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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Sponsor Information:

| Project Name: | 1633 Valencia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Address (w/ cross St): | 1633 Valencia, San |
|  | Francisco, CA 94110 |

Sponsor(s):<br>Ultimate Borrower Entity:<br>Mercy Housing California<br>Mercy Housing California 108, L.P.

(at Cesar Chavez St.)

## Project Summary:

Mercy Housing California in partnership with the San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund (SFHAF) requests permanent financing in the amount of up to $\$ 41,036,048$ (including a $\$ 2 \mathrm{M}$ AHP bridge loan) as well as funding through the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) in the amount of $\$ 80,785,406$ over an 18-year LOSP term to support program operations and to service the \$16M SFHAF Innovation loan to create permanent supportive housing at 1633 Valencia. The proposed development will create 145 newly constructed studio units, plus one staff unit, for a total of 146 units, to be made available as permanent supportive housing for seniors ages 55 and above experiencing homelessness (Project). The Project is being proposed as further iteration of the Tahanan ( 833 Bryant) permanent supportive housing project, utilizing the same floorplate and efficient design (though not using modular construction) as well as other cost-saving and time-saving measures and similarly deferring City investment until the operations phase and conversion to permanent financing. This innovative approach diversifies the housing production models to bring on line 145 PSH units more quickly and cost effectively without an initial City capital investment.

Development costs through construction for the Project are anticipated to total approximately \$84.6M. The Project is being constructed using philanthropic and private funding that will make possible completion of the Project for approximately $\$ 580 \mathrm{~K}$ per unit including site acquisition, and $\$ 541 \mathrm{~K}$ per unit without acquisition costs This total development cost per unit is approximately $20 \%$ below the $\$ 729 \mathrm{~K}$ cost per unit for comparable projects. The City permanent loan subsidy is up to $\$ 281 \mathrm{~K}$ per unit. (The specific goal of the Sponsor is to achieve total development cost of approximately $\$ 530 \mathrm{~K} /$ unit removing land acquisition, developer fee and reserves, within three years from site acquisition to construction loan closing, using the same metrics as they used for Tahanan.) Once completed, the Project will rely on an "enhanced" LOSP agreement with a 19-year term to subsidize operations at project completion as well as to pay down the 18year construction loan from SFHAF.

1633 Valencia will provide 145 permanent supportive studios restricted by the City loan at $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI (and ranging from 30\%-60\% Area Median Income as restricted by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee), with residents paying $30 \%$ of their income in rent. The ground floor features a residential lobby near elevator access. Each residential floor has similar floor layouts to maximize efficiency of design. Resident-serving common spaces will include one community room, two offices for property management and a supportive services suite as well as building maintenance spaces.

The Project will be financed with 4\% Low Income Housing Tax Credits, tax-exempt bonds from CalHFA, and a below-market philanthropically supported permanent loan provided by SFHAF. An accelerated procurement using HSH's emergency authorization, coupled with an ability to forego state tax credits (accessing only federal tax credits) based on lower total development costs, all but assured the project's ability to receive a tax credit award on its first application, further expediting the predevelopment process. To-date, the Project has utilized no City capital financing and is anticipated to complete construction and
begin lease up in January 2026. The investment at completion will come in the form of a City SF Health and Recovery GO Bond Permanent loan totaling up to $\$ 41,036,048$, a General Fund LOSP grant agreement for debt and operations, and HSH services funding. Approval is being requested now to enable the construction loan closing in mid-May 2024. The permanent loan commitment includes \$2M in the form of a bridge loan to cover an application for AHP funds which the Sponsor will apply for in 2025, and once awarded, the City commitment will be reduced by the amount of the AHP award.

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | Type IIIA over I | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Stories: | 6 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 0.42 acres / 18,508 sf |
| Number of Units: | 146 | Architect: | David Baker Architects |
| Total Residential Area: | 57,594 sf | General Contractor: | Cahill Contractors |
| Total Commercial Area: | 0 sf | Property Manager: | Mercy Housing Management Group |
| Total Building Area: | 68,802 sf | Supervisor and District: | Sup. Ronen D-9 |
| Land Owner: | Mercy Housing California 108, L.P. |  |  |
| Total Development Cost (TDC): | \$84,605,578 | Total Acquisition Cost: | \$5,630,433 |
| TDC/unit: | \$579,490 | TDC less land cost/unit: | \$541,236 |
| Loan Amount Requested: | Up to \$41,036,048 | Request Amount / unit including AHP Bridge loan: | \$281,068 |
| HOME Funds? | N | Parking? | N |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

1. Selection of the Sponsor is authorized under HSH's Chapter 21B waiver of competitive bidding requirements for "Projects Addressing Homelessness" to bring new PSH units quickly online. Selection of a supportive services provider which will be selected under a competitive procurement process. See Section 1.2 Applicable NOFA/RFQ/RFP.
2. This request is the first LOSP project to include a debt service component, required to repay the HAF loan over an 18 year term to replicate the model of Tahanan to bring PSH units on line quickly and at lower cost. The requested LOSP term is 19 years to start the operating subsidy at project completion, which exceeds MOHCD's typical 15-year LOSP term. See Section 7.2.3 LOSP Commitment.
3. The development budget includes a $\$ 750 \mathrm{~K}$ lease up and stabilization reserve as a onetime pilot to cover additional management and maintenance staffing, overtime and security, repair damages and insurance deductibles during lease up and the initial two year stabilization period when residents are adjusting to the new building during and after lease up. Any remainder of this reserve not needed during the transition period will go to
reduce the LOSP A for operations funding amount to be disbursed in January 2029. See Section 6.5.3 Permanent Uses Evaluation.
4. Cost containment measures include a design build approach with locked in subcontractor pricing and with projected fewer change orders and less impact on contingencies, potentially rendering savings which could reduce the City loan at permanent conversion. See Section 4.3 Construction Representative Evaluation.
5. Maintaining low construction costs depends primarily on the seamless coordination among Mechanical/Electrical Plumbing (MEP) design-build subcontractors' design, other trade designs, and the architectural/structural drawings already submitted to DBI. The project incorporates Building Information Modeling (BIM) clash prevention (3-D visualization of the trades to make it easy to see any conflicts before construction starts) and the design contingency to protect against cost overruns. However, as additional safeguard, the Project team will be held responsible for regular check ins with MOHCD staff regarding DBI status on the MEPs plan check and any potential new pricing from subs related to plan check. See Section 4.3 Construction Representative Evaluation.
6. MOHCD's long-term policy is to own the land on which affordable housing projects are built. Because of the Project's proposed ownership and financing structures, which require greater risk on behalf of the Sponsor, the Project and the land on which it is being built will both be owned by the Limited Partnership. Mercy Housing California 108, L.P. will provide the City with an Option Agreement to acquire the land and improvements in the event of default or disposition of the property after the tax credit compliance period. See Section 4.1. Site Control.
7. Loan commitment includes a bridge AHP amount and requirement that the Sponsor apply for AHP in the next round after start of construction, which if awarded, would reduce the amount of the capital loan commitment dollar for dollar. See Section 6.3.1 Permanent Financing.

## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Predevelopment Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFHAF Predev Loan | $\$ 4,826,022$ | $\$ 33,055$ | 3 yrs $@ 3 \%$ simple interest | Closed |
| Total | $\$ 4,826,022$ | $\$ 33,055$ |  |  |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFHAF Permanent Loan | $\$ 16,000,000$ | $\$ 109,589$ | 20 yrs @ $3 \% /$ Res Rec | Committed |
| SF Health \& Recovery GO <br> Bond Loan | $\$ 39,036,048$ | $\$ 267,370$ | 55 yrs @ $1 \% /$ Res Rec | THIS REQUEST |
| AHP | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $\$ 13,699$ | Grant | Application 2025 |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 27,569,430$ | $\$ 188,832$ | $\$ 0.965$ tax credit pricing | Committed |
| Sponsor Contribution | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 1$ |  | Committed |
| Total | $\$ 84,605,578$ | $\$ 579,490$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 5,630,433$ | $\$ 38,565$ | $\$ 82$ |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 56,841,842$ | $\$ 389,328$ | $\$ 826$ |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 17,025,471$ | $\$ 116,613$ | $\$ 247$ |
| Reserves | $\$ 2,607,832$ | $\$ 17,862$ | $\$ 38$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 2,500,000$ | $\$ 17,123$ | $\$ 36$ |
| Total | $\$ 84,605,578$ | $\$ 579,490$ | $\$ 1,230$ |

## 1. BACKGROUND

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

When the San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund (SFHAF) and Tipping Point Community (TPC) created the Homes for the Homeless Fund, their intent was to build high-quality permanent supportive housing in less than three years and for less than $\$ 400,000$ per unit - and then to replicate that model. SFHAF staff began looking for a second housing development parcel soon after Tahanan closed its bond financing and construction was successfully underway to replicate the model of creating new permanent supportive housing units at lower cost and faster timeframe. (Per the Tahanan Cost Certification, total development costs minus acquisition came in at $\$ 420 \mathrm{~K} /$ unit, and under $\$ 400 \mathrm{~K} / u n i t$ using the initiative's metric of removing acquisition, developer fee and reserves ${ }^{1}$ ).

In December 2020 SFHAF identified a new development opportunity at 3435 Cesar Chavez Street (Site) in San Francisco's Mission-Bernal neighborhood. The opportunity came to the SFHAF through Sequoia Living (SL, formerly Northern California Presbyterian Homes and Services), a senior housing provider that works throughout the Bay Area. SL made an offer of $\$ 13,500,000$ on the $1+$ acre Parcel, expressing interest in entering into separate acquisition agreement with the SFHAF for a portion of the Parcel due to its large size exceeding what SL needed for its planned future development of affordable senior housing. SL formally acquired the site on August 21, 2022.

Envisioned as the 'Tahanan Replication' project, SFHAF brought this innovative development opportunity to Mercy Housing California (MHC) in 2021 with the goal of replicating the total development cost per unit and timeline successes of Tahanan, to build 145 studio units serving seniors experiencing and at-risk of homelessness. SFHAF had selected Mercy Housing, David Baker Architects (DBA), and Cahill Contractors through a competitive process for Tahanan Street and wanted to incorporate lessons learned from that project into an improved 2.0 version. In lieu of modular factory-built housing which was the model for Tahanan alongside three other permanent supportive housing projects in 2020, this Project utilizes design-replication and design-build contract innovations, partnering with Cahill Contractors and DBA to target a cost goal of \$530k/unit (removing land acquisition, developer fee and reserves) and to bring units to market within 3 years of entitlement approval. A higher per-unit cost goal was
${ }^{1}$ See evaluation study https://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/833-Bryant-February-2021.pd
established based on significant construction cost escalation in the years since Tahanan construction bids were finalized. The Project is presently meeting the timeline goal and reflecting TDC/unit of under \$520k/unit not including land acquisition, developer fee and reserves. SFHAF has provided a predevelopment loan of $\$ 4,826,022$ to complete predevelopment activities through construction closing date of May 2024.

In the fall of 2022 as Mercy began the entitlement process for 1633 Valencia, SFHAF and Mercy began meeting with MOHCD, HSH and D9 Supervisor Ronen to discuss an innovative financing approach that would leverage private/philanthropic capital to finance projects that can meet aggressive cost and time goals. By spring of 2023, SFHAF had secured commitments for \$50M from prospective investors for a new innovation-focused fund, with 1633 Valencia as the inaugural project. The below market, "innovation" loan would replace a key part of the Project's capital stack - the State tax credits, a scarce and competitive source. By eliminating the need for State Tax Credits, 1633 Valencia could apply for 4\% tax credits and tax-exempt bonds in the third round of 2023, all but ensuring the Project would receive an allocation. In preparation for this application, SFHAF and Mercy approached MOHCD/HSH with a request for funding commitments that would enable the Project to seize this unique financing opportunity. HSH issued a commitment for a LOSP contract and Mercy submitted the application for tax credits and bonds on September 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$. MOHCD approved CalHFA serving as the conduit issuer for private activity bonds and the Project received an award from CalHFA in December of 2023.

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

SFHAF and Mercy were selected to develop this permanent supportive housing under HSH's Chapter 21 emergency procurement waiver authorization to bring new PSH units quickly online with reduced cost. This waiver does not cover the supportive services provider, which will be selected under a separate HSH formal procurement process.
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. The borrower entity for the residential loan is Mercy Housing California 108, L.P. The managing general partner is Mercy Housing California 108 LLC, a subsidiary of Mercy. See Exhibit B.
1.3.2. Joint Venture Partnership. N/A.
1.3.3. Demographics of Board of Directors, Staff and People Served. See table below for gender identity and race demographics for the Mercy board and staff. Mercy does not collect sexual orientation data from board members or staff.

|  | Gender <br> Identity | Race |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Mercy Housing California Board | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{M}: 43 \% \\ \mathrm{~F}: 57 \% \end{gathered}$ | Asian: 14.29\% <br> African American: 7.14\% <br> Caucasian: 43.86\% <br> Latinx: 14.29\% <br> Biracial: 21.43\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mercy Housing, Inc. Board | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{M}: 50 \% \\ \mathrm{~F}: 50 \% \end{gathered}$ | Asian: 5\% <br> African American: 15\% <br> Caucasian: 75\% <br> Latinx: 5\% |
| Mercy Housing, Inc. All Staff | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M}: 42 \% \\ & \mathrm{~F}: 58 \% \end{aligned}$ | 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 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M}: 43 \% \\ & \mathrm{~F}: 57 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2 or More Races - 5\% <br> American Indian/Alaska Native - 1\% <br> Asian - 21\% <br> Black or African American - 17\% <br> Hispanic or Latino - 31\% <br> Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander - 2\% <br> Not specified - 1\% <br> White-22\% |
| Mercy Housing California - <br> Development Staff | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M}: 50 \% \\ & \mathrm{~F}: 50 \% \end{aligned}$ | Asian - 20\% <br> Not specified - 20\% <br> White-60\% |

MHC owns and operates 4,217 units of affordable housing in San Francisco. The chart below represents the total number of people currently living in MHC owned properties $(7,176)$, disaggregated by race and ethnicity.

|  | Race | Ethnicity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mercy Housing | Asian: 42\% <br> California | White: 19\% <br> San Francisco resident <br> responses to US <br> Census definitions <br> Black or African American: 16\% <br> Other: 15\% <br> Did not specify: 3\% <br> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific |
| Islander: 2\%  <br> American Indian or Alaska Not-Hispanic or Latino: 77\% <br> Hispanic or Latino: 19\% <br> Did not specify: 3\% <br> Blank 1\% <br>  Native: 2\% <br> Blank: 1\%  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## *Responses are from US Census definitions which cause overlap between race and ethnicity categories.

From January 2022 through November 2022 MHC had 17 resident evictions. Currently, Mercy does not track move out reasons and does not track evictions by race.
1.3.4. Racial Equity Vision. Mercy is dedicated to moving forward racial equity work. Mercy Housing was founded on the belief that housing justice is social justice. Mercy's organizational values of respect, justice, and mercy are integral to its racial equity work. To advance its racial equity and social justice, Mercy's national office launched the Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (REDI) initiative. In 2021, Mercy Housing Inc. hired Web Brown as SVP for Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Mr. Brown has created a coordinated approach to REDI that includes creating an organizational framework that consists of focus areas to produce action plans throughout the organization in areas of internal culture, resident empowerment, education, and training, hiring and recruitment, communication, and advocacy.

Mercy has also established REDI goals for each department. The California real estate development team generated five goals in 2020 and created workplans around achieving each of the goals. Goals include: expanding the pipeline of diverse real estate staff, creating a national contracting and procurement policy, developing REDI evaluation standards for each stage in the development process, incorporating equitable digital access in development projects, and creating a legislative advocacy strategy. San Francisco real estate staff have been central in elevating these conversations an moving the goals forward. In 2023, Mercy Housing Inc. published its organization wide racial equity mission and goals.
1.3.5. Relevant Experience. Mercy Housing, Inc. (MHI) is the largest non-profit owner of affordable housing in the United States. MHI owns and provides property management (through Mercy Housing Management Group or "MHMG") to more than 23,000 units of affordable housing and currently serves more than 50,000 people. Mercy Housing California is the California affiliate of MHI. In San Francisco, the company owns and/or manages 56 properties with 4,551 homes and 7,620 residents. Of the rental housing completed, approximately $52 \%$ is for families, $32 \%$ for seniors, and $16 \%$ supportive housing for formerly unhoused households. In addition, Mercy has nearly 6,000 units in its development pipeline with a team of 38 development staff members to support the process. In San Francisco, the company owns and/or manages 56 properties with 4,551 homes and 7,620 residents.

Mercy's San Francisco portfolio includes Casa de la Mision, which is a 45-unit permanent supportive housing for seniors experiencing homelessness located at $300124^{\text {th }}$ Street, as well as Tahanan located at 833 Bryant Street, which served as the basis of design for 1633 Valencia, and similarly provides 145 studio units of permanent supportive housing for individuals experiencing homelessness.
1.3.6. Project Management Capacity. Clare Murphy is the Associate Director of Real Estate Development and dedicates approximately 50\% of her time to the Project. Chris Hacnik is the Project Manager and dedicates approximately 50\% of his time to 1633 Valencia. Clare and Chris are supported by Ramie Dare (Director of Real Estate Development), and Doug Shoemaker (President). (See Attachment C.)

### 1.3.7. Past Performance. There are no past performance issues.

1.3.7.1. City audits/performance plans. Mercy Housing participated in the last citywide fiscal and compliance monitoring program in December 2021, and there are no known findings or issues with the audits. MOHCD community development staff have found no performance issues working with Mercy, and identified the agency as a strong City partner, compliant with regulations.
1.3.7.2. Marketing/lease-up/operations. MOHCD's DAHLIA / Marketing manager did not note any concerns and does not manage lease-up of Coordinated Entry HSH referral units. See Section 1.3 .3 for resident demographic data.

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

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning: | NCD - MISSION BERNAL NEIGHBORHOOD <br> COMMERCIAL DISTRICT |
| Maximum units allowed by current <br> zoning (N/A if rehab): | 50-X Height and Bulk District, Project was granted a <br> waiver from height limit pursuant to SB35? State <br> Density Bonus Law. |
| Number of units added or removed <br> (rehab only, if applicable): | N/A |
| Seismic (if applicable): | N/A <br> Soil type: <br> the Sponsor completed Phase I and II reports and <br> system (VMS) consisting of a sub-slab ventilation layer, <br> ventilation piping, membrane barrier, and monitoring <br> system, which was designed by a professional <br> engineer based on the identified soil conditions. See <br> Section 2.6 below. |
| Environmental Review: | Project is exempt from CEQA under SB35. [please <br> confirm] <br> Phase I completed on May 11, 2021 <br> Phase II completed on May 10, 2021 |
| Adjacent uses (North): | One-story Commercial |
| Adjacent uses (South): | Commercial |
| Adjacent uses (East): | Multi-family residential |
| Adjacent uses (West): | Hospital |
| Neighborhood Amenities within 0.5 <br> miles: | Precita Park, San Francisco Public Library- Mission <br> Branch Library, Safeway (3350 Mission Street), , <br> Walgreens Pharmacy (3398 Mission Street) |


| Public Transportation within 0.5 miles: | SFMTA MUNI Lines 27/14/14R/48/49, 24 <br> BART |
| :--- | :--- |
| Article 34: | Required Mission |
| Article 38: | Not exempt. The site is within the Air Pollutant <br> Exposure Zone. The design is subject to relevant <br> guidelines and requirements. |
| Accessibility: | Fifteen percent of the units (22) will meet Chapter 11B <br> accessibility standards with all remaining units specified <br> to meet Chapter 11A adaptability standards; ten <br> percent of the units (15) in the building will include <br> communication features. All common areas will be <br> accessible. 50\% of the units will have roll-in showers. |
| Green Building: | Based on current design, the project plans to achieve a <br> Green Point rating of "Platinum". The Sponsor has <br> engaged a sustainability consultant and will continue to <br> monitor green standards throughout construction. |
| Recycled Water: | Exempt |
| Storm Water Management: | The Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan was <br> approved on 9/19/23 by the Public Utility Commission <br> (PUC). |

2.1. Description. The Site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Valencia Street and Cesar Chavez Street and will be developed independently from the adjacent SL site, which will be developed into $100 \%$ affordable senior housing of around 100 plus units. The Sponsor submitted for a subdivision of the existing parcel to develop the 1633 Valencia Project on the newly formed assessor parcel known as Block 6574, Lot 071. The parcel is an 18,508 square foot undeveloped lot in the Mission neighborhood, bounded by Cesar Chavez, Valencia, and Mission Streets. Prior to demolition of existing structures, the site consisted of two one-story vacant commercial metal buildings, and a parking lot.
2.2. Zoning. Under SB-35, given the Project is providing 145 units of housing affordable to low- and very low-income households, and is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, the Project is not subject to any maximum control on density and is entitled to receive up to four concessions/incentives and an additional three stories, or 33 feet of height and unlimited waivers. The project sponsor is requesting no concessions/incentives from the development standards. The project is located in a $50-$ X Height and Bulk District and proposes a maximum building height of 64 feet, excepting those features specified as exemptions to the height limit under Planning Code Section 260(b).
2.3. Probable Maximum Loss. N/A.
2.4. Local/Federal Environmental Review. On July 28, 2023, the San Francisco Planning Department determined that the proposed Project was eligible for SB- 35 and is exempt from CEQA review. There are no federal funds triggering federal environmental review.
2.5. Environmental Issues.

- Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results. The Site is within the Maher Area and therefore subject to the requirements of Article 22A of the San Francisco Public

Health Code (Maher Ordinance). Article 22A states that construction projects in San Francisco, which are bayward of the historic 1852 high tide line or within the expanded Maher Area and disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil, require assessment of the site history (Phase I Environmental Site Assessment) and soil quality (Phase II ESA or Environmental Site Characterization (ESC)) of the material that will be encountered during construction in accordance with Article 22A.

A Phase I report was completed as of April 6, 2021; revised report is dated May 11, 2021. Phase II Report was completed May 10, 2021.

The Phase II report indicates Site is underlain by a layer of fill material with elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and heavy metals classified as State of California Class I non-RCRA hazardous waste criteria. The remainder of the fill material at the site not classified as State of California Class I non-RCRA hazardous waste will most likely be classified as Class II non-hazardous waste.
In soil gas, VOCs (benzene, PCE, and vinyl chloride) were detected above 2019 ESLs. The detected concentrations of VOCs are low, likely associated with limited localized sources.

The site work includes a vapor mitigation system to ensure that soil gasses from past industrial uses of the land are contained. The system includes a vapor barrier below the slab with perforated pipe to collect the gas and solid pipe up to the roof of the building to vent the area under the slab.

As of December 29, 2023, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) approved the Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) and Vapor Mat System (VMS) design and the Project will be constructed in accordance with these documents.

- Potential/Known Hazards. As noted above, hazardous soil is present on the site and will need to be removed and transported to appropriate facilities during construction.

In 1988, Ashfield \& Co., Inc. of San Francisco, California closed-in-place six Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) that reportedly contained motor oil at the former AAMCO Transmission shop located at 1633 Valencia Street. SFDPH approved the closure of the six USTs based on analytical results collected at the site in their letter dated February 9, 1989. Since there is no analytical data available for review, the developer is relying on the SFDPH review of the data and issuance of a case closure letter. If the results were elevated at time of closure letter, SFDPH would have required additional sampling at that point. The USTs are planned for removal for construction of the project.
2.6. Adjacent uses and neighborhood amenities. The Site is in the Mission-Bernal Neighborhood of San Francisco. This location is well-served by public transit along Mission Street, including the $24^{\text {th }}$ Street BART station. It is nearby parks including Juri Commons, Precita Park and Bernal Heights Park, in addition to being near several grocers on Mission Street and other amenities such as banks, barbers, restaurants, and more. See Attachment F for Amenities list and map.
2.7. Green Building. The Project requires certification under the Green Point Rated (GPR) program with a minimum of 125 points. As currently envisioned the Project exceeds the
minimum and will achieve "Platinum" certification under the GPR program. Among the key sustainable design features are the heat pump hot water system, highly efficient envelope and all low-VOC paints coatings and sealants.

## 3. COMMUNITY SUPPORT

3.1. Prior Outreach. The Sponsor, in partnership with SFHAF and Dolores Street Community Services (DSCS), mailed out project introduction sheets to SF Planning's Bernal Neighborhood Contact list and 300 ft radius surrounding the Project Site; the mailing included translations. The project introduction sheet and translations were also distributed to community partners and neighbors by email. The Sponsor has also publicized a Project website (www.1633valencia.org) providing project updates, additional information, and options for the public to contact the Sponsor for additional information or be added to contact lists for future outreach. To date, the Sponsor has met with following community organizations to provide project information: Calle 24 Land Use Committee Meeting in November 2022, the Council of Community Housing Organizations in December 2022, the adjacent Sears Building Resident Meeting in June 2023, and meetings with the Mission Neighborhood Health Center, legacy neighborhood businesses, and the American Indian Cultural District? in November 2023. The Sponsor and DSCS also met with the Latino Task Force Street Safety Committee in November 2023 and presented to the Latino Task Force full board on February 12, 2024. The Sponsor and SFHAF continuously met with District 9 Supervisor Ronen to provide project updates in 2023. The Project team has received positive feedback and support for the Project vision, across meetings with Missionbased CBOs and partners.
3.2. Future Outreach. The Sponsor will continue to conduct outreach throughout the remainder of predevelopment and through construction to garner support for the Project, and keep the community apprised of the Project plans and schedule. The Project team intends to hold a neighborhood meeting in March 2024 prior to commencement of construction. Throughout construction, the Sponsor plans to provide continued outreach to the community through email, mail, website updates, and continue meetings with local organizations and neighbors.
3.3. 1998 Proposition I Citizens' Right-To-Know. Sponsor will post Proposition I Neighborhood Notification at the Site by April 8, 2024, to ensure notice is provided at least 30 days prior to the Mayor's signature on the Board Resolution.
4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN
4.1. Site Control. Fee ownership
4.1.1. Site Acquisition. The Site, 3485 Cesar Chavez, is currently owned by Sequoia Living (SL, formerly Northern California Presbyterian Homes and Services). Mercy Housing California 108, L.P., the limited partnership owner entity, executed a Purchase and Sale Agreement (PSA) on September 5, 2023 to purchase and develop one of the two parcels, pending a lot split. A PSA Amendment was signed on January 4, 2024.

> The original parcel required a lot split and demolition of an existing vacant commercial structure to be completed in order to record a new parcel map, due to an existing structure's location on the proposed lot line. The lot split map, parcel map 11671, was recorded on December 21, 2023 and demolition permits, issued October 24, 2023, were officially signed off by DBI as of January 26, 2024. The subdivision created two separate land parcels for two proposed affordable housing communities which will have separate ownership, financing, and development plans. 1633 Valencia is located on Parcel B (Block 6574, Lot 071). SL will retain ownership of Parcel A (Block 6574, Lot 070). As outlined in the PSA Amendment, acquisition will take place concurrently with closing of construction financing.
4.1.2. Proposed Property Ownership Structure The borrower entity, Mercy Housing California 108, L.P., will own the land and improvements, which is not the standard policy for MOHCD-financed affordable housing and ground lease policy. This LP ownership is being maintained to enable the structure of no City financing or ground lease prior to completion and conversion to permanent financing in order to develop the Project at reduced cost, and replicates the Tahanan ownership model. The managing general partner is Mercy Housing California 108 LLC, a subsidiary of Mercy. Mercy Housing California 108, L.P. will provide the City with an Option Agreement to acquire the land and improvements in the event of default or disposition of the property after the tax credit compliance period.
4.2. Proposed Design. This Project utilizes design-replication and design-build contract innovations, partnering with Cahill Contractors and David Baker Architects, who designed and built Tahanan, to keep costs low and to bring units to market within 3 years of entitlement approval. Under the design replication model, the architect and contractor were selected to design and construct 1633 Valencia using lessons-learned and post-occupancy evaluations of the completed unique pilot project Tahanan.

As of January 2024, the Project has completed 95\% construction drawings and bought out the design-build subcontractors' contracts for $95 \%$ of the overall construction cost. The Sponsor intends to execute a design-build contract with Cahill and assign the architecture contract over to Cahill to complete the balance of Construction Design work and Construction Administration. The architect and contractor have worked closely together on design, permitting and bidding under the design-build process throughout the design stages. There has been a high level of Building Information Modeling involving design-build subcontractors throughout design development and construction documentation. This is a 3-D program that brings all the trades into the picture to show how they all interact and to detect anything that is out of alignment or which "clashes." It is costly upfront but pays off later, reducing the change orders and mistakes in the field.

In addition, the Sponsor has contracted with a Quality Assurance and Quality Control consultant to review drawings at 100\% design development and 100\% construction documentation milestones.

The Project is six stories and consists of a Type I ground floor concrete podium for common areas and Type IIIA wood frame construction at the upper floors 2-6. The Project will include 145 studio units as well as a two-bedroom manager's unit for a total of 146 units. The units range in size from 309 GSF to 322 GSF (270-279 Net SF). The units have been carefully planned to have adequate space for a full-sized bed and kitchen table. There will be a built-in closet, and a galley kitchen that will include built-in storage, apartment sized refrigerator and 2 burner cook top, and counter space for resident's microwave and other cooking items. Fifteen percent (15\%) of the units (22) will meet Chapter 11B accessibility standards with all remaining units specified to meet Chapter 11A adaptability standards; $5 \%$ of the units (8) will include communication features. The building is served by two elevators. Each residential floor has a trash room with chutes for recycle, trash and compost disposal. Each residential floor has duplicated stacked floor layouts .

Ground floor interior common spaces include community room, laundry room, offices for property management and a supportive services suite area with case management and resident services offices. The ground floor also includes maintenance spaces. All common areas will be accessible.

The bike room provides spaces for 51 bikes. There is no vehicle parking proposed on the site.

The rear courtyard will be developed with areas of planting and permeable paving and landscape furnishings for private gathering areas. The courtyard has been designed with specific needs of the population to be served in mind including a dog relief area and a smoking area located as far as possible from building entries.

The Project will be "all-electric", as required by City Ordinance, with centralized heat pump domestic hot water heating. Pumps will be required for domestic water service and fire protection. The office spaces will have split package units for HVAC with the compressors located on the roof. In the apartment units, heating and cooling will be provided by superefficient and individually operated Packaged Terminal Air Conditioners (PTACs) within each unit. All corridor and bathroom ventilation fans will vent directly to the exterior, and tempered fresh air with MERV 13 filtration for the units and corridors will be provided. The fire protection system will meet NFPA 13 requirements throughout and include a fully monitored fire alarm system. The building will include a closed circuit television monitoring system, card-key access control system and a door monitoring and alarm system.

| Residential SF: | 68,802 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Commercial SF: | - |
| Building Total SF: | $\mathbf{6 8 , 8 0 2}$ |


| UNIT TYPES | Avg Unit SF - <br> This Project | CTCAC-Required <br> Minimum SF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Studio: | 316 | 200 |
| 2BR: | 896 | 700 |
| Do all units meet CTCAC minimum SF? | Y |  |

4.3. Construction Representative's Evaluation. The building design is a straightforward rectangle with double-loaded corridor units and floors exactly stacked for the greatest efficiency. The Site design takes advantage of the unorthodox shape of the lot by placing the outdoor spaces in the non-rectilinear areas. All community amenities community room and kitchen, and laundry - face out and open to the outdoor spaces, providing the best possible spaces tailored for the residents and staff. These studio micro-units - larger than an SRO but smaller than a typical MOHCD PSH or senior studio unit - are well-equipped and laid out for both efficiency and comfort. There is relatively little square footage allotted to circulation: units are arranged on one doubleloaded corridor and the ground floor reception area doubles as circulation.
Much like a factory-built approach, for maximum efficiency, there is one kitchenette design, two resident unit designs (one with bay windows to create rhythm and texture at the street façade), and only two bathroom designs. (The manager's two-bedroom ground floor unit is the exception.) With 146 units in 6 floors and sufficient community and outdoor spaces for the residents, the Site has been fully maximized.

The mechanical/electrical systems proposed - PTAC space cooling and heating systems for the units - are appropriate for the units and cost effective for both construction and operations.

While the Tahanan replication model was a factory-built project, and 1633 Valencia is stick/site-built, this Project is applying a very similar process, with subcontractor designbuild instead of factory design-build. This approach should ensure cost controls by locking in pricing based on the subs' own designs that meet the architect's performance specifications, and by putting the responsibility for constructability, costs goals, and schedule firmly in the general contractor's hands. This approach lends itself to predictability with fewer (if any) change orders and no alterations to design or specifications during construction except as directed by the Owner or those pertaining to utility coordination.

The 1633 Valencia and Tahanan buildings are virtually the same, with the same footprint and similar amenities and outdoor space. The Valencia stick-built units will be the same dimensions as Tahanan's factory-built, and with the exception of the PTAC space conditioning at Valencia, the major systems equipment is the same as Tahanan's. An exception is the location of the transformer: most of San Francisco's urban affordable buildings utilize the underground sidewalk vaults for transformers, as did Tahanan, because of limited space in the buildings. Approvals for the street improvement permit take much longer for underground vaults, so for this Project, as a lesson-learned, the team carved out space inside the building. Also, of late, PGE's lead time for underground transformers has been precarious, and currently double that for pad-mounted transformers. Pad-mounted transformers are also less expensive than the underground equipment and vault. Since the Project team has recently gone through all the City regulatory processes with Tahanan, little should be left to chance about approvals for 1633 Valencia.

Tahanan had some post-occupancy problems with poor elevator function and bathroom floor drainage. The Project team made corrections for the elevators for 1633 Valencia. The problems with drainage pertain specifically to the improper sloping with factorybuilt units, so the same drainage issues will not befall the new Project.

The proposed construction cost of $\$ 56,841,842$ is considered reliable given the replication from Tahanan project and that buy-outs are $95 \%$ complete, and the Project team is in the process of executing a design-build agreement that forecloses on any future escalation. The total construction cost includes the demo of the existing structure and soil hazards mitigations. The Guaranteed Maximum Price does not include a contractor's contingency. Total costs include a $5 \%$ hard cost contingency which is appropriate given the project has been bought out, and Mercy will allow Cahill to share this contingency up to $2 \%$ at Mercy's discretion.

The deep foundation and vertical superstructure addenda have been fully approved by DBI, and Mechanical/Electric/Plumbing addendum is in plan check, through it has been well-reviewed according to the Project team. Fire Service approval is still outstanding with SFFD. PUC Water application is pending and depends on SFFD approvals. The risk of plan check changes affecting costs has been significantly mitigated, but MEPs and Fire are often rough spots with DBI, warranting the plan check contingency.

At \$403,026/unit construction cost, the Project compares favorably to comparable permanent supportive housing and senior developments in the MOHCD portfolio, the average of which is $\$ 572 \mathrm{~K} /$ unit or $30 \%$ more costly per unit. As with the MOHCD portfolio, the Project costs are based on prevailing wages (required by SB35). The square footage cost for 1633 Valencia at $\$ 855 /$ sf is $18 \%$ higher than the comparable MOHCD PSH/senior portfolio, due to the small, dense unit structure. However it is significantly less than 180 Jones, a recently completed close comp. 180 Jones, is 70 units (half PSH) in a 4,850 sf footprint, at $\$ 979 /$ sf. 1633 Valencia packs 146 units into a 11,600 sf footprint at $\$ 855 /$ sf. Like 1633 Valencia, 180 Jones' square foot costs are relatively high because of the small footprint and small units, and the unit costs are relatively low, but costs for this Project are $13 \% /$ sf and $\$ 149 \mathrm{~K}$ or $27 \% /$ unit less than that of 180 Jones (all escalated with Construction Cost Index for San Francisco (CCI)). The efficiency of design and the design-build process with locked in costs appear to deliver a less expensive project that can be approved and built faster.

Tahanan's construction costs, based on the cost certification and escalated to today's dollars with the CCI are $\$ 344 \mathrm{~K} /$ unit ( 146 units) and $\$ 728 /$ sf. The proposed 1633 Valencia costs per unit and square foot are $17 \%$ and $18 \%$ higher, respectively, than Tahanan. On-site stick-built construction versus factory-built may primarily account for this delta. Should the replication be successful, the contingencies built into the costs could potentially be saved to bring the costs more in line with Tahanan.

### 4.4. Commercial Space. N/A

4.5. Service Space. The ground floor services suite includes 8 offices for case management and resident services.
4.6. Interim Use. N/A
4.7. Infrastructure. N/A
4.8. Communications Wiring and Internet Access. 1633 Valencia will comply with the 2021 MOHCD Communications Systems Standards. Units will be equipped with Category 6, coax, and fiber optic cabling. In addition, Sponsor intends to provide wireless access in common areas.
4.9. Public Art Component. N/A. The Project is not required to include a public art component, however, the developer is working with the neighboring building (Harley Davidson) and Precita Eyes Muralists on plans to restore and preserve the historical Chevrolet Mural that was uncovered via the demolition of vacant commercial structures.
4.10. Marketing, Occupancy, and Lease-Up. The population served will be seniors (age 55+) experiencing, or at imminent risk of, homelessness, and referrals will be provided through Coordinated Entry (CE) or a referral process to be approved by HSH. Similar to 1064 Mission Senior, the 55 year plus senior designation allows the Project to serve people experiencing homelessness who are typically physically older than their counterparts due to the health impacts of living on the streets.

HSH has committed to working with project partners to guarantee a neighborhood prioritization process in the referral of unhoused adults from the Mission neighborhood or with ties to the Mission. The Mission neighborhood prioritization will be codified in the Resident Selection Plan. While referrals may come from different Access Points, the Mission neighborhood Access Point will be a key referral source for the Project. HSH , in cooperation with other stakeholders, will ensure that the referral process for the Project is in alignment with the City's strategic and equity goals, provider's ability to make timely referrals, and adherence to federal and state requirements for the City's Coordinated Entry System. HSH is convening a Coordinated Entry Redesign Workgroup with a broad set of stakeholders, including Mercy, and expects that the workgroup will make recommendations to inform changes to Coordinated Entry referrals in the future.

Under the LOSP program, residents will pay $30 \%$ of their income towards rent; based on comparable senior permanent supportive housing projects in Mercy's portfolio, the assumed tenant paid portion of rent is $\$ 225 /$ unit/month.

### 4.11. Relocation. Not applicable.

## 5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consultant Type | Name | SBE/LBE | Outstanding <br> Procurement Issues |
| Architect | David Baker Architects | N | N |
| Landscape Architect | Fletcher Studio | N | N |
| General Contractor | Cahill Contractors | N | N |


| Owner's Rep/Construction <br> Manager | Regent Construction <br> Management | Y | N |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Financial Consultant | CHPC | N | N |
| Community Engagement | DSCS | Y | N |
| Legal | Gubb \& Barshay | N | N |

5.1. Procurement Plan. N/A as there is no City capital funding during construction.
5.2. Opportunities for BIPOC-Led Organizations. The Sponsor partnered with Dolores Street Community Services (DSCS) as the community engagement partner for 1633 Valencia. DSCS will receive a community engagement and service fee of $\$ 300 \mathrm{~K}$ for their work on the Project, which will allow them to further build capacity as a BIPOC-led organization doing work in the Mission-Bernal neighborhoods.
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: Not applicable - no prior City funding.
6.2. Prior Predevelopment Funding: SFHAF provided a predevelopment loan in the amount of up to $\$ 4,926,022$ to get to construction loan closing, of which $\$ 2,987,407$ has been expended. The terms are 3\% simple interest with $0.75 \%$ origination fee. Mercy's line of credit was used to pay one-off expenses which could not go through the lengthier draw process and were paid off immediately upon receipt of the predevelopment loan funds.

### 6.3. Proposed Permanent Financing

6.3.1. Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative: The Borrower proposes to use the following sources to permanently finance the project:

- City Permanent Loan (up to $\$ 41,036,048$ ): City and County of San Francisco, 55 -years, $1 \%$ interest residual receipts loan, made up of 2020 Health and Recovery GO Bond funds. The loan includes a $\$ 2$ million AHP bridge loan, which the Sponsor has committed to apply to in Spring 2025. The bonds have not yet been sold, which will be done by the Office of Public Finance (OPF) before the conversion to permanent financing. The loan will have the standard term of 55 years. $1 \%$ interest is requested to avoid issues with capital accounts at LP exit.
- Permanent Loan ( $\$ 16,000,000$ ): SFHAF Loan, 20 years fully amortizing, 3\% interest rate.
- 4\% Tax Credit Equity (\$27,569,430): National Equity Fund, committed at a price of $\$ 0.965$ per credit.
- GP Capital (\$100): Sponsor contribution
- Tax-exempt Construction Loan (\$42,634,766): While not a permanent source, the construction loan terms are California Bank and Trust, 29 months, $6.350 \%$ interest rate.
- Below-Market SFHAF Construction Loan $(\$ 18,815,937)$ : While not a permanent source, the construction loan terms are SFHAF, 29 months, $4.9 \%$ interest rate.
6.3.2. CDLAC Tax-Exempt Bond Application: On December 6, 2023, CDLAC adopted a resolution to transfer $\$ 42,799,116$ of 2023 State Ceiling on Qualified Private Bonds to CalHFA for the Project, which imposes a construction closing deadline of June 2024.


### 6.5.3 Permanent Uses Evaluation:

| Development Budget |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meets } \\ \text { Standard? } \\ (\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N}) \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit is within standards | Y | $\$ 389 \mathrm{~K} /$ unit is low (nearly $30 \%$ reduction) compared to other similar sized studio units in the pipeline; construction cost of $\$ 855$ / sf is above comparable projects by $18 \%$ and reflects the dense, small unit structure; see Section 4.3 Construction Rep evaluation for further detail on hard cost |
| Construction Hard Cost Contingency is at least $5 \%$ (new construction) or $15 \%$ (rehab) | Y | Hard Cost Contingency is 5\% |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees are within standards | Y | Total Architecture and Engineering Fees (including owner-engineers) total $\$ 3,774,009$, which is approximately $7 \%$ of hard costs (without contingencies). The higher design costs are due to the design-build nature of the project. |
| Construction Management Fees are within standards | Y | 12 months of predevelopment at $\$ 4,200 /$ month, and 23 months of construction at $\$ 6,000 /$ month. |
| Developer Fee is within standards, see also disbursement chart below | Y | The developer fee is sized at $\$ 2.5$ million, under the max allowable developer fee of $\$ 2.660 \mathrm{M}$ for this size project. <br> Under agreement with SFHAF, Mercy is restricting the developer fee to $\$ 2.5$ million to limit the Project cost, as well as putting a greater portion of fee at risk (68\%). <br> PROPOSED: <br> Project management fee: \$780,000 <br> At risk fee: \$1,720,000 <br> Deferred fee: \$0 <br> GP equity: \$100 <br> Commercial fee: \$0 <br> Total fee: $\$ 2,500,000$ |


| Consultant and legal fees are reasonable | Y | Consultant and legal fees are reasonable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entitlement fees are accurately estimated | Y | Yes, based on actuals |
| Construction Loan interest is appropriately sized | Y | Committed construction loan terms are $6.350 \%$ variable rate with a cap for 29 month term for CB\&T Tax-Exempt Construction Loan and $4.9 \%$ fixed rate for 29 month term for SFHAF Construction Loan |
| Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ per standards | N | Soft Cost Contingency is $5.5 \%$, lower than Underwriting Guidelines standard of $10 \%$ given that the design costs under the GC are not included in the soft cost contingency sizing and don't pose risk to the developer (including architecture and subconsultant soft costs) |
| Capitalized Operating Reserves are a minimum of 3 months | Y | Capitalized Operating Reserve is equal to 6 months, common for PSH |
| Furnishings | Y | Furnishings meet underwriting guideline standard for PSH units and common areas |
| Request for lease up and stabilization reserve in amount of $\$ 750 \mathrm{~K}$ as PSH pilot | N | The Project budget includes a $\$ 750 \mathrm{~K}$ capitalized lease up and stabilization reserve as a one-time pilot to cover additional management and maintenance staffing, overtime and security, repair damages and insurance deductibles during lease up and the initial two year stabilization period when residents are adjusting to the new building during and after lease up. This reserve will assist the building to fully lease up on schedule and hit its stabilization period for conversion to permanent financing while addressing the risk of LOSP funding shortfalls in the most challenging initial period of operations. Any remainder of this reserve not needed during the transition period will go to reduce the LOSP A disbursement for the operations' funding amount to be disbursed in January 2029. |

6.5.4 Developer Fee Evaluation: The milestones for the payment of the developer fee to the sponsor are specified below:

| Total Developer Fee: | $\$ 2,500,000$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Management Fee Paid to Date: | $\$ 280,000$ |  |
| Amount of Remaining Project Management <br> Fee: | $\$ 500,000$ |  |


| Amount of Fee at Risk (the "At Risk Fee"): | $\$ 1,720,000$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Amount of Fee Deferred (the "Deferred Fee"): | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Amount of General Partner Equity <br> Contribution (the "GP Equity"): | $\$ 100$ |  |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of <br> Developer Fee remaining and payable for <br> Project Management | Amount Paid <br> at Milestone | Percentage <br> Project Management Fee <br> Acquisition / Construction Loan Closing |
| $50 \%$ Completion | $\$ 150,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| TCO | $\$ 100,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Reach Certificate of Final Completion | $\$ 100,000$ | $12 \%$ |
|  |  | $12 \%$ |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of <br> Developer Fee defined as At Risk Fee | Percentage At Risk Fee |  |
| 100\% lease up and draft cost certification | $\$ 344,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Permanent conversion |  | $\$ 860,000$ |
| Project close-out | $\$ 344,000$ | $50 \%$ |

## 7. PROJECT OPERATIONS (See Attachment I and J for Operating Budget and Proforma)

7.1. Annual Operating Budget. The proposed annual operating budget is $\$ 2,480,895$, or \$16,992 PUPA before reserves, fees and debt service. Operating costs are reasonable for a permanent supportive housing project of this size, and slightly above average of comparable 100\% permanent supportive housing projects escalated to 2026. The operating budget includes lessons learned from Tahanan's first two years of operations, which has needed increased staffing and part time site security for the same size building and population.


Operating costs are subsidized by LOSP program, allowing residents to pay 30\% of their income in rent and a per unit LOSP cost of $\$ 15,415$ PUPA as shown in
column LOSP A. Projected staffing level is high at 15.4 FTE, or 1 FTE per 9 households, including full time desk clerk coverage, vacation \& holiday desk clerk coverage, one Property Manager and two Assistant Property Managers, . 5 FTE Housing Support Specialist (Mercy's position that supports housing stabilization and has been successful at other PSH projects); 3 FTE janitors and 3 maintenance staff. The budget includes a security services contract for 5 hours / day 7 days a week to provide assistance both inside and outside of the building. Within the building, the security service would visit floors and report any incidents to the front desk staff; they would assist with de-escalation when there is an altercation, as well as help secure the front desk area when the desk clerk needs to step away from the desk. They would help block unauthorized guests into the property, which has been an ongoing issue at Tahanan. Outside the building, security would help de-escalate incidents between residents. The request for security is based on the last two years of operations at Tahanan, the same size PSH Project, but budgeted at half of the level implemented at Tahanan.

The staffing plan and proposed security will be further discussed with HSH and MOHCD before the LOSP contract underwriting is taken to Loan Committee in 2025 prior to entering into the LOSP agreement. It is worth noting that while proposed staffing and salary costs are higher than comparable PSH projects, administrative costs are lower than comps, bringing the per unit operating cost in line with average.


The LOSP agreement is requested to be for 19 years to cover the 18 year mortgage term for the SFHAF $\$ 16$ million loan with the first disbursement to be made in January

2027 in the annual amount of $\$ 1,158,969$. (See LOSP operating budget where "LOSP A" column funds operating costs and "LOSP B" funds annual debt payments.)

### 7.2. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation.

| Operating Proforma |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? $(Y / N)$ | Notes |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio is minimum 1.1:1 in Year 1 and stays above 1:1 through Year 17 | N/A | DSCR is not applicable as a $100 \%$ PSH project without debt except for the HAF loan paid through LOSP |
| For TCAC projects: Vacancy rate meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy rate is $5 \%$ of tenant rents, per LOSP policy and MOHCD underwriting guidelines |
| Annual Income Growth is increased at $2.5 \%$ per year or $1 \%$ for LOSP tenant rents | Y | Income escalation factor is $1 \%$ for LOSP units per standard LOSP policy |
| For TCAC projects: 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 $\$ 17 \mathrm{~K}$ per unit per annum before reserves, fees and debt service. Operating costs are reasonable for a permanent supportive housing project of this size, and roughly equivalent to comparable PSH projects trended to 2026. |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is $\$ 140,160$, or \$80 PUPM, which meets the HUD maximum fee for a project with this target population |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | Proposed staffing is rich, and based on the recent experience of operating the same size PSH Project of Tahanan. Proposed staffing and security will be reviewed with final LOSP Contract underwriting prior to executing the LOSP agreement in 2025: <br> 1 FTE Property Manager (PM) <br> 2 FTE Assistant PM .5 FTE HSS <br> 4.9 FTE Front Desk Coverage 3 FTE Janitor <br> 3 FTE Maintenance Tech <br> 1 FTE security services contract for 5 hours / day 7 days / week |


| Asset Management and Partnership <br> Management Fees meet standards | Y | Annual AM Fee is \$26,009/yr; annual PM Fee is <br> $\$ 25,999 / y r ~(i n c l u d e s ~ e s c a l a t i o n ~ t o ~ 2026) . ~$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| For TCAC projects: <br> Replacement Reserve Deposits <br> meet or exceed TCAC minimum <br> standards | Y | Replacement Reserves are \$600 per unit per <br> year, which exceeds MOHCD and State <br> replacement reserve standard, but is warranted <br> for permanent supportive housing units |
| Limited Partnership Asset <br> Management Fee meets standards | Y | \$5,000/year with no escalation |
| MOHCD monitoring fee |  | Included at \$2,500 / year to cover MOHCD AMR <br> review and project monitoring |

7.2.1. Income Restrictions for All Sources. The TCAC and CDLAC AMI restrictions are between $30 \%-60 \%$ TCAC AMI. The City loan will restrict units at $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI. The requirement for the project to serve people who have experienced homelessness and income restrictions will be included the SF Health and Recovery permanent loan documents for as long as the City enters into service and operating subsidy contacts and provides the subsidies. If Mercy is not in default of those contracts, and the LOSP or service funding ends, the Project would stop serving the homeless population and would float up rents to the underlying restricted levels or higher if needed to maintain project feasibility. Existing project reserves would cover this transition.

| NON-LOTTERY | No. of <br> Units | MOHCD | TCAC / Bond |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| STUDIO - [LOSP] | 72 | $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI | $30 \%$ TCAC AMI |
| STUDIO - [LOSP] | 29 | $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI | $50 \%$ TCAC AMI |
| STUDIO - [LOSP] | 44 | $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI | $60 \%$ TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ |  |  |
| STAFF UNITS |  |  |  |
| 2 BR | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 3 . 1 \%}$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 4 6}$ |  |  |
| PROJECT <br> AVERAGE |  | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |  |

7.2.2.MOHCD Restrictions.

| Unit <br> Size | No. of <br> Units | Maximum Income <br> Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio | 145 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |
| 2-BR | 1 | Manager's Unit - not <br> restricted |

The Sponsor requests standard float up language in the event of loss of LOSP or service subsidy to ensure the Project can operate and no longer serve people experiencing homelessness.

### 7.2.3. LOSP Commitment for senior loan repayment.

Senior Permanent Loan Repayment: The Project requests a LOSP portion (LOSP B in the operating budget) at the fixed annual amount of $\$ 1,158,969$ for Mercy to make annual payments on the SFHAF permanent loan starting in January 2027 through January 2044.

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

8.1. Services Plan. Mercy and their support services partner to be selected by HSH will provide supportive services for all senior residents. A preliminary services plan was prepared for the CDLAC / TCAC application, and a more defined services plan will be developed once HSH has selected the services agency through an RFP. The scope of work in the services plan will include:

- outreach, intake and assessment
- case management
- Income or benefits obtainment and maintenance
- housing stability support which includes coordination with property management and eviction prevention
- wellness and emergency safety support, support groups, social events, and organized activities
- all services provided in alignment with housing first, harm reduction, and trauma informed care

Anticipated staffing is as follows:

| Position | FTE | Description |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Senior Case Manager <br> (bilingual) | 7.0 | Provides psychological assessments, <br> supportive counseling, and individualized wrap- <br> around case management. 1:20 Case <br> Management Ratio |
| Resident Services <br> Coordinator II - Mercy <br> (serving all residents) | 1.5 | Coordinates on site services programs, <br> partnerships with outside organizations, and <br> property management. Implements community <br> engagement, health and wellness initiatives, <br> and housing stability. |
| Total FTE | 8.5 |  |

8.2. Services Budget. Services will be funded through a separate contract with HSH; HSH will fund case management services for the LOSP units at a rate of \$576/unit/month (\$1,002,240 / year). The funding amount is based on the new client case management ratio and PUPM HSH allocations. Ratios now at 1:25 as there are no specific behavioral health target population
requirements (such as for MHSA or NPLH) for this site, so additional services dollars are not allocated.


| HSH payment standard | $\$ 576$ | Per unit per month |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | $\$ 1,002,240$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| CM ratio | $1: 25$ |  |
| $\#$ of CMs | 5.8 |  |

8.3. HSH Assessment of Service Plan and Budget. The proposed budget is reasonable and the preliminary services plan meets expectations for the intended target population at this point in planning. HSH will procure the services provider, and then a more detailed services plan will be due in April 2025.
9. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

### 9.1. Proposed Loan/Grant Terms.

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | Up to $\$ 41,036,048$ |
| Loan Term: | 55 years |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2081 (55 years from conversion date) |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Residual Receipts |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $1 \%$ |
| Date Loan Committee approves prior expenses <br> can be paid: | Loan Committee Approval April 5, 2024 |


| Financial Description of Enhanced LOSP Agreement requested |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOSP Amount for operations and debt: | $\$ 80,785,406$ |
| Grant Term: | 19 years |
| Grant Maturity Date: | December 2044 (19 years from start date) |
| LOSP A - Operations: | $\$ 59,923,964$ over 19 year term |
| LOSP B - Annual Debt Service: | $\$ 20,861,442$ over 18 year term with annual <br> debt payments of $\$ 1,158,969$ <br> January 2027 - January 2044 |
|  |  |

### 9.2. Recommended Loan Conditions

1. Sponsor must apply for AHP in CY 2025 round after start of construction, which if awarded, would reduce the amount of the capital loan.
2. Under the proposed design build structure, the GC is responsible for most cost overruns, and there may be savings that will reduce the City loan at permanent conversion.
3. The $\$ 750 \mathrm{~K}$ capitalized lease up and stabilization reserve is a one-time pilot to cover additional management and maintenance staffing, overtime and security, repair damages and insurance deductibles during lease up and the initial two year stabilization period when residents are adjusting to the new building during and after lease up. Any remainder of this reserve not needed after CY 2028 will go to reduce the LOSP A for the operations funding amount to be disbursed in January 2029. Mercy will report on utilization of this reserve in the Project's submittal of Annual Monitoring Reports.
4. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with detailed monthly updates via the MOH Monthly Project Update, including on:
5. Community outreach completed, and
6. Outcomes achieved related to racial equity goals
7. DBI status on the MEPs plan check and any potential new pricing from subs related to plan check
8. Sponsor must provide HSH and MOHCD with an updated services plan in April 2025 after the services contractor has been selected by HSH through a competitive procurement process.
9. While the up to amount of the LOSP contract has been approved for construction closing, Sponsor must submit an updated $1^{\text {st }}$ year operating budget and 20-year cash flow by December 1 before the City's fiscal year in which the project will achieve TCO (FY 2025-26) for Loan Committee review prior to the LOSP contract being executed.
10. Sponsor must provide initial draft tenant selection criteria within 12 months of anticipated TCO.
11. Sponsor must provide quarterly updated response to any letters requesting corrective action.

## 10. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

Daniel Adams, Director
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
[ ] 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

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

## REQUEST FOR PERMANENT LOAN AND LOSP FINANCING FOR 1633 VALENCIA STREET

Adams, Dan (MYR) [Dan.Adams@sfgov.org](mailto:Dan.Adams@sfgov.org)
Tue 4/9/2024 6:45 PM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
Hi Vanessa - I vote yes to approve the above listed request.
Daniel Adams
Director
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco

## 1633 Valencia

Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org)
Tue 4/9/2024 2:30 PM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
I support Mercy Housing request for permanent financing in the amount of up to $\$ 41,036,048$ (including a $\$ 2 \mathrm{M}$ AHP bridge loan) as well as funding through the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) in the amount of $\$ 80,785,406$ over an
18-year LOSP term to support program operations and to service the \$16M SFHAF Innovation loan to create 145 new units of permanent supportive housing at 1633 Valencia.


Salvador Menjivar
Director of Housing
Pronouns: $\mathrm{He} / \mathrm{Him}$
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.

## Request for Permanent Loan and LOSP Financing for 1633 Valencia Street

Slutzkin, Marc (CII) [marc.slutzkin@sfgov.org](mailto:marc.slutzkin@sfgov.org)
Fri 4/5/2024 11:56 AM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
Cc:Ely, Lydia (MYR) [lydia.ely@sfgov.org](mailto:lydia.ely@sfgov.org);Kaslofsky, Thor (CII) [Thor.Kaslofsky@sfgov.org](mailto:Thor.Kaslofsky@sfgov.org);Colomello, Elizabeth (CII) [elizabeth.colomello@sfgov.org](mailto:elizabeth.colomello@sfgov.org)

Hi Vanessa,

I approve the above request on behalf of OCII.

Thanks

Marc


Marc Slutzkin
Deputy Director

- One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
A www.sfocii.org


## REQUEST FOR PERMANENT LOAN AND LOSP FINANCING FOR 1633 VALENCIA STREET

Katz, Bridget (CON) [bridget.katz@sfgov.org](mailto:bridget.katz@sfgov.org)
Fri 4/5/2024 11:57 AM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
Approve, subject to City Attorney and counsel's determination that Health and Recovery GO Bonds can be used for loans

## Bridget Katz

Deputy Director, Office of Public Finance
Controller's Office | City \& County of San Francisco
Office Phone: (415) 554-6240
Cell Phone: (858) 442-7059
E-mail: bridget.katz@sfgov.org

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

| No. | Performance Milestone | Estimated or Actual Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) | 4/8/24 | To be posted 30-days prior to Mayor execution of BOS Resolution |
| 1 | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | 3/21/22 | Execution of Predevelopment Loan Agreement |
| 2. | Site Acquisition | 5/7/24 | SL acquisition 08/2022 |
| 3. | Development Team Selection |  |  |
| a. | Architect | 07/2022 |  |
| b. | General Contractor | 07/2022 |  |
| c. | Owner's Representative | 08/2022 |  |
| d. | Property Manager | 8/1/23 |  |
| e. | Service Provider | 11/2024 | Subject to HSH timing |
| 4. | Design |  |  |
| a. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Estimate | 11/21/22 |  |
| b. | Submittal of Design Development \& Cost Estimate | 8/18/23 |  |
| c. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | 10/13/23 |  |
| d. | Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate (75\%$80 \%$ CDs) | 12/8/23 |  |
| 5. | Commercial Space | N/A |  |
| a. | Commercial Space Plan Submission | N/A |  |
| b. | LOI/s Executed | N/A |  |
| 6. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | SB 35 Application Submission | 12/19/22 |  |
| 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 | 6/2/23 |  |


| b. | Perm Power Application Submission | 6/2/23 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | 12/19/22 |  |
| b. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | 2/15/24 |  |
| c. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | 9/20/23 | Approved 2/16/2024 |
| d. | Addendum \#3 Submitted | 10/13/23 |  |
| e. | Addendum \#4 Submitted | 10/19/23 |  |
| f. | Addendum \#5 Submitted | TBD |  |
| g . | Addendum \#6 Submitted | TBD |  |
| h. | Addendum \#7 Submitted | TBD |  |
| i. | Addendum \#8 Submitted | TBD |  |
| j. | Addendum \#9 Submitted | TBD |  |
| k. | Addendum \#10 Submitted | TBD |  |
| 1. | Addendum \#11 Submitted | TBD |  |
| 9. | Request for Bids Issued | N/A |  |
| 10. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | 3/5/24 |  |
| b. | Final | 4/5/2025 |  |
| 11. | Additional City Financing | N/A |  |
| a. | Preliminary Gap Financing Application | N/A |  |
| b. | Gap Financing Application | N/A |  |
| c. | Preliminary Gap Financing Term Sheet | 12/22/23 |  |
| 12. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | HCD Application | N/A |  |
| b. | Preliminary Construction Financing Term Sheet | 10/17/23 |  |
| c. | AHP Application | Spring 2025 |  |
| d. | CDLAC Application | 9/6/23 |  |
| e. | TCAC Application | 9/6/23 |  |
| f. | LOSP Commitment | 7/26/23 |  |
| g . | LOSP Funding Request | 12/1/2024 |  |


| 13. | Closing |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| a. | Construction Loan Closing | $5 / 13 / 24$ |  |
| b. | Conversion of Construction Loan to Permanent <br> Financing; funding of City loan | $10 / 2026$ |  |
| 14. | Construction |  |  |
| a. | Notice to Proceed | $5 / 14 / 24$ |  |
| b. | Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Cert of <br> Substantial Completion | $12 / 15 / 25$ |  |
| 15. | Marketing/Rent-up |  |  |
| a. | Marketing Plan Submission | $12 / 15 / 24$ |  |
| b. | Commence CES process | $7 / 20 / 25$ |  |
| c. | $95 \%$ Occupancy | $5 / 20 / 26$ |  |
| 16. | Cost Certification/8609 | $2 / 2027$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Attachment B: Borrower Org Chart



## Attachment C: Development Staff Resumes

RAMIE K. DARE

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mercy Housing California, San Francisco, California Senior Housing Developer, May 1997 to Present Developer of affordable rental housing for families, seniors, and people with special needs utilizing 4\% and $9 \%$ tax credits, tax exempt bonds, conventional financing and rental subsidies. Experienced in all aspects of development, including feasibility study, contract negotiation, project management, financing and community acceptance planning. Developments include Bermuda Garden Apartments ( 80 unit rehab), Eden House Apartments ( 116 unit rehab) Marlton Manor (150 unit special needs, rehab), Tolton Court and Montclair Court (26 units urban infill), La Costa Paloma Apartments (180 units inclusionary housing), Carter Terrace (106 family units), $10^{\text {th }}$ and Mission Family Housing (136 high rise family units, mixed use), and $9^{\text {th }}$ and Jessie Senior Housing ( 107 high rise senior units, HUD 202 mixed finance) and Sunnydale HOPE SF (50 acre master planned mixed income community).

CREDO Housing, Inc, Oakland, California
Housing Developer, September 1993 - April 1997
Developer of affordable rental housing in Oakland, Berkeley and unincorporated Alameda County totaling $\$ 19$ million and 273 units. Experience in developing projects financed by low income housing tax credits, tax exempt bond, cities of Oakland and Berkeley, Alameda County, HUD and institutional lenders.

## EDUCATION

University of California Los Angeles
Bachelor of Arts, Urban Studies major, 1991
Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government Master in Public Policy, 1993

Bank of America Leadership Academy
Development Training Institute, 2002

## PROFESSIONAL \& COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Member of Board of Directors of Community Housing Partnership, which develops permanent affordable housing and services for formerly homeless individuals and families in San Francisco, April 2004 to Present.

Co-Chair of EBHO Community Acceptance Strategies Committee to build community acceptance of affordable housing amongst policymakers and the public. Served on EBHO Board of Directors, January 1996 to February 1997.

Member of Board of Directors of Californians for Justice, a statewide organization engaged in community organizing in low-income communities for racial justice, 1995-2001

Clare Murphy<br>33 Southern Heights Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94107<br>Phone: (415) 259-1605 Email: cmurphy @mercyhousing.org

## EDUCATION

## University of Oregon - Eugene, Oregon

Bachelor of Arts: Planning, Public Policy and Non-profit Management Major, June 2015
Economics Minor, June 2015

- Dean's Scholarship \& Dean's List


## EXPERIENCE

| Associate Director - Real Estate Development | November 2022 - Current |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California |  |
| $-\quad 1633$ Valencia Street - Predevelopment |  |
| $-\quad$ Sunnydale Masterplan Development |  |
| $\quad$ Phase 3 Infrastructure - Predevelopment |  |

Project Developer II - Real Estate Development
December 2021 - November 2022
Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California

- 1939 Market Street - Predevelopment
- 1633 Valencia - Predevelopment
- Casa de la Mision - Construction, Close-out
- Bermuda Gardens Renovation - Predevelopment, Construction, Close-out
- Dorothy Day Renovation- Close-out


## Project Developer I - Portfolio Syndication

January 2019 - December 2021
Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California

- Bermuda Gardens Renovation - Predevelopment, Construction
- Dorothy Day Renovation - Predevelopment, Construction
- Francis of Assisi Renovation - Close-out
- Dudley (Elevator Replacement) - Construction, Close-out


## Assistant Project Manager II - Portfolio Syndication <br> March 2018 - January 2019

Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California

- Dorothy Day Renovation - Predevelopment
- Francis of Assisi Renovation - Predevelopment, Construction
- Bennett House Renovation - Predevelopment
- Britton Courts Renovation - Predevelopment, Closing

Assistant Project Manager I - Portfolio Syndication
Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California

- Columbia Park Renovation - Predevelopment, Construction, Close-out
- 111 Jones/Padre Palou Scattered Site Renovation - Predevelopment
- Santa Cruz Scattered Site Renovation - Predevelopment


## Asset Management Intern

Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California
Asset Management Intern
Community Housing Partnership, San Francisco, California
Administrative Intern
San Francisco Housing Action Coalition, San Francisco, California

June - September 2014
July - September 2013
March - May 2010

# Christoper J. Hacnik 

San Francisco Bay Area
Phone: (480) 298-1037 Email: chris.hacnik@mercyhousing.org

## EDUCATION

University of California, Berkeley, College of Environmental Design
Master of City Planning - Housing, Community \& Economic Development
Interdisciplinary Graduate Certificate in Real Estate

## American University, Washington, DC

B.A. History; B.A. Music Performance - Cum Laude

## EXPERIENCE

Project Developer I - Real Estate Development
January 2024 - Present
Mercy Housing, San Francisco, California

- 1633 Valencia - Predevelopment
- $\quad 6007^{\text {th }}$ Street - Construction


## Senior Development Associate

June 2021 - June 2022
The Related Companies of California, Los Angeles, California

- Southwest Village Apartments in San Diego - Construction Loan Closing, Construction
- Chapel Avenue Apartments in Alhambra - Construction Loan Closing, Construction
- 1405 S. Broadway (Alveare Ph I, II, III) - Predevelopment
- Union at Echo Park - Predevelopment
- Acts Cherry Hill Apartments - Construction, Lease-Up


## Development Associate, Affordable Housing Intern

June 2021 - June 2022
The Related Companies of California, San Francisco, California

- Santa Rosa Mendocino Avenue Phase I - Construction Loan Closing
- Santa Rosa Mendocino Avenue Phase II - Predevelopment (Financing), Construction Loan Closing


## Graduate Student Researcher

January 2022 - July 2022
Turner Center for Housing Innovation, UC Berkeley

- Co-Author of "New Pathways to Create More Deeply Affordable Housing: Early Lessons from HUD’s Faircloth-toRAD Program," Terner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley, Published January 31, 2023


## Development Consultant/Intern

September 2021 - December 2021
Housing Authority of the City of Alameda, California

- Advised management staff on federal regulations and underwriting requirements related to the agency's use of underutilized federal rental subsidies under the Public Housing program using HUD's Faircloth-to-RAD Conversion tool


## Business Development \& Marketing Coordinator

February 2020 - January 2021
Reno \& Cavanaugh, PLLC, Washington, DC

## Legal Assistant

May 2018 - January 2020
Reno \& Cavanaugh, PLLC, Washington, DC

- Drafted, reviewed, and finalized real estate contracts for over 60 multifamily affordable housing financial closings involving federal housing programs, preserving 3,474 public housing units nationwide


## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

Mercy Housing California (MHC) will assume asset management duties for 1633 Valencia. Asset Management falls under the National Portfolio Management department of Mercy Housing Inc.

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 Lilli Lew-Hailer, 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 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.

Description of Scope and Range of Duties of Developer's Asset Management Team
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 demonstrate 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 ration will increase but remain within the industry standard.

## Attachment E: Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria

N/A as developer procured under HSH's Chapter 21 emergency powers

## Attachment F: Site Map with amenities

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

## Attachment G: Elevations and Floor Plans



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

## Afirordable Mufifiamily Housing New Construction Cost Comparison - San Francisco



## Attachment I:

## Attachment J: Development Budget



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



## Attachment L: 20-year Operating Proforma

| Total \# Units: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{146}^{146}$ | ${ }_{\substack{145 \\ 10000 \%}}^{\text {10, }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{2026}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Vear }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{2028}^{\text {Year } 3}$ |  |
| Income | anctal | \% annual |  | LOSP. A | LOSP. ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | Total | LOSP. A | LOSP- B | Total | LOSP - A | LOSP - $B$ |  |
| Resisiontial- Tenant Rents |  | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ |  | 39,500 |  | ${ }_{391.500}$ | ${ }^{355445}$ |  | ${ }_{39545}$ | ${ }^{399389}$ |  | ${ }_{399368}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {Residenial }}$ Sosis Payments | na | 4.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ |  | ${ }^{22255309}$ |  | ${ }^{22355.009}$ | ${ }^{23177200}$ |  | ${ }_{2} 2.317201$ | ${ }^{2,4038841}$ |  | ${ }^{2,4098.841}$ |
|  |  | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Paking | 2.5\% | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -LOSP $\mathrm{B}^{\text {P F Funding }}$ | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 0.0\% | Man |  |  |  |  | 1,158989 | ${ }^{1.158 .969}$ |  | 1,58.89 | 158 |
| Supporve Senveses hicome |  | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundra and Vending |  |  |  | ${ }^{8.760}$ |  | 8,760 | 8.979 |  | ${ }_{8.979}$ | 9.203 |  | 9.203 |
| Teenat Charas Miscellaneus Residenial l coome | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | n/a | 2.5\% | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withrawal tom Capitilized Reseneve depositit operating account) Coss | na | n/a |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {1,158, } 69}$ | 3.80 .564 |  | ${ }_{1}^{1,58969}$ |  |
| Vacancy Loss Resisionital - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enereramus manaly per feven Mor | ${ }_{\text {cta }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {2, }}$ | (19,77] |  | (1,7,71) | (19,986) |  | (, 19,980) |
| Vacancy Loss - - Residenial - Tenant Assistance Payments | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ | na |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 2,615,994 |  | ${ }^{2,615,994}$ | 2,70, 284 | 1,159,969 | 3,660,739 | ${ }^{2,782445}$ | 1,159,96 | 3,95,1414 |
| Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Management Fee }}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ | schedule. | (140,100 |  | (10,160 | (145066 |  | (145066 | cot.193 |  |  |
| Management Exp |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{17,93}^{20,9}$ |  |  | ${ }^{178,04}$ |  | ${ }^{178,04}$ |
| Solite esaries | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{\text {3,5\% }}$ | \% $\frac{3.56}{}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{2472055}}^{2045}$ |  | ${ }^{2472055}$ | ${ }_{\text {25 }}^{258857}$ |  | ${ }^{255,587}$ | ${ }^{2648472}$ |  | ${ }^{2648.812}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\frac{224}{1524}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Saaries enenitis Adminitaive |  |  |  | ${ }^{42787}$ |  | 42787 | ${ }^{4228}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4583}$ |  | 45.835 |
| Sub-toal Salaries Benefits |  |  |  | ${ }^{667,06}$ |  | 667,006 | ${ }^{60,351}$ |  |  | 714,54 |  | ${ }^{714,554}$ |
| Advertsing and Mak | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 5.000 |  | 5.000 | ${ }_{5,173}$ |  | 5.755 | ${ }_{5,366}$ |  |  |
| Oficee |  |  |  | 31,000 |  | 31.000 | ${ }_{32088}$ |  | ${ }^{32085}$ | ${ }^{38208}$ |  | 208 |
| Legal Expense-P | ${ }_{3}^{3}{ }^{3}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 15.00 |  | 15.00 | ${ }^{15.53}$ |  | ${ }_{15,525}$ | 16.088 |  | 16.088 |
| Audit xenese |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{11.500}$ |  | ${ }^{11}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{11.903}$ | -12399 |  | (1239 |
|  | ${ }^{3}{ }^{3} 3^{56}$ |  |  |  |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{28000}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{2,277 \\ 9,0,05}}^{2}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {2,5, }}^{2,377}$ |  |  |
| Unilites | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{255000}$ |  | 255000 | ${ }^{268925}$ |  | ${ }^{268,925}$ | ${ }^{273,162}$ |  | ${ }^{275,162}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80.382 |  |  |
| Seever | ${ }^{\text {3.5\% }}$ | ${ }_{\text {j3.5\% }}$ |  | 96.500 |  | 96.500 | ${ }_{9,9878}$ |  |  | 100373 |  | ${ }^{100373}$ |
| Sub-otala Uilites |  |  |  |  |  |  | 441,228 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real Ssale Texes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | \|3.5\% |  | 10000 <br> 88300 <br> 80 |  | $\stackrel{10.0}{ }$ | $\xrightarrow{10.350}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{10,35}$ | 10.722 |  |  |
| Paysol Taxes ${ }^{\text {Miselneous }}$ Taxes, Licenses and Peemits | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musclaneous Taxes, Lienses and Pesmbis.otal Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {9,5,300 }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{9,6,565}^{\text {9,593 }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{102088}^{1020}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {120, }}^{10,088}$ |
| Insurance Property and Lability hsurance | 350 | 350 |  | 295000 |  | ${ }^{265000}$ | ${ }^{274275}$ |  | ${ }^{274275}$ | ${ }^{288875}$ |  | ${ }^{288885}$ |
| Friopery | ${ }^{\text {3,5\% }}$ | ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ 3\% |  | 205000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.05 |
| Workers compensation |  |  |  | 15.000 |  | 15.000 | 15.525 |  | 15.525 | 16.068 |  | 16.068 |
| Sub-total hsurance |  |  |  | 20,000 |  | ${ }^{200,00}$ | ${ }^{29,800}$ |  | 298.00 | ${ }^{29,943}$ |  | ${ }^{29,9,93}$ |
| Maineonace \& Repair |  | .5\% |  | ${ }^{34} 1.688$ |  | ${ }^{341,688}$ | ${ }^{353,847}$ |  |  | ${ }^{366025}$ |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Pay }}$ |  | 50\% |  | ${ }_{\text {Soloon }}$ |  | ${ }^{30} 0000$ | ${ }^{31,50}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {30,0.50 }}$ | ${ }^{32137}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {300, }}$ |
| Contract | ${ }_{3,5 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }_{122,500}^{10}$ |  | ${ }^{122,500}$ | ${ }^{130,928}$ |  | ${ }^{1030298}$ | ${ }^{1385}$ |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{\frac{3.5 \%}{3.5 \%}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{10.300 \\ 151.143}}$ |  |  | ${ }^{156}$ |
|  |  | 5 |  | 20.00 |  | 20.00 | 20,700 |  | 20.70 | 21,425 |  | ${ }^{21,425}$ |
|  | ${ }^{3.5 \% \%}$ |  |  | 000 |  | 25.00 | 25.87 |  | ${ }^{25,875}$ | ${ }^{26,787}$ |  | ${ }^{26,781}$ |
| Sub-otal Mainienance \& Reparir Expenses |  |  |  | 5,220 |  | 5,2 | ${ }_{78,72}$ |  | ${ }^{78,23}$ | ${ }^{87,15}$ |  |  |
| Supporive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  | comem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES |  |  |  | 2,880,995 |  | ${ }^{2.880,985}$ | 2,567,26 |  | $2,568,726$ | 2,657,997 |  | 2,667,597 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | e: Hodeen | asam | arinal |  |
| Girund Lease Base Rent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Deposit |  |  |  | 87,800 |  | 88,600 | ${ }_{\text {8,7,000 }}$ |  | ${ }^{87,600}$ | ${ }_{8}^{8,7,000}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {8, } 8,600}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Resesve 2 D Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reauired Reseve Deposity, Commercial |  |  | Comemel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-otal Reserves G Ground Lease Ease Rentrond Fees |  |  |  | ${ }^{10,600}$ |  | 101,000 | ${ }^{10,600}$ |  | .60 | 101,600 |  | 10,600 |
| TTTAL OPERATING EXPENSESS (w/ Reserves $G$ L Base Rent fon | fees) |  |  | 2,582995 |  | 2,582995 | 2,669,326 |  | 2,669,32 | 2,759,19 |  | 2,759, |
| Net operating income (INCOME Minus op expenses) |  |  |  | 3,499 |  | cis,999 | ${ }^{324988}$ | 1,159,99 | ,191,467 | ${ }_{3,248}$ | 1,159,99 | 1,192,217 |
| DEBT SERVICE/MUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized lo Hard Debt - First Lender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158.969 | 1,1589899 |  | ti, | li,599999 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) <br> Hard Debt - Fourth Lender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial lard Debit serice |  |  | from 'Commercial Up. Buaget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CASH FLOw (NOI minus debt service) |  |  |  | 33,499 |  | 33,999 | ${ }^{32} 2988$ |  |  | ${ }_{3} 3248$ | , 1,564. | ${ }_{\substack{1,15,9,969 \\ 33,24}}^{\text {a }}$ |
| Allocaion of Commercial surpus to LOPS Mon-LOSP Presidua inco |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVAILABLE CASH FLOw |  |  |  | ${ }^{33,499}$ |  | 33,99 | ${ }_{32,988}$ |  |  | ${ }^{33,24}$ |  | ${ }^{33248}$ |
| USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) |  |  | DSCR: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beowwheline Asset Mot tee Uncommon in new frojects, see policy |  |  |  | 2.500 |  |  | 2.500 |  |  | 2.500 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{25999}{5.000}$ |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { 25.999 } \\ 5.000}}{ }$ | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{24.998 \\ 5.000}}$ |  | 24.988 | ${ }^{2 \text { 25.7.48 }}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | Per Motco poicy ra amual icrease |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.000 |
| Oiner Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Noon-amontizing Loan Pmtl- Lender 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dieiered Developoer fee (Ener amt $<=$ Max Fee tom row 131 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PREEEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 33,999 |  |  | ${ }^{32498}$ | - | ${ }^{32498}$ | 33248 | - | ${ }^{33,248}$ |
|  | монСд |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residual Recieits spilit of al lyeas. - Lender/Owner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCD Resilual recelis debt service |  | ${ }^{\text {Dist Sot }}$ |  | cum oeferes ode | eoper fee: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCO Residual Receiois Amount Pue |  |  | Amenemen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipis Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner Distrubutionslicentive Management Fee |  |  | , |  |  | : |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | - |
| Final Balance ( (should be ero) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REPLACEMEET RESERVE- - UNNING BALANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{88,600}{ }$ |  |  |  |
| Repacement Reseeree Inerest RR Running Balance |  |  | aramer |  |  | ${ }^{87,500}$ |  |  | ${ }_{175,20}$ |  |  | ${ }^{262800}$ |
| OPERATMG ReSESVVE- RUNNMG BALANCE |  |  | RF Baancount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance Operating Reserve Deposits |  |  | - |  |  | : |  |  | . |  |  | - |
| Operating Reserve Withdrawals <br> Operating Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OR Running Balance |  | Of Baare | ior $Y$ OP Exps + Deets Sencic |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.0\% |
| OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Deposits <br> Other Resere 1 Withrazals |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Interest <br> Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| other reserve 2- running balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance <br> Other Reserve 2 Deposits |  |  | - |  |  | . |  |  | $:$ |  |  | - |
| Other Resere 2 Withtrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oner heseve 2 Ineersther Required Reserve 2 Rumning Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |








## LOSP FUNDING SCHEDULE

Project Address: 1633 Valencia
Project Start Date: $1 / 1 / 2026$
Exhibit A

| $\begin{gathered} \text { annual } \\ \text { \%age } \\ \text { increase } \\ \text { (uses Full } \\ \text { Year } \end{gathered}$ | Calend | Y Year | Full Year Funding Amount | \# Months to Fund |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Total "LOSP - } \\ \text { B" } \\ \text { Disbursement } \\ \text { for } \\ \text { Calendar Year } \end{array}$ | Total <br> Disbursement for Calendar Year | Estimated Disbursement Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amount) | CY-1 | 2026 | \$2,235,309 | 12 | \$2,235,309 | \$0 | \$2,235,309 | 1/1/2026 |
| 3.66\% | CY-2 | 2027 | \$2,317,201 | 12 | \$2,317,201 | \$1,158,969 | \$3,476,170 | 1/1/2027 |
| 3.74\% | CY-3 | 2028 | \$2,403,841 | 12 | \$2,403,841 | \$1,158,969 | \$3,562,810 | 1/1/2028 |
| 3.73\% | CY-4 | 2029 | \$2,493,604 | 12 | \$2,493,604 | \$1,158,969 | \$3,652,573 | 1/1/2029 |
| 3.73\% | CY-5 | 2030 | \$2,586,604 | 12 | \$2,586,604 | \$1,158,969 | \$3,745,573 | 1/1/2030 |
| 3.72\% | CY-6 | 2031 | \$2,682,953 | 12 | \$2,682,953 | \$1,158,969 | \$3,841,922 | 1/1/2031 |
| 3.69\% | CY-7 | 2032 | \$2,781,925 | 12 | \$2,781,925 | \$1,158,969 | \$3,940,894 | 1/1/2032 |
| 3.72\% | CY-8 | 2033 | \$2,885,304 | 12 | \$2,885,304 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,044,273 | 1/1/2033 |
| 3.71\% | CY-9 | 2034 | \$2,992,399 | 12 | \$2,992,399 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,151,368 | 1/1/2034 |
| 3.71\% | CY-10 | 2035 | \$3,103,341 | 12 | \$3,103,341 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,262,310 | 1/1/2035 |
| 3.70\% | CY-11 | 2036 | \$3,218,264 | 12 | \$3,218,264 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,377,233 | 1/1/2036 |
| 3.70\% | CY-12 | 2037 | \$3,337,310 | 12 | \$3,337,310 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,496,279 | 1/1/2037 |
| 3.67\% | CY-13 | 2038 | \$3,459,644 | 12 | \$3,459,644 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,618,613 | 1/1/2038 |
| 3.69\% | CY-14 | 2039 | \$3,587,345 | 12 | \$3,587,345 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,746,314 | 1/1/2039 |
| 3.69\% | CY-15 | 2040 | \$3,719,618 | 12 | \$3,719,618 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,878,587 | 1/1/2040 |
| 2.52\% | CY-16 | 2041 | \$3,813,484 | 12 | \$3,813,484 | \$1,158,969 | \$4,972,453 | 1/1/2041 |
| 3.69\% | CY-17 | 2042 | \$3,954,322 | 12 | \$3,954,322 | \$1,158,969 | \$5,113,291 | 1/1/2042 |
| 3.69\% | CY-18 | 2043 | \$4,100,200 | 12 | \$4,100,200 | \$1,158,969 | \$5,259,169 | 1/1/2043 |
| 3.69\% | CY-19 | 2044 | \$4,251,296 | 12 | \$4,251,296 | \$1,158,969 | \$5,410,265 | 1/1/2044 |
| 3.64\% | Total "LOSP - A" Amount--> |  |  |  | \$59,923,964 | \$20,861,442 | <--Total "LOSP - B" Amount |  |
|  |  |  | Total Contract Amount: |  |  |  | \$80,785,406 |  |

