gap Financing Request | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{8 / 25 / 23} \\ & \underline{2 / 1 / 24} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 12. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | HCD Application - MHP | 6/1/23 |  |
| b. | Construction Financing RFP | 5/3/24 |  |
| c. | AHP Application | 3/1/25 |  |
| d. | CDLAC Application | 5/2/24 |  |
| e. | TCAC Application | 5/2/24 |  |
| f. | Other Financing Application |  |  |
| g. | LOSP Funding Request | 11/29/24 |  |
| 13. | Closing |  |  |
| a. | Construction Loan Closing | 11/29/24 |  |
| b. | Conversion of Construction Loan to Permanent Financing | 7/16/27 |  |
| 14. | Construction |  |  |
| a. | Notice to Proceed | 12/1/24 |  |
| b. | Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Cert of Substantial Completion | 8/7/26 |  |
| 15. | Marketing/Rent-up |  |  |


| a. | Marketing Plan Submission | $\underline{11 / 29 / 25}$ |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| b. | Commence Marketing | $\underline{2 / 1 / 26}$ |  |
| c. | $95 \%$ Occupancy | $\underline{12 / 1 / 26}$ |  |
| 16. | Cost Certification/8609 | $10 / 30 / 27$ |  |
| 17. | Close Out MOH/OCII Loan(s) |  |  |

## Attachment B Borrower Org Chart:

## Residential Borrower Entity: Mercy Housing California 104, L.P.

Borrower Org Chart


## Attachment C: Development Staff Resumes

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mercy Housing California, San Francisco, California
Project Developer I, J uly 2020 to present

- Manage and perform all tasks related to the development of affordable housing associated with acquisition and new construction.
- Responsible for reviewing sites for potential housing developments, preliminary land use analysis to determine feasibility; secure local approvals and neighborhood acceptance; prepare financial analysis and secure project funding; oversee design and construction process and close out with the investors and lender.
- Projects include: $6007^{\text {th }}$ Street -221 units of affordable PSH and family housing; 2530 $18^{\text {th }}$ Street with Homeless Prenatal Program - 73 units of affordable family housing.

Beacon Development Group, San Francisco, California
Housing Developer, August 2016 to 2019

- Directly managed an affordable housing development portfolio worth over $\$ 150$ million in Northern California and concurrently supporting projects in Southern California and Washington State - the portfolio included urban infill construction, re-syndications, acquisition rehabs, new markets TC and 4\%non-competitive.
- Oversaw all aspects of project development, working closely with clients and project teams on site acquisition, predevelopment, entitlements, design, financing, construction, and project close out. Negotiated development, Ioan, and partnership agreements with public and private equity partners.

Nashville Civic Design Center, Nashville, Tennessee
Research Fellow, May 2014 to 2016

- Authored, "Creating Inclusive Communities," a publication describing 7 topic areas for Nashville to pursue that improve housing accessibility for low to moderate-income individuals. The report assembled statistical demographic changes, engaged with over 50 community stakeholders, and showcased national best practices.
- Advised and consulted with the Mayor's Office, government agencies and officials, community organizations and trade groups on tools to increase the city's affordable housing stock and improve non-profit capacity.
- In partnership with the Chamber of Commerce and the Urban Land Institute, proposing an innovation district in the city's midtown and began preliminary work for its creation.


## EDUCATION

BA, Urban Planning, Vanderbilt University, 2014

## CURRENT PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS \& COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board Board Member, Yimby Action: San Francisco Board Tree Planting Leader, Friends of the Urban Forest

## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

Mercy Housing California (MHC) will assume asset management duties for $253018^{\text {th }}$ Street. Asset Management falls under the National Portfolio Management department of Mercy Housing Inc, which is led by Senior Vice President Melissa Clayton.

Total Number of Projects and Average Number of Units Per Project Currently in Developer's Asset Management Portfolio
California represents the largest portion of the portfolio with 156 operating properties across the state; 55 Mercy owned and occupied properties are located in the City of San Francisco.

Developer's Current Asset Management Staffing Including Job Titles, Full Time Employees, an Organizational Chart and the Status of Each Position (filled/vacant)
Yelena Zilberfayn is the Vice President of Asset Management at Mercy Housing where she has worked for the past 22 years, 9 of which in the Asset Management Department, and is responsible for a portfolio of real estate assets serving families, seniors, and special needs individuals. She leads a team of five Asset Managers, four in San Francisco, one in Sacramento.

Two Asset Management Analysts and one Commercial Asset Management Analyst based in the National Office in Denver, CO, and one Commercial Asset Manager based in San Francisco are supporting Yelena's team. In addition, there are two Asset Managers overseeing other regions in CA and one Capital Project Investment Manager, reporting directly to Melissa Clayton.
Yelena is located in the San Francisco office and interfaces directly with Doug Shoemaker, President of Mercy Housing California (MHC), and Jennifer Dolin, Vice President of Operations of MHC. Yelena and her team act as Mercy Housing's representatives in relation to the physical and financial status of each asset and protect its financial health and long-term viability. Mercy's portfolio management also includes Transaction Team comprised of 2 staff devoted to other specialized needs such as the Year 15 buy out and the refinance of properties.
All positions are currently filled and they are all full time.
The breakdown of the Bay Area asset management staff positions is as follows:
(1) Vice President of Asset Management
(1) Director of Portfolio Analysis
(4) Asset Managers
(2) Asset Management Analysts
(1) Commercial Asset Management Analyst
(1) Commercial Asset Manager

Each Asset Manager oversees a portfolio of up to 25 assets. The 4 Asset Managers in the San Francisco office currently have 90 assets in their portfolio. Eight of these properties are in predevelopment, under construction or in rehab in the City of San Francisco or Bay Area. In San Francisco, Asset Managers manage fewer than the maximum of 25 assets in order to free up capacity for future developments. Once development is complete, a San Francisco based Asset Manager will assume asset management duties for $153018^{\text {th }}$ Street.

Asset Management staff has oversight over all operations of the properties. The portfolio is analyzed monthly through the Portfolio Scorecard, which looks at physical and economic occupancy, trade and intercompany payables. In addition, the team performs quarterly risk ratings according to Affordable Housing Investment Council (AHIC) standards, of every property to evaluate occupancy, reserves, management, capital needs and available reserves. If a property is placed on the watchlist, there is a quarterly meeting with the Asset Management team, Mercy Housing Management Group and Mercy Housing California President to find a solution to get the property off the watchlist.

Asset Managers are responsible for tracking all capital needs on their portfolio on a quarterly basis as part of Mercy's watchlist process. They are assisted by various staff of Mercy Housing Management Group, including the Regional Facilities Manager and the various Area Directors of Operations assigned to the properties. Using various analysis including our watchlist and budget planning, reviewing CNAs, and Reserve analysis, the Asset Managers determine when the necessary capital needs can be completed in the short and long term.

The analyst team submits reserve replacement requests bi-annually. In addition, the analyst team helps with the compliance with financing requirements and various reporting regulatory requirements by sending quarterly and annual reporting to investors and funders. Portfolio preservation planning is accomplished through balancing the use of reserves with the payment of scheduled partnership and deferred development fees through cash flow. The transaction team handles some of the longer term needs of the portfolio such as Year 15 analysis and investor buyout and a property restructuring such as a refinance.

Description of Developer's Coordination Between Asset Management and Other Functional Teams, Including Property Management, Accounting, Compliance, Facilities Management, etc. There is constant coordination between Property Management, related departments and Asset Management. Asset management oversees all aspects of operations so there is ongoing coordination with property management on a daily basis in regards to those issues. Asset and Property Management work together on the annual audits and budgets. In addition, there is constant coordination around cash management and the financial oversight of the property. There is also contact around preparation of the financials. Asset Management and Compliance primarily coordinate around compliance issues that directly affect ownership and the partnership. Asset management and facilities coordinate around preparation the budget and capital projects. The Asset Management staff also coordinates around emergencies.

Developer's Budget for Asset Management Team Shown as Cost Center (nationwide) Asset Management staffing budget is $\$ 2,460,839$.

Number of Projects Expected to be in Developer's Asset Management Portfolio in 5 Years and, If Applicable, Plans to Augment Staffing to Manage Growing Portfolio
Mercy Housing anticipates that the portfolio will grow from 156 buildings to approximately 170 buildings in the next 5 years. Two new Asset Manager positions based in San Francisco were added in 2017 and one in 2019.

MOHCD Asset Management staff assessment of Sponsor's asset management capacity: The Sponsor's description of their asset management functions, duties and coordination with related teams within the organization demonstrates an adequate asset management operation for their existing portfolio. With 7 FTE asset managers statewide and a portfolio of 156 projects in California, the project/asset management staff ratio is 22 , which is in line with the industry standard of 20-25 recommended by NeighborWorks America. In addition, the Sponsor's asset management staff also includes Asset Management Analysts who support the Asset Managers. The full range of asset management responsibilities are covered by the asset managers and the analysts. With an increase of 15-16 projects in the Sponsor's portfolio anticipated over the next 5 years, the ratio will increase but remain within the industry standard.

## Attachment E: Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria

## Minimum Qualifications and Scoring from Homeless Family NOFA 2022

All applications that meet the Minimum Experience and Capacity Requirements will be scored and ranked according to the following selection criteria:

|  | Category | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | EXPERIENCE: | 40 |
| i. | Developer (12 pts) <br> > Experience with the following: <br> - Completing projects on time and on budget <br> - Obtaining competitive financing terms <br> - Developing Type V/I or III/I construction <br> - Developing housing for low-income families and those experiencing homelessness <br> > Building community support through outreach <br> > Current staff capacity and experience to take on this project type |  |
| ii. | Owner (4 pts) <br> Track record successfully owning housing financed with LowIncome Housing Tax Credits <br> - Experience owning affordable housing for low-income families and those experiencing homelessness <br> Effectiveness of current asset management structure and staffing, given portfolio size <br> Capacity for assuming asset management of an expanded portfolio once the development is complete |  |
| iii. | Property Manager (8 pts) <br> > Experience managing property for low-income families and those experiencing homelessness <br> > Experience achieving high rates of housing retention <br> > Implements low barrier tenant selection policies consistent with Housing First principles and the HSH Documentation Policy <br> > Contributes to long-term sustainability of the development <br> > Achieves cost efficiencies in operations |  |
| iv. | Service Providers (8 pts) <br> Experience delivering services to low-income families and those experiencing homelessness <br> > Experience linking residents to the City's safety net of services <br> > Works with property management to achieve high rates of housing retention <br> > Supports positive outcomes for residents around health and economic mobility <br> > If applicable, provides explanation for service contracts terminated prematurely within the last 5 years |  |


|  | Capacity to attract and retain adequate staffing to take on this project |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v. | Racial Equity (8 pts) <br> Describes level of racial equity awareness <br> > Experience providing housing to COP and neighborhood preference holders <br> Uses innovative approaches to engagement with COP and neighborhood preference holders <br> Demonstrates commitment to racially diverse project development teams <br> Demonstrates experience with serving historically excluded communities of color, including formerly homeless households Describes approaches to overcoming historical obstacles to communities of color obtaining high quality affordable housing Describes experience providing access and implementing effective service delivery strategies to historically excluded communities of color, including formerly homeless households |  |
| B. | VISION: | 60 |
| i. | Program Concept ( 20 pts) <br> Proposes site whose location, size, configuration, and zoning support the development of affordable and permanent supportive housing, including ability to maximize unit yield in a cost-effective construction type and make use of entitlement expediting such as SB 35 . <br> Describes vision for a development program at this site, while best achieving the project goals, and includes: <br> - A residential program and other envisioned uses; <br> - Indicates how the proposed uses and amenities will enhance the lives of the proposed target population and the surrounding neighborhood. <br> Indicates particular groups served by the programs and spaces (families, families experiencing homelessness, young adults, children etc.). <br> > Describes how the program will contribute to lowering barriers to persons of color seeking and retaining quality housing. |  |
| ii. | Community Engagement Strategy ( 10 pts ) <br> Describes community engagement strategy and includes: <br> - The team's philosophy on community engagement; <br> - Process for establishing and/or building positive relationships with surrounding neighbors and the larger community; <br> - Efforts designed to engage all interested community members - particularly BIPOC members of the target populations - and including monolingual non-English speaking members of the community; <br> - How the Development Team intends to comply with the City's Language Access Ordinance. |  |


|  | $>$Describes the Team's approach to achieving entitlements for the <br> project expeditiously and the approach to maintaining and <br> building community relationships after entitlements have been <br> achieved and the development is in operations. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $>$Indicates how particular community engagement strategy will <br> address the historical exclusion of communities of color from <br> quality housing, including but not limited to marketing to attract <br> target populations. |  |
|  |  | Services Delivery Strategy (10 pts) |
| Describes the Development Team's services delivery strategy <br> and includes: <br> $0 \quad$ The overall service philosophy; <br> Model for providing services to formerly homeless <br> residents (including case management ratio and <br> provision of amenities such as front desk clerks, if <br> applicable); |  |  |
| The services goals of the proposed vision. |  |  |


|  | Describes strategies used to help BIPOC tenants overcome <br> barriers to accessing supportive services and income that <br> mitigate the effects of poverty and lead to improved self- <br> sufficiency. | TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Attachment F: Site Map with amenities



## Attachment G: Elevation



## Attachment H: Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments

## Affordable Multifamily Housing New Construction Cost Comparison - San Francisco

| Updated 8/18/2023 |  | Acquisition by Uniteeds |  |  |  |  |  | Construction by UnitBedss |  |  |  |  |  | Soft Costs By Unit eedsF |  |  |  |  |  | Total Development Cost (lnc. L Land) |  |  |  |  |  | Subsidy |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Acqunit |  | Acq/ER |  | Acqlot sq.tt |  | Cons |  | Conster |  | Const s $9.4 \mathrm{f}^{\text {b }}$ |  | Softunit |  | Sotitibr |  | Softrsa.ft ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | Gross TDC/unit |  | Gross tocirr |  | Gross TDC/ sa.fit |  | Susidy / unit |  | Leveraging ${ }^{\text {7 }}$ |
| Detta of Sujiect and Comparable Projects |  | s | 78,299 | s | 48,466 | s | 425 | s | 121,088 | s | 68,82 | s | 38 | s | 121,130 | s | 73,339 | s | 84 | s | 318,957 | s | 188,901 | s | 184 | s | (7,442) | ${ }^{123.3}$ |
|  | Detata Percentage |  | 377\% |  | 369\% |  | 358\% |  | 18\% |  | 16\% |  | \% |  | 66\% |  | 63\% |  | 49\% |  | 36\% |  | 34\% |  | 23\% |  | 26\% | 185\% |
| SUBJECT PROJECT |  | s | 99,084 | s | ${ }^{61,616}$ | s | 543 | s | 791,179 | 5 | 491,994 | s | 664 | s | 305,457 | s | 189,948 | s | 256 | s | 1,195,720 | 5 | 743,557 | 5 | 1.004 | s | 216,216 | 81.\% |
| Comparable Projects | Average: | s | 20,786 | s | 13,149 | s | 118.47 | s | 670,092 | s | 423,912 | s | 626 | s | 184,327 | s | 110,608 | s | 172 | 5 | 876,764 | s | ${ }_{554,657}$ | s | 819 | s | ${ }_{290,658}$ | 66.8\% |

## 

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  | Total Dev. Cost wland | Local Subsidy | Total Dev. Cost wo land |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lot sq.ft | Completion/ start date | \# of Units | \# of $\mathrm{BR}^{\prime}$ | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Non-Res. } \\ \text { Saq.ta }}}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | Total sg.ft. | Acc. Cost ${ }^{3}$ | Constr. Cost ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | Soft cost |  |  |  | Notes on Financing | Builing Type | Stories | Comments |
| ALL PROJECTS | Average: | 31,513 |  | ${ }^{120}$ | 191 | ${ }^{120,323}$ | ${ }^{13,545}$ | ${ }^{132,205}$ | ${ }^{\text {S } 1,677,187}$ | S 80,541,800 | 18,824,491 | 101, 144,660 | 29,006, 149 | 99,484,962 |  |  |  |  |
| Comparable Projects Completed (fiterece) | Average: | 18,635 |  | 106 | 171 | 100,418 | 12,246 | 112,664 | \$5,185,149 | \$66,430,523 | \$15,072,442 | \$88,688,113 | \$27,788,500 | \$79, 502,964 |  |  |  |  |
| Comparable Projects Under Construction | Average: | 21,830 |  | 116 | 189 | 110,171 | 21,465 | 131,637 | 53,333 | 577,458,038 | 523,574,096 | \$102,035,467 | \$33,512,240 | S102,032,134 |  |  |  |  |
| Comparable Projects in Predevelolopment | Average: | 13,609 |  | ${ }^{86}$ | 127 | 79,792 | 6,965 | ${ }^{85,562}$ | \$1,217,458 | 563,627,300 | \$18,161,189 | \$83,486,658 | s22,277,214 | s82,472,110 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Comparable Projects | Average: | 18,025 |  | 103 | 162 | 96,794 | 13,559 | 109,954 | S2,13,313 | s68,838,620 | \$18,935,909 | 590,070,080 | s29,859,318 | 588,002,403 |  |  |  |  |
| eless Prenatal Program (HPP) \& Family Housing | 253018 th St | 13,504 | 411212024 | 74 | 119 | 79,010 | 12,768 | 88,166 | S 7,332,250 | S 58,54, 274 | ¢ 22,603,791 | S 88,48, , 15 | s 16,000,00 | 81,151,065 | 4\%, MHP, IIG, AHP | Trye el 1 B | 8 |  |
| Delta of Subject and Comp Project Averages |  | ${ }^{-4,521}$ |  | - 29 | ${ }^{-43}$ | ${ }_{-17.784}^{-186}$ | - 7 - 61 | ${ }^{-21.788}$ | ${ }_{\text {S5, } 1969,937}^{233^{\prime}}$ | ${ }_{(510,291,346)}^{\text {- } 15 \%}$ | ${ }^{\text {s3,667,882 }}$ | (51,586,765) | $(\$ 13,859,318)$ | $(\$ 6,851,338)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Delta Percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -46\% |  |  |  |  |  |



## Attachment I: Predevelopment Budget



## Attachment J: Development Budget



## Attachment K: $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget



| Application Date: | $8 / 2 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total \# Units: | 74 |


| Total \# Units: |
| :--- |
| First Year of Operations (provide data assuming that |

First Year of Operations (provide data assuming that
Year 1 is a full year, ie. 12 months of operations):

| income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | Losp) | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments |  |  |  |
| Commercial Space <br> Residential Parking |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| Supporive Sericeses Income |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending <br> Tenant Charges | Losp | noo-Losp | (only acceptable if LOSP-specific expenses are being |
|  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| Withrawal from Capitaized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | to operating account) |  | area |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Residentitial - Tenant Assistance Payments |  |  |  |
| cancy Loss - Commercial |  |  |  |

EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME


TOESAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD
ReCEONGMOHCD)
Residual Receipts Calculation
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual R
Residual Receipt Obligation?
Max Defertred Deveveloper FeelBorrower \% of Residual Receiptsint

| MOHCD/OCII - Soft Debt Loans MOHCD/OCII - Ground Lease Value or Land Acq Cost HCD (soft debt loan) - Lender 3 Other Soft Debt Lender - Lender 4 Other Soft Debt Lender - Lender 5 |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

REMAINING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS
DEBT SERVIICE
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Rececipts Amount Due
ender 5 Residual Receipts Due
Iotal Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service

[^0]
## Attachment L: 20-year Operating Proforma




Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receipts spili for all years. - Lender/Owner

## MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE



| $\underset{\substack{\text { res } \\ 67 \% / 338}}{\substack{380}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |






| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) |  |  | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCO policy | 12,135 | ${ }^{12,135}$ | 24,270 | ${ }^{12,135}$ | 12,135 | 24,270 | 12,135 | 12,135 | 24,270 |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mat Fee") (see policy for limits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy no annual increase | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enter comments e: annual increase, elc. | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt-Lender 2 |  |  | Enter comments re: anual increase, etc. | - | $\cdots$ |  | . | . |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt $<=$ Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,2 |

Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?

## MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE



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




Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receipts splitif or al y years. - Lender/Owner

## MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE




| Total \# Units: <br> 74 <br> income | $\begin{gathered} \text { Units } \\ 37 \end{gathered}$ | Non-Losp <br> Units <br> 37 <br> $50.00 \%$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 13 } \\ 2038 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 14 \\ 2039 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 15 } \\ 2040 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { annual } \\ \text { inc LOSP } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \% annual increase | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  | 150,093 | 926,117 | 1,076,210 | 151,594 | 949,270 | 1,100,864 | 153,110 | 973,002 | 1.126,112 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 864.843 |  | 864,843 | 895.160 |  | 895,160 | 926.575 |  | 22,575 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  | - |  |  | . |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Serices Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 3.027 | 3.027 | ${ }^{6,055}$ | 3,103 | 3,103 | 6,206 | 3,181 | ${ }^{3,181}$ | 6.361 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  | 1,017,964 | 929,145 | 1,947,108 | 1,049,857 | 952,373 | 2,002,231 | 82,865 | 976,183 | 2,059,048 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a |  |  | (7,505) | (46,306) | (53,811) | (7,580) | (47,464) | (55,043) | (7,655) | (48.650) | (56,306) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments VacancyLoss - Commercia | $\stackrel{\text { n/a }}{\text { n/a }}$ | $\frac{\text { n/a }}{\text { n/a }}$ | policy; annual incrementing usually not |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 1,010,459 | 882,839 | 1,893,298 | 1,042,278 | 904,910 | 1,947,187 | 1,075,210 | ${ }^{927,533}$ | 2,002,742 |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD schedule. | 41,696 | 41,696 | 83,393 | 43,156 | 43,156 | 86,312 | 44.666 | 44,666 |  |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 18,344 | 18,344 | 36,689 | 18,986 | 18,986 | 37,973 | 19.651 | 19.651 | 39,302 |
| Salaries/Benefits Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  | 60,041 | 60,041 | 120,082 | 62,142 | 62,142 | 124,84 | 64,317 | 64,317 | 128,34 |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 41,875 | 4,815 | 83,631 | 43,279 | 43,279 | 86,558 | 44,794 | 44,794 | 89,588 |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{56.808}$ | ${ }^{56,808}$ | 113.616 | ${ }^{58,796}$ | ${ }^{58,796}$ | 117,592 | ${ }^{60.854}$ | ${ }^{60,854}$ | 121,708 |
| Heatth Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 52,056 | 52,056 | 104,112 | 53,878 | 53,878 | 107,756 | 55,764 | ${ }^{55,764}$ | 111,528 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.599 | 2.599 | 5.198 | 2.690 | 2.690 | 5,380 | 2.784 | 2.784 | ${ }^{5.568}$ |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | $\stackrel{-}{153.279}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{153.279}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\text { 306,577 }}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{158,643}$ | $\stackrel{\cdot}{158,63}$ | $\stackrel{\cdot}{317287}$ | $\stackrel{\cdot}{164,196}$ | $\stackrel{\cdot}{164,196}$ | $\underset{\text { 328,392 }}{-}$ |



| Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 80,969 | ${ }^{80,969}$ | 161,938 | ${ }^{83.803}$ | 83.803 | 167,006 | 86,736 | ${ }^{86,736}$ | 173.472 |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 19,305 | 19,305 | 38,609 | 19,980 | 19.980 | 39.961 | 20.680 | 20.680 | 41,359 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 46,239 | 46,239 | 92,477 | 47,857 | 47,857 | 95.714 | 49,532 | 49.532 | 99,064 |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 146,512 | 146,512 | 293,025 | 151,640 | 151,640 | 303,281 | 156,948 | 156,948 | 313,996 |
| Raxes and Licenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.909 | 2.909 | 5.818 | ${ }^{3.011}$ | 3.011 | ${ }_{6.021}$ | 3.116 | ${ }^{3.116}$ | 6.232 |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 2,909 | 2,909 | 5,818 | 3,011 | 3,011 | 6,021 | 3,116 | 3,116 | 6,232 |
| Insurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 117,108 | 117,108 | 234,216 | 121,207 | 121,207 | 242,413 | 125.449 | 125.449 | 250,898 |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Insurance |  |  |  | 117,108 | 117,108 | 234,216 | 121,207 | 121,207 | 242,413 | 125,499 | ${ }^{125,499}$ | 250,898 |
| Maintenance \& Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 87,291 | 87,291 | 174.583 | 90,347 | ${ }^{90,347}$ | 180.693 | ${ }^{93.509}$ | ${ }^{93.509}$ | 187.017 |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 7,370 | 7.370 | 14,740 | 7,628 | 7,628 | 15,256 | 7,895 | 7,895 | 15.790 |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 33,734 | 33,734 | 67,468 | 34,915 | 34,915 | 69,829 | 36,137 | 36,137 | 72,273 |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 48,756 | 48,756 | 97,512 | 50,463 | 50,463 | 100,925 | 52,229 | 52,229 |  |
| Security Payolll Contract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 205.037 | 68.346 | 273.383 | 212.213 | 70,738 | 282,951 | 219.641 | 73.214 | 292.854 |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 9.112 | 9.112 | 18,223 | 9.431 | 9.431 | 18.861 | 9.761 | 9.761 | ${ }^{19,521}$ |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,133 | 1,133 | 2,267 | 1,173 | 1,173 | 2,346 | 1,214 | 1,214 | 2,428 |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  |  | 392,434 | 255,742 | 648,176 | 400,169 | 264,693 | 670,86 | 420,385 | 27,958 | 694,34 |
| Supportive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | ${ }^{50,645}$ | 50,645 | - | 52,418 | 52,418 | . | ${ }^{54,252}$ | 54,252 |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  | Commercial to Resididutatal alocation 100\% |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total operating expenses <br> PUPA (w/o Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond Fees) |  |  |  | 909,10 | 823,055 | 1,732,1 | 940,920 | 851,862 | 1,792,782 | 973,652 | 881,677 | 1,855,529 |

Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees
Ground Lease Base Rent

| Replacement Reserve Deposit |
| :--- |
| Operating Reserve Deposit |


| Other Required Reseve |
| :--- | :--- |
| Other Required Resenve 2 Depososit |

Required Reserve Deposits, Commercial
Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES ( $\mathbf{w} /$ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOMPA (INCOME Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond

## DEBT SERVICEMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans)

Hard Debt- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lender)
Hard Debt- - Fourth Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender)
TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Commercial Only Cash Flow
Allocation of Comercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
AVALABLE CASH FLOW
USES OF CASHELOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD)
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receits split or all years. - Lender/Owner

## MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due <br> Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Lease <br> NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below)


## PLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANCE

Replacement Resesve Starting Balance

| Replacement Reserve Deposits |
| :--- | :--- |
| Replacement Resve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) |
| Replacement Reserve Itherest |

## RR Running Balance

OPERATING RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE

| Operating Reserve Statiting Balance |
| :--- |
| Operatin Reserve Deposis |
| Operating Reserv Withrawals |
| Operating Reserve Interest |

OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Reserve 1 Statiting Balance

| Other Reserve 1 Deposits |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals |


| Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |
| :--- |
| rewals |

OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Resesve 2 Starting Balanc



|  | 7.500 | 7.500 | 15.000 | 7.500 | 7.500 | 15.000 | 7.500 | 7.500 | 15.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,250 | 1,250 | 2,500 | 1,250 | 1,250 | 2.500 | 1,250 | 1.250 | 2.500 |
|  | ${ }_{1}^{18,500}$ | ${ }^{18,500}$ | 37,000 | ${ }_{18,500}$ | ${ }_{18,500}$ | 37,000 | ${ }_{18,500}$ | 18,500 | 37,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Op. Bugarer Worksheet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mercial o Resisiditala alocation: 10\%\% | 27,250 | 27,250 | 54,500 | 27,250 | 27,250 | 54,500 | 27,250 | 27,250 | 54,500 |
|  | 936,351 | 850,305 | 1,786,657 | 968,170 | 879,112 | 1,877,282 | 1,001,102 | 908,927 | 1,910,029 |
|  | 74,108 | 32,534 | 106,641 | 74,107 | 25,798 | 99,905 | 74,108 | 18,605 | 92,713 |


| Ener comments e: annual incease, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ener comments e: annual incease, etc. | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 | 59.473 | 59.473 | 118,945 |
| Ener comments e: annual increase, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ener comments e: eanual incease, elc. | , | - | . | - | - | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59,473 |  |
| 59,473 |  | 59,473 118,945 |  | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 | 59,473 |  | 118,945 |


|  |  | 14,635 | (26,939) | (12,304) | 14,635 | (3,675) | (19,040) | 14,635 | (40,867) | (26,232) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 14,635 | (26,939) | (12,304) | 14,635 | (3,675) | (19,040) | 14,635 | (40,867) | (26,232) |
| 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 3.5\% | Per MOHCD poicicy | ${ }^{12,135}$ | ${ }^{12,135}$ | 24,270 | ${ }^{12,135}$ | ${ }^{12,135}$ | 24.270 | ${ }^{12,135}$ | ${ }_{12,135}^{2}$ | 24,270 |
|  | Per MOHCD policy n a annual increase | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 5.000 | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 |
|  | Ener comments ere anual incease elc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Enter comments se: annual increase, elc. | . | . |  |  | - |  | - | . |  |
|  |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | . | . |  |
|  |  | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 |






| Hard Debt-First Lender | Enter comments ee:anual increase elc. | 59,473 | 59.473 | 118,945 | 59.473 | 59.473 | 118,945 | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard Debt- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lender) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | Enter comments ere: anual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard Debt- Fourth Lender | Enter comments e: annua increase, elc. | , | . | . | . | - | . | . | . |  |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVIICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 59,473 \\ & (65,403) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118,945 \\ & (50,768) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 59,47314,635 |  | $59,473$$(48,538)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118,945 \\ & (33,903) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59,473 \\ & 14,635 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59,473 \\ & (56,708) \end{aligned}$ | 118,945 (42,073) | $\begin{aligned} & 59,4,63 \\ & 1, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEst
Comerial Only Cash Fow
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
AVIABLE CASH FOW
LSES USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL


ESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW min PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD)
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receipts spili for all years. - Lender/Owner

## MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE



Dist Soott
Debt Loans

| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Dist. Soft } \mid \\ \text { Debt Loans } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 36.32\% |  |
|  | Loans, and MOHCD Desidual reee |
|  | Proposed Total MOHCD Amt Due less Loan Repayment |
|  | loan |
| 0.00\% |  |



| REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below) |
| :--- |
| Ower Distribution/l/centive Management Fee |
| Other Distributionssluses |
| Final |







| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 107,303 | 107,303 | 214,607 | 11,059 | 11,059 | 222,118 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 9,060 | 9.060 | 18,120 | 9,377 | 9.377 | 18,75 |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 41,468 | 41,468 | ${ }_{82,935}$ | 42,919 | 42,919 | ${ }_{85,838}$ |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 59.934 | 59,934 | 119,867 | 62,031 | 62,031 |  |
| Security Payrollcontract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 25,043 | 84.014 | 336,057 | 260.864 | 86,955 | 347.819 |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 11,201 | 11,201 | 22.401 | ${ }^{11,593}$ | 11,593 | 23,185 |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{1,393}$ | 1,393 | 2.786 | 1,442 | 1,442 | 2.884 |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  |  | 482,401 | 314,373 | 796,74 | 499,285 | ${ }^{325,376}$ | 824,661 |
| Supportive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | 62,256 | 62,256 |  | 64,435 | 64,435 |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  | - |
| total operating expenses <br> PUPA (w/o Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond Fees) |  |  |  | 1,117,518 | 1,011,745 | 2,129,263 | 1,156,631 | 1,047,156 | 2,003,787 |

und Lease
Keplacement Reseeve Deposit

| Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit |
| :--- |
| Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit |

Required Reserve Deposits, Commercial
Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES ( $\mathbf{w} /$ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)
DEBT SERVICEMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans)


Hard Debt- Fourth Lender
TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Commercial Only Cash Flow
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
AVAlLABLE CASH FLOW
USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)

| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommmon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | Peer MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partnership Management Fee ( (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | ${ }^{12,135}$ | ${ }^{12,135}$ | 24.270 | ${ }^{12,135}$ | ${ }^{12,135}$ | 24.270 |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mat Fee") (see policy for linits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy n a annual increase | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.000 |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enner comments e: anuua increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amoritizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 |  |  | Enter comments e: anuua i incease, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt <= Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 | 14,635 | 14,635 | 29,270 |
| RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS PRECEDIN | монсD) |  |  | ${ }^{(0)}$ | (89,280) | (89,280) | ${ }_{(0)}$ | (99,095) | (99,095) |


|  | 7.500 | 7.500 | 15.000 | 7.500 | 7.500 | 15.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.250 | 1.250 | 2,500 | 1.250 | 1,250 | 2.500 |
|  | 18.500 | 18.500 | 37,000 | 18.500 | 18.500 | 37,000 |
|  | . | . | . |  |  |  |
|  | . | - | . | . | . | . |
| from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet;Commercial to Residential allocation: $100 \%$ | . |  | , | . | , |  |
|  | 27,250 | 27,250 | 54,500 | 27,250 | 27,250 | 54,500 |
|  | 1,144,768 | 1,038,995 | 2,183,763 | 1,183,881 | 1,074,406 | 2,258,287 |
|  | 74,107 | (15,172) | 58,935 | 74,107 | (24,988) | 49,120 |


| Enter comments re: annual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enter comments ee: anual increase, elc. | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 | 59,473 | 59.473 | 118,945 |
| Enter comments e: a anual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enter comments e: annua increase, elc. |  | . | . | . |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 | 59,473 | 59,473 | 118,945 |

Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation
Project Defer Developer Fee?
Reidual Receipts spolit for al flyears. - Lender/Own

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE


REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below) Owner Distributions/l/ncentive Management Fee

| REPLACEMENT RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE |
| :--- |
| Replacement Reserve Staritg BBalance |
| Replacement Resere Deposita |
| Replacement Resevene Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) |
| Replacement Reserve Interest |
| RR Running Balance |



OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance

| Other Reserve 1 Deposits |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Withrawals |

drawals
Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance
OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANC
Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 36828 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| - | 666000 | ${ }^{73,300}$ |
|  | 33,000 |  |
| R8 Bataount |  | Resome |
| - | $\square$ | $\square$ : |
| - | $\square$ | $\square$ |
|  | 00\% | 00\% |
| $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square:$ |
| $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


[^0]:    REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there a
    Wmer Distributions/Incentive Management Fee
    Other DistributionsUSses
    Final Balance (should be zero)

