## Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee

# San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development <br> Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Controller's Office of Public Finance 

## 1939 Market <br> \$4,000,000 Funding Amount Predevelopment Loan Request

| Evaluation of Request for: | $\$ 4,000,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Committee Date: | November 5, 2021 |
| Prepared By: | Sarah Nusser, Senior Project <br> Manager |
| MOHCD Asset Manager: | Omar Cortez, Asset Manager |
| Sources and Amounts of New Funds | $\$ 2,000,000-$ Housing Trust Fund |
| Recommended: | $\$ 2,000,000-$ CPMC |
|  | Total: $\$ 4,000,000$ <br> Sources and Amounts of Previous City <br> Funds Committed: |
| NOFA/PROGRAM/RFP: | Multisite Request for Qualifications <br> issued on November 30, 2020 |
| Applicant/Sponsor(s) Name: | Mercy Housing California and <br> Openhouse |
|  |  |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Sponsor Information:

| Project Name: | 1939 Market | Sponsor(s): |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Mercy Housing California |
| :--- |
| and Openhouse |

## Project Summary:

Mercy Housing California ("Mercy") and Openhouse (together, the "Sponsor") request \$4MM to finance predevelopment costs for a proposed new construction affordable senior housing development located at 1939 Market (the "Site" or the "Project"), a city-owned parcel at Market Street and Duboce Avenue. The development will be LGBTQ+ affirming and is envisioned to build on an existing LGBTQ+ centered "campus" in San Francisco that includes MOHCD-funded developments on Laguna, the eastern edge of the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District, the San Francisco LGBT Center, the Bob Ross LGBT Senior Center, and the Openhouse Community Center.

The Sponsor applied as co-developers to MOHCD's Multi-site Request for Qualifications (RFQ), issued on November 30, 2020, and was selected to develop the Site. The RFQ did not require respondents to provide a conceptual design, and therefore this request is based on a preliminary concept that is expected to be further refined during the initial design phases. The Project responds to the Consolidated Plan by providing housing opportunities for low-income senior San Franciscans, residents experiencing homelessness, residents living with HIV/AIDS, and by supporting the LGBTQ population.

For feasibility purposes, the base concept presented for 1939 Market is a 9-story mid-rise building with approximately 1,500 sf of ground floor community-serving commercial space. As allowed under SB-35 and the City's Affordable Housing Bonus Program, the Sponsor will explore developing a high-rise building to increase the number of affordable units.

The proposed Project will provide 134 units ( 66 studios, 67 1-bedrooms, and 12 -bedroom), including a twobedroom manager's unit, with 27 units ( $20 \%$ of total units) serving formerly homeless seniors subsidized by the City's Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP), 40 units ( $30 \%$ of total units) serving extremely low-income seniors supported by the City's Senior Operating Subsidy (SOS), 7 units serving Plus Housing seniors, and the remaining serving low-income seniors at 50-55\% Area Median Income ("MOHCD AMI").

Proposed permanent financing includes tax-exempt bonds, 4\% Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program (AHP) funds, Deferred Developer Fee, General Partner Equity, a MOHCD gap Ioan, a State of California Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) loan, and a State of California Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (IIG) grant. Construction is expected to start May 2024 and be completed April 2026.

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | Type I, Midrise | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Stories: | 9 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 0.27 acres / 11,860 sq ft |
| Number of Units: | 134 | Architect: | TBD |
| Total Residential Area: | $87,884 \mathrm{sf}$ | General Contractor: | TBD |
| Total Commercial Area: | $1,500 \mathrm{sf}$ | Property Manager: | Mercy Housing Management <br> Group |


| Total Building Area: | $89,384 \mathrm{sf}$ | Supervisor and District: | Rafael Mandelman, District 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Land Owner: | City \& County of San <br> Francisco |  |  |
| Total Development Cost <br> (TDC): | $\$ 86,033,897$ | Total Acquisition Cost: | $\$ 0$ |
| TDC/unit: | $\$ 642,044$ | TDC less land cost/unit: | $\$ 642,044$ |
| Loan Amount Requested: | $\$ 4,000,000$ | Request Amount / unit: | $\$ 29,850$ |
| HOME Funds? | N | Parking? | N |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- Community Outreach around Entitlements, Programming and Design, Lease Up, and Commercial Space - There are a number of aspects of the Project that will require robust and targeted community outreach in order to achieve the Sponsor's and MOHCD's goals for the project. In particular, these include ensuring the Project design and programming meets the needs of LGBTQ+ seniors, including those most marginalized by race and gender identity; and a marketing strategy that meets MOHCD's marketing requirements and connects with applicants who are LGBTQ+ seniors, Black seniors, senior COP holders, and/or those who hold more than one of these identities. See Section 3, Section 4.4, Section 4.11, and Section 9.2.
- Base Concept Scenario - The 9-story, Type I, 134-unit base concept presented to Loan Committee may change after community feedback and cost efficiency analyses on the Project's development and operating cost. The Sponsor will be outreaching to surrounding neighborhoods about the project proposal, and community engagement and outreach will inform the Project's commercial space programming and inform an acceptable building height. The Sponsors will work with the selected architect, Planning Department, and MOHCD to explore an increase in building height and number of affordable housing units. Please see Section 4.3 and Section 9.2.
- Financing Plan - The proposed financing plan assumes the maximum \$20MM HCD-MHP loan and 4\% LIHTC and tax-exempt bonds. HCD revised MHP guidelines to synchronize with the latest TCAC and CDLAC regulation changes. Furthermore, CDLAC bond allocations are competitive and the Project's estimated score is not currently competitive compared to past awarded projects. The Sponsor will need to track changes to MHP and CDLAC regulations that could impact the maximum MHP request, the Project's income restrictions and cash flow, and the Project's CDLAC bond competitiveness. See Section 6.2, Section 7.5, and Section 9.2.


## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Predevelopment <br> Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD/OCII | $\$ 4,000,000$ | 3 yrs @ 3\% Def (may be <br> consolidated with perm <br> loan at construction <br> closing) | This Request |
| Total | $\$ 4,000,000$ |  |  |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD/OCII | $\$ 31,028,625$ | 57 yrs @ 3\% Res Rec | Not Committed |
| HCD - MHP | $\$ 20,000,000$ | 55 yrs @ .42\% \& 3\% Res | Nec Committed |
| HCD - IIG | $\$ 750,000$ | Grant | Not Committed |
| AHP | $\$ 1,250,000$ | 5 yrs @ 0\% Def | Not Committed |
| Equity | $\$ 24,535,265$ | $\$ 0.98$ per creidt | Not Committed |
| Deferred Developer Fee | $\$ 340,000$ | N/A | Not Committed |
| GP Equity | $\$ 8,130,007$ | N/A | Not Committed |
| Total | $\$ 86,033,897$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 63,638,624$ | $\$ 474,915$ | $\$ 711.97$ |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 11,725,266$ | $\$ 87,502$ | $\$ 131.18$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 10,670,007$ | $\$ 79,627$ | $\$ 119.37$ |
| Total | $\$ 86,033,897$ | $\$ 642,044$ | $\$ 962.52$ |

* The City acquired the site for $\$ 12$ MM in 2020.


## 1. BACKGROUND

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

1939 Market is a .27-acre parcel located in San Francisco's MidMarket/Castro neighborhood. It is improved with a parking lot and a multistory office building. The City acquired the site in 2020, and the building currently has three tenants (see Section 4.7).

In early 2021, Mercy and Openhouse applied for the opportunity to develop the site as senior housing under MOHCD's Multisite RFQ. The Sponsor was selected to develop the site in Summer 2021.
This request for predevelopment financing will allow the Sponsor to begin the community engagement and design process with an architect and consultants, conduct site due diligence, refine construction pricing, and seek financial commitments to bring the project to construction closing and start of construction.

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

City of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) 2020 Multisite RFQ. The Sponsor met the minimum threshold eligibility requirements and was one of two teams to submit qualifications to develop the site. Via a competitive scoring process, the Sponsor was selected as the higher-ranking team, scoring 89 out of 100 points.

### 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 to-be-formed borrowing entity will be Mercy Housing California 109, L.P., with Mercy Housing California 109 LLC as the general partner and Mercy Housing Calwest as the sole member/member there-of, and South of Market Mercy Housing as the initial limited partner. At construction closing, the limited partner will be replaced with the investor limited partner.
1.3.2. Joint Venture Partnership. Mercy and Openhouse have partnered as co-developers for the development of the Project, collaborating on various aspects of the development of the vision and programming. Mercy and Openhouse have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines the roles and responsibilities of each partner. Mercy will take the lead role on the real estate development responsibilities including design, entitlements, engagement of community on development issues, permitting, budget, securing financing and operating subsidies, construction administration, lease-
up, property management, services planning and implementation, and asset management including regulatory and budget compliance. Openhouse will take the lead on the vision concept as an LGBTQ+ affirming senior housing project, providing input on design, community engagement and support for the vision, marketing and outreach to the LGBTQ+ senior community including initial lease-up and re-leasing of vacancies. Mercy will receive $80 \%$ of the developer fee and Openhouse will receive 20\%. Mercy will be in the Project's ownership entity and Openhouse will not.

### 1.1.1. Demographics of Board of Directors, Staff and People Served.

Mercy board and staff:

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

For a breakdown of who Mercy serves by race/ethnicity, see Section
1.1.5.2.

Openhouse board and staff:

|  | Sexual Orientation | Gender Identity | Race |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Board of Directors | Gay: 7 | Transgender: 3 | Asian: 1 |
|  | Lesbian: 7 | M: 8 | African American: 0 |
|  | Bisexual: 1 | F: 6 | White: 8 |
|  |  | GNC: 0 | Latinx: 6 |
| Staff | Gay: 12 | Transgender: 3 | Asian: 4 |
|  | Lesbian: 16 | M: 12 | African American: 3 |
|  | Other: 1 | F: 13 | White: 20 |
|  |  | GNC: 4 | Latinx: 2 |

Who Openhouse serves:


| Racial Background | Number <br> of CM |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| African American/Black | 77 | $8.4 \%$ |
| Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander | 46 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Caucasian/White | 428 | $46.8 \%$ |
| Hispanic/Latino | 60 | $6.6 \%$ |
| Middle Eastern | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Multiracial | 22 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Native American/Indigenous | 12 | $1.3 \%$ |
| Other | 9 | $1.0 \%$ |
| Unknown | 260 | $28.4 \%$ |
| Total | 915 |  |

### 1.1.2. Racial Equity Vision.

Mercy is in the process of creating a Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (REDI) organizational framework which is targeted to be released publicly by the end of 2021. The REDI organizational framework will consist of 6 focus areas:

1. Resident Empowerment
2. Policy, Planning, and Practice
3. Communication and Advocacy
4. Education and Training
5. People and Culture
6. Hiring, Recruitment and Promotion

Openhouse did not provide an organizational racial equity vision or plan.

### 1.1.3. Relevant Experience.

Mercy has deep experience in developing affordable and supportive housing for seniors in San Francisco, having developed 22 seniorserving properties to date ( 1,800 units). Of those 22 properties, six serve seniors who have experienced homelessness and eleven additional properties are considered supportive housing communities (892 units total).

Since 1998, Openhouse has worked with LGBTQ+ seniors and adults with disabilities to provide LGBTQ+-welcoming services that build stronger community connections in San Francisco. Since 2006,

Openhouse has developed, organized and delivered LGBTQ+ agingspecific, structured activities including: individual case management, friendly visitor connections, lifelong learning opportunities, resource and housing navigation, mental and physical health education, emotional support groups, and social and community engagement events. Openhouse now serves over 3,000 LGBTQ+ older adults, adults with disabilities, and caregivers each year.

Mercy and Openhouse have partnered on two previous LGBTQ+ affirming affordable housing developments - 55 Laguna, which completed construction in 2017, and the Marcy Adelman and Jeanette Gurevitch Openhouse Community (at 95 Laguna), which completed construction in 2020. Together these developments attracted a resident pool of 50\% LGBTQ+ identifying residents and approximately $10 \%$ COP holders, with $11 \%$ of the units set aside for seniors living with HIV/AIDS.
1.1.4. Project Management Capacity. 1939 Market is staffed by Mercy's Clare Murphy (40\% FTE) as Project Developer, Ahmed Almahbashi (25\% FTE) as Assistant Project Manager, and with supervision by Sharon Christen, Associate Director of Permanent Supportive Housing, and Barbara Gualco, Regional Director of Development. Openhouse's Matthew Cimino (10\% FTE), Director of Operations, staffs weekly project check-ins with MOHCD and coordinates on facility's needs as they relate to the programming through construction of the project. See individual staff resumes attached.

### 1.1.5. Past Performance.

1.1.5.1. City audits/performance plans. Mercy and Openhouse have no known and outstanding performance issues with respect to current grants administered by MOHCD's Community Development program staff.
1.1.5.2. Marketing/lease-up/operations. Mercy has performed relatively well in recent marketing efforts, but they tend to be understaffed. At their RFQ presentation for 1939 Market, they committed to hiring a local marketing staff person. That has not happened yet. Furthermore, while a successful marketing strategy was ultimately developed by Mercy and Openhouse at 95 Laguna, working with MOHCD, Openhouse was resistant to operating within MOHCD's marketing requirements, including the use of DAHLIA and providing a 21-day marketing period for senior projects. See Section 4.11 for MOCHD's marketing requirements.

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

| Race $\nabla$ | Count ${ }^{\text {F }}$. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian | 2995 | Ethnicity $\nabla$ | Count 0 - |
| White | 1385 | Not-Hispanic or Latino | 5576 |
| Black or African American | 1155 | Hispanic or Latino | 1383 |
| Other | 1092 | Member did not specify | 180 |
| Member Did Not Specify | 212 | Blank | 32. |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific IsI | 173 |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 154 |  |  |
| Blank | 10. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 7176 |  | 7171 |

To date in 2021, there have been 5 evictions in Mercy's 4,217unit portfolio. Mercy does not currently track move out reasons, including evictions, by race at this time.

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

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning: | NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial <br> Transit District) in the 85-X height and bulk district. |
| Maximum units allowed by current <br> zoning (N/A if rehab): | There is no residential density limit in the NCT-3 <br> Zoning District. Density is regulated by the permitted <br> height and bulk, required setbacks, exposure and <br> open space of each development lot. |
| Number of units added or removed <br> (rehab only, if applicable): | N/A |
| Seismic (if applicable): | Seismic Zone 4. PML/SUL are N/A because there are <br> no existing structures on site that will be retained. |
| Soil type: | The soil surface texture hydrologic group is Class D - <br> very slow infiltration rate. Soils are clayey, have a <br> high water table, or are shallow to an impervious <br> layer. <br> Further geotechnical investigation will be conducted <br> during predevelopment. |
| Environmental Review: | The Project will be exempt from CEQA under SB 35. <br> If the Project receives federal funding (ie. Continuum <br> of Care operating subsidy), NEPA review will be <br> required. <br> A Phase I was prepared for the City (1/10/20) by |
| Rincon. A Limited Phase II was completed prior to the |  |
| City's acquisition (12/18/19) by SCS Engineers. See |  |
| detailed results below. |  |


| Adjacent uses (East): | Single family homes, apartment buildings, and retail <br> shops. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjacent uses (West): | Federal government office, Safeway, Whole Foods, <br> pharmacy, bank, and apartment buildings. |
| Neighborhood Amenities within 0.5 <br> miles: | Safeway, Walgreens, Duboce Park, Open house <br> Senior Services, Sutter Hospital, Wells Fargo. |
| Public Transportation within 0.5 miles: | Buses (K,L,N,T,7,22); Light Rail (F,J,M,KT). |
| Article 34: | Not exempt. Will obtain approval before <br> predevelopment loan is executed. |
| Article 38: | Not exempt. |
| Accessibility: | Per updated TCAC minimum building standards, 15\% <br> will be mobility units; 10\% will be accessible for <br> households with hearing and/or visual impairments. <br> All units will be adaptable. Sponsor is working to meet <br> a high-level of universal design standards intended to <br> include additional mobility features within the <br> residential units to ease modification to meet <br> residents' specific needs. |
| Green Building: | TBD |
| Recycled Water: | Exempt. |
| Storm Water Management: | Not Exempt. To be Submitted. |

### 2.1. Description.

Located at the corner of Market Street and Duboce Avenue, the site is 0.27 acres and irregularly shaped. The site is improved with a parking lot and a two-story office building, which currently has three tenants (see Section 4.7).
Demolition of the building is expected to occur after construction close. The site is currently comprised of two separate parcels (006 and 007), which will need to be merged before construction close.
2.2. Zoning. Mercy expects to submit a notice of intent to submit an SB-35 application in April 2022 to start the entitlement process. The SB-35 process is expected to take up to 120 days including the notification period.

### 2.3. Probable Maximum Loss. N/A.

2.4. Local/Federal Environmental Review. The predevelopment budget includes funds for Mercy to have a NEPA conducted on the Project. Mercy expects to pursue this so that the project is best set up to apply for federal Continuum of Care subsidies, which would replace locally-funded LOSP units.

### 2.5. Environmental Issues.

### 2.5.1. Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results.

The Phase I found recognized environmental issues, which are excerpted from the report below:

- Serpentine rock containing Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) underlying the subject property.
- Former use of the subject property as a gasoline station, motorcycle repair, used automobile sales, and postage meter manufacturing.
- Location of the subject property within a Maher Ordinance Area.
- Presence of PCE and benzene exceeding residential Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) underlying the subject property.
The Phase I found that there is one potential environmental concern:
- Long term use of hydraulic elevator onsite.

The limited Phase II focused on evaluating the potential for migration of gasoline-related constituents to the site from releases that may have originated from former fueling operations (ie. a neighboring gas station). The report found benzene to be present above commercial and residential ESLs and PCEs to be present above residential ESLs. The report found other VOCs to be present, but not above commercial or residential ESLs. SCS Engineers also conducted a vapor intrusion analysis to evaluate the risk of these VOCs to occupants of the current office building. The report found that indoor air concentrations of benzene and PCE in the existing building would be at least two orders of magnitude below current ESLs designated for indoor air in commercial buildings and therefore likely does not pose a health and safety risk to building occupants.
The report goes on to indicate that the impact on residential occupants of the above concentrations of benzene and PCE will need to be evaluated at the time of redevelopment. Mercy has reached out to an environmental consultant to investigate any needed mitigations given the above findings.
The predevelopment budget is adequately sized to absorb environmental consultant costs associated with further investigating these conditions. The hard cost estimate in the development budget can also absorb the cost of a passive vapor barrier system, if necessary to mitigate. If an active system is required, it would be more logistically challenging and could add to budgeted costs.

### 2.5.2. Potential/Known Hazards. NOA, benzene, and PCE.

### 2.6. Adjacent uses and neighborhood amenities.

LGBTQ+ senior uses and services in the immediate neighborhood include:
55 Laguna (LGBTQ+ affirming senior housing providing case management services), 65 Laguna (Openhouse's offices and the Bob Ross Senior Center), 75 Laguna (Openhouse's Community Day services with On Lok which will open soon providing meals, services programming,
care, and transportation), 95 Laguna (LGBTQ+ affirming senior housing providing case management services), and the SF LGBT Center.

### 2.7. Green Building.

Per the City's Green Building Code, the Sponsor is required to achieve an all-electric building. Green features will be determined by the Sponsor during predevelopment and will be expected to meet the minimum TCAC Green Building Requirements in addition to City code. The Sponsor will evaluate both LEED and GreenPoint Rated certifications.

## 3. COMMUNITY SUPPORT

### 3.1. Prior Outreach.

While no prior outreach has been conducted for 1939 Market Street todate, Mercy and Openhouse's years of experience working on the UC Laguna Campus redevelopment, as well as Mercy's experience working in Hayes Valley (on 455 Fell as well as Richardson Apartments), and Openhouse's deep roots working with community groups in the Castro, bring considerable knowledge of community interests and relationships to the 1939 Market Street development. Mercy and Openhouse are presently working to create a diverse list of stakeholders comprised of individuals and neighborhood groups, including LGBTQ+ and BIPOC-lead organizations, in the community to obtain comprehensive and varied perspectives on neighborhood and LGBTQ+ needs.
3.2. Future Outreach. Openhouse will take the lead on community outreach, which will begin March 2022 prior to the SB-35 notification process. Mercy and Openhouse are currently developing a community outreach plan.

As a condition of this loan, staff recommends the Sponsor provide a community outreach plan for the entire predevelopment period through construction completion and lease-up. The plan should identify key community stakeholders that will be outreached to and should describe the team's overall community outreach strategy and timeline. It should also include specific outreach strategies and timelines for the following processes and audiences:

- The entitlement process with surrounding neighbors
- The design and programming process with senior LGBTQ+ communities, particular those most marginalized by race and gender identity
- The marketing and lease up process with LGBTQ+ seniors, Black seniors, senior COP holders, and those who hold more than one of these identities
- The commercial space plan with neighbors and LGBTQ+ communities.
3.3. Proposition I. Chapter 79 of the City's Administrative Code requires public noticing (Prop I) for initial City-funding made to any new construction project. The Sponsor will need to complete the noticing process immediately following Loan Committee's approval of this request.


## 4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

4.1. Site Control. The City and County of San Francisco bought the site from the Sheet Metal Workers' Internal Association, Local Union No. 104 on May 27, 2020 for $\$ 12$ MM or $\$ 89,552$ per unit. The City will enter into an Option to Ground Lease with the LP to establish LP site control for financing applications.

### 4.1.1. Proposed Property Ownership Structure

The City will own the land and enter into a long-term ground lease with the LP. The LP will own the improvements.
4.2. Proposed Design. While design work as not yet commenced, 1939 Market is conceptually proposed to be 9 -story, Type I mid-rise. Due to the shape of the site, the building is expected to be a flatiron with a full-height courtyard to the east and an upper story courtyard. The ground floor is expected to include approximately 1,500 square feet of community serving café space (see Section 4.5). As per NCT-3 zoning requirements, the most active groundfloor uses will be along Market Street, and include a café, the residential lobby and the community room. The café is envisioned to be at Market and Duboce, which is the flatiron location and the most visible. Sidewalk seating is expected on Market Street. Along Duboce Street, the ground floor frontage may include utility rooms and the building's bike room, to be accessed from the building interior. The Sponsor proposes no car parking and will request a reduction in the required bike parking ratio (to 1 space / 3 units) due to the building's excellent access to transit and the senior population being served.

| Residential SF: | 87,884 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Commercial SF: | 1,500 |
| Building Total SF: | $\mathbf{8 9 , 3 8 4}$ |

The Sponsor's hard cost budget is based on comps from a Mercy project in predevelopment, The Kelsey Civic Center.

### 4.3. Proposed Rehab Scope. N/A.

### 4.4. Construction Supervisor/Construction Representative's Evaluation.

At this very early stage in the process before an architect has even been hired, there is not much to comment on in terms of design and cost containment. The relatively small size of the lot and it's narrow flat-iron shape are challenging constraints that would tend to lead to an inefficient design, as multiple unit types will likely be needed. The prominent Market

Street location will likely cause a bit more scrutiny from the Planning Department that could also escalate costs. Additionally, the Sponsor will need to study the possibility of stepping back the building on Duboce to avoid the power lines, which appear to have both primary and secondary power, versus the cost of undergrounding the power.
As shown in the Cost Comparison Chart (see Attachment H), the early estimating from the developer is almost exactly on the average across all metrics (per square foot and per bedroom costs) when compared to similarly sized projects with essentially a $1: 1$ bedroom-to-unit ratio. The constraints mentioned above will likely lead to a slightly above-average construction cost.

### 4.5. Commercial Space.

- Space Description. One groundfloor commercial space consisting of approximately 1,500 sf. The space is proposed to be for a communityserving commercial use, specifically a café supporting intergenerational LGBTQ+ relationship-building and socializing. The space concept includes programmed musical acts, events, and speakers while offering inexpensive coffee and snacks. The Sponsor will create a plan for identifying a tenant early on in the predevelopment period. Given current retail and restaurant/café market conditions, the Sponsor should ensure that its Planning approvals allow for maximum flexibility as to the use of the commercial space, specifically allowing for nonprofit use should current market conditions not improve.
- Commercial Leasing Plan. One of the goals of the MOHCD Multisite RFQ is the "provision of ground floor commercial spaces that serve the neighborhood (including the residents of the Project), with specific programming determined through a comprehensive community outreach process where ground floor commercial uses are appropriate and feasible." An outreach plan specific to the commercial space will be a part of the larger Project community outreach plan. The Sponsor anticipates the commercial space use and vision to be an ongoing topic of discussion for interested community members and stakeholders to ensure the uses are appropriately serving the needs of the neighborhood, including future residents of 1939 Market.
- Operating Pro Forma. The Sponsor anticipates the LP master leasing the commercial space to a Sponsor-affiliated commercial entity. Under this structure, $60 \%$ of commercial surplus cash remains with the master commercial tenant, and $40 \%$ of commercial surplus cash is paid to the LP. The Sponsor is projecting the individual commercial tenant to pay $\$ 1 / \mathrm{sf} / \mathrm{mo}$ in rent in addition to reimbursing the master commercial tenant for any Common Area Maintenance charges and the commercial space share of property insurance. This is a below market rate rent, as the tenant is proposing to meet MOHCD's definition of community-serving. The master commercial tenant will
have the following operating expenses to be paid from rent revenues: commercial space management fee and, potentially, replacement reserve deposits.
- Tenant Improvement Build Out. Mercy will work closely with the commercial tenant in designing and fundraising for the tenant-paid tenant improvements.
4.6. Services Space. While the conceptual design is not advanced enough to speak to the amount of services space, specifically, the Sponsor envisions the ground floor to include one or more case management offices, located adjacent to a management office, with the possibility of a private meeting room.
4.7. Interim Use. Currently, there are three (3) office tenants whose leases expire March 2022. There is one vacant space that has interest from one of the existing tenants. All three tenants are interested in staying in the building for an extended period of time. MOHCD and the Real Estate Department are working on potential rent relief for one of the tenants. MOHCD's goal is to keep this building activated and occupied until the start of construction.
4.8. Infrastructure. N/A.
4.9. Communications Wiring and Internet Access. MOHCD Communications Wiring Standards are under review and will be released soon. Costs permitting, the Sponsor will work with the MOHCD Construction Representative to determine the appropriate communications wiring scope that meets MOHCD's standards.
4.10. Public Art Component. The Project's public art requirement calculation is based off $1 \%$ of expected construction cost multiplied by the percent of Project funded by MOHCD. Currently, the Project's development budget includes $\$ 230 \mathrm{~K}$.

| MOHCD Committed | $\$ 31,028,625$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| TDC | $\$ 86,033,897$ |
| Hard Cost Total | $\$ 63,638,624$ |
| Public Art Requirement Calculation |  |
| $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Construction Cost | $\$ 63,638,624$ |
| Percent funded by MOHCD <br> (MOHCD Committed / TDC) |  |
| Public Art Requirement |  |

### 4.11. Marketing, Occupancy, and Lease-Up

Mercy will act as leasing agent and Openhouse will lead marketing and outreach efforts, targeting the senior LGBTQ+ population. The development will be marketed as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Welcoming Senior Housing on MOHCD's DAHLIA portal.

Seniors experiencing homelessness will be referred to the Sponsor by HSH and seniors who are a part of the PLUS Housing Program will be referred to the Sponsor by MOHCD. Seniors eligible for the SOS operating subsidy will apply through the DAHLIA portal.

MOHCD's marketing policies and procedures will be applied to all units. Marketing and occupancy outreach for the Project will be conducted in accordance with all applicable fair housing laws. Units that are not Plus Housing or subsidized by LOSP will be entered in a lottery and subject to San Francisco preferences. The marketing period for the lottery units will be 21 days. Among all eligible applicants, preferences will be observed in the following order:

1. San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Certificate of Preference (COP) Holders,
2. Displaced Tenant Housing Preference (Ellis Act/OMI) Certificate Holders,
3. Neighborhood Resident Preference ( $25 \%$ of lottery units given the expected HCD-MHP funding to the Project), and
4. Live or Work in San Francisco.

As a condition of this loan, the Sponsor will provide a clear marketing strategy for COP holders, in addition to addressing how their marketing is consistent with the Mayor's Racial Equity statement and promotion of positive outcomes for Black/African American San Franciscans.

Finally, it should be noted that the Sponsor has expressed interest in defining "senior" as 55 years old and above, as opposed to 62+. The Sponsor argues that this lower age restriction better targets a diverse range of seniors who have either experienced displacement or are more at risk of displacement. This lower age restriction is possible if the Project does not pursue $9 \%$ tax credits, which is not currently contemplated. This will be an ongoing discussion between the Sponsor and MOHCD.
4.12. Relocation. At the City's acquisition of the site, the existing tenants signed lease amendments, which extended their lease terms, and waived their rights to relocation benefits.
5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Name | SBE/LBE | Outstanding <br> Procurement Issues |  |
| Architect | TBD | TBD | RFQ forthcoming. |
| Landscape Architect | TBD | TBD | RFQ forthcoming. |
| General Contractor | TBD | TBD | RFP forthcoming. |
| Owner's Rep/Construction |  |  |  |
| Manager | TBD | TBD | RFQ currently <br> posted. |


| Financial Consultant | California Housing <br> Partnership Corporation | N | N |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other Consultant | TBD | TBD | RFQ forthcoming. |
| Legal | Gubb \& Barshay LLP | N | N |

5.1. Procurement Plan. CMD has approved Sponsor's procurement plan for Professional/Architecture \& Engineering Services, and Sponsor's goal for procuring Local Business Entity (LBE) contractors is 25\% of total contract value. The Sponsor posted their first professional services RFQ for an Owner's Rep in early October. Once selected, Sponsor will work with their Owner's Rep to post an RFQ for Architecture and Engineering Services.
5.2. Opportunities for BIPOC-Led Organizations. To increase their contracting with BIPOC-led firms, the Sponsor is doing the following:
-Partnering with the San Francisco National Organization of Minority Architects to identify opportunities for participation in projects
-Creating a BIPOC-led or -owned professional firms list for distributing contracting opportunities (this is building on efforts from The Kelsey Civic Center project)
-Including meaningful scoring in RFQ and RFP procurements for professional services (ie. Owner's Rep, Architect and Engineers, and General Contractor) for firms with racial and gender equity-centered initiatives in regards to advancement within the organization, hiring and subcontracting.
6. FINANCING PLAN (See Attachment F for Cost Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments; See Attachment G and H for Sources and Uses)
6.1. Prior MOHCD/OCII Funding: N/A.
6.2. Disbursement Status. Loan Committee approves payment of costs no earlier than July 1, 2021 so long as these costs are deemed acceptable and correspond to the predevelopment budget attached herein.
6.3. Fulfillment of Loan Conditions. N/A.
6.4. Proposed Predevelopment Financing
6.4.1. Predevelopment Sources Evaluation Narrative

The predevelopment budget, totaling $\$ 4 \mathrm{M}$, is solely funded by MOHCD and sized to take the Project through construction closing
6.4.2. Predevelopment Uses Evaluation:

|  | Predevelopment Budget |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets |  |
| Standard? |  |  |
| $(\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N})$ |  |  |$\quad$ Notes $\quad$ $\quad$|  |
| :--- |


| Acquisition Cost is based on <br> appraisal | N/A | Not included. Site is currently owned by <br> the City. Since the City owns there is no <br> property taxes or other holding costs <br> associated with the site budget. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Holding costs are reasonable | N/A | See above. |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees <br> are within standards | Y | Architecture fees during <br> predevelopment total $\$ 2,001,463$, and <br> additional third-party design consultants <br> total $\$ 340,981$. |
| Consultant and legal fees are <br> reasonable | Y | Consultant fees for environmental work, <br> survey, market analysis, utilities, and <br> financial consultant are standard. Legal <br> fees are appropriately small for <br> predevelopment period at $\$ 5,000$. |
| Entitlement fees are accurately <br> estimated | Y total of $\$ 333,492$, broken down as |  |
| follows: |  |  |
| DBI plan review: $\$ 203,244$ |  |  |
| Planning review: $\$ 37,784$ |  |  |
| Demo permit fee: $\$ 20,000$ |  |  |
| Impact fees: $\$ 44,964$ |  |  |
| Mapping/Subdivision: $\$ 12,500$ |  |  |
| MOD plancheck: $\$ 15,000$ |  |  |$|$

### 6.5. Potential Permanent Financing

The permanent financing is being presented to demonstrate the project's overall feasibility but is not intended to be presented for Loan Committee approval at this time.

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

- 4\% Tax Credit Equity ( $\$ 24,535,265$ ): The Sponsor is assuming $\$ 0.98$ per federal credit pricing.
- HCD MHP Loan ( $\$ 20,000,000$ ): The Sponsor is assuming the maximum award amount under MHP. MHP prioritizes providing permanent financing to extremely low-income units at or below 60\% TCAC AMI. HCD is updating their guidelines for MHP as well as 5 other programs (including IIG, mentioned
below) that will be part of HCD's "Super-NOFA" published annually in the spring. MHP is expected to be extremely competitive and will award the highest scoring projects with the lowest tiebreakers based on a project's average AMI of MHP Assisted units. The Sponsor is planning to apply in Spring 2023 and will need to work with MOHCD to structure the project as competitively as possible.
- HCD IIG Grant ( $\$ 750,000$ ): The Sponsor is assuming an IIG grant in the amount of the infrastructure improvement costs associated with the Project.
- MOHCD Loan (\$31,028,625): The estimated MOHCD gap Ioan amount is or $\$ 231,557 /$ unit, which meets the targeted \$250k/unit stated in the Multisite RFQ. Furthermore, the Sponsor may request MOHCD to bridge the AHP loan amount, depending on the timing of the AHP award.
- AHP $(\$ 1,250,000)$ : The Project will be competitive based on the senior population, timing of submitting the application to maximize Project readiness points, and a request just under \$10,000 per unit. The Sponsor will apply for AHP financing in 2023 and if not awarded, will apply again in 2024. The Sponsor will identify the bank sponsor closer to the application date, with a successful award to be disbursed at closing or during construction.
- Deferred Developer Fee ( $\$ 340,000$ ): The Sponsor will take deferred fee in an amount based on $50 \%$ of surplus cash through Year 8.
- General Partner Equity (\$8,130,007): The Sponsor is maximizing General Partner Equity to leverage additional tax credit equity, as encouraged in MOHCD's Developer Fee Policy. Since including the GP equity as a cost may negatively impact the cost per unit, making the project less competitive for a bond allocation, the GP equity may be removed from the budget at a later time (see Section 6.5.2).
- Construction Loan $(\$ 44,456,994)$ : While not a permanent source, the construction loan terms are a 24-month term, with a 4\% interest rate.
6.5.2 CDLAC Tax-Exempt Bond Application: The Sponsor's goal is that the project compete in the ELI/VLI set-aside within the New Construction pool and the Bay Area's geographic set-aside.


## CDLAC Self-Score

| Opportunity Map <br> Resource Level | Moderate Resource |
| :--- | :--- |
| TCAC Housing Type <br> (new construction <br> only) | Senior |


| Bond Allocation <br> Request Amount | $\$ 44,456,994$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Self-Score (out <br> of 120 points) | 119 |
| Tiebreaker Score | $\$ 296,800$ |

The Project will apply to CDLAC-TCAC in September 2023 for a December 2023 allocation with an approximate \$44.5MM tax-exempt bond request, scoring 119 out of 120 total points, with a tiebreaker of $\$ \$ 296,800$ (based off the 2020 tiebreaker calculation). With two opportunities to compete in the New Construction set-asides - ELI/VLI and Bay Area regional pool -- the Project's tiebreaker score is not competitive for an allocation in either pool because Bay Area projects are disadvantaged by higher development cost.

In addition to hard cost interventions to increase competitiveness, the Sponsor may need to reduce the general partner equity contribution from TCAC's maximum developer fee of $15 \%$ eligible basis. Although general partner equity would generate additional eligible basis to increase tax credit equity and lower MOHCD's gap loan, the Project's tax-exempt bond request would consequently have to increase to meet the 50\% test.

### 6.5.3 HOME Funds Narrative. N/A.

6.5.4 Commercial Space Sources and Uses Narrative: The Sponsor is proposing the commercial space to be leased by a Community Serving Commercial Use. As commercial space planning evolves, MOHCD will evaluate whether the proposed tenant meets this definition. Assuming it does, MOHCD will invest in the warm shell build out of the commercial space per MOHCD's Commercial Underwriting Guidelines. The Sponsor anticipates a very small percentage of the hard costs not being included in eligible basis as a result of being for commercial use.
6.5.2. Permanent Uses Evaluation:

| Underwriting Standard | Development Budget <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard Cost per unit is within |  |  |
| standards |  |  |$\quad$ Y $\quad$ \$474,915/unit and \$712/sf


| Construction Management Fees are <br> within standards | Y | Assumes two years of preconstruction <br> Owner's Rep services at $\$ 84,000$ and <br> two years of construction services at <br> $\$ 91,000$. |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Developer Fee is within standards, <br> see also disbursement chart below | Y | Project management fee: $\$ 1,100,000$ <br> At risk fee: $\$ 1,100,000$ <br> Deferred fee: $\$ 340,000$ <br> GP equity: $\$ 8,130,007$ <br> Total fee: $\$ 10,670,007$ |
| Total soft costs fees are reasonable | Y | $\$ 167,129 /$ unit and $\$ 251 /$ sf, which is <br> around the average for comparable <br> projects. |
| Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ per <br> standards | Y | Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ |
| Capitalized Operating Reserves are <br> a minimum of 3 months | Y | Capitalized Operating Reserve is equal <br> to 6 months. To be re-visiting based on <br> funding requirements. |

6.5.4 Developer Fee Evaluation: The proposed developer fee falls within the requirements of MOHCD's Developer Fee Policy and also meets HCD's developer fee maximums, which are more restrictive than MOHCD's. The milestones for the payment of the developer fee to the Sponsor are specified below:

| Total Developer Fee: | $\$ 10,670,007$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Management Fee Paid to Date: | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Amount of Remaining Project Management <br> Fee: | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| Amount of Fee at Risk (the "At Risk Fee"): | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| Amount of Commercial Space Developer Fee <br> (the "Commercial Fee"): | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Amount of Fee Deferred (the "Deferred Fee"): | $\$ 340,000$ |  |
| Amount of General Partner Equity <br> Contribution (the "GP Equity"): | $\$ 8,130,007$ | $10 \%$ |
| 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 |
| At closing of initial predevelopment loan* | $\$ 165,000$ | $10 \%$ |
| At submittal of MOHCD-approved <br> Community Outreach Plan* | $\$ 110,000$ | $10 \%$ |
| Submission of HCD funding application* | $\$ 110,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Submission of joint CDLAC and TCAC* <br> application | $\$ 110,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Construction close | $\$ 220,000$ | $10 \%$ |
| At Temporary Certificate of Occupancy |  | $\$ 220,000$ |
| Project close-out | $\$ 110,000$ | Percentage At Risk Fee |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of <br> Developer Fee defined as At Risk Fee |  |  |


| $100 \%$ lease up and draft cost certification | $\$ 220,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Permanent conversion | $\$ 550,000$ | $50 \%$ |
| Project close-out | $\$ 330,000$ | $30 \%$ |

*This fee must be split 50/50 between Mercy and Openhouse per MOHCD's Developer Fee Policy.
7. PROJECT OPERATIONS (See Attachment I and J for Operating Budget and Proforma)
7.1. Annual Operating Budget. Please note that the annual operating budget presented is to demonstrate the project's overall feasibility but is not intended for Loan Committee approval at this time.
On the revenue side, the proposed Project will receive a 15 -year LOSP contract for 27 LOSP units ( $\$ 11,448 /$ unit in Year 1) and a 15 -year SOS contract for 40 SOS units (a $\$ 479,520$ building subsidy in Year 1). Otherwise, tenant rents at a range of AMIs will support building operations, in addition to small amounts of revenue from building laundry and $40 \%$ of commercial surplus cash (about $\$ 7,200$ in Year 1, assuming full occupancy).
Operating expenses are almost entirely divided between non-LOSP and LOSP units proportionate to percentage of total units. There are small deviations to this within Legal Expenses and Electricity expenses. The most significant operating cost driver is the proposal to provide 24/7 front desk coverage (see Section 9.2).

### 7.2. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation.

| Underwriting Standard | Operating Proforma <br> Seets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio is <br> minimum 1.1:1 in Year 1 and stays <br> above 1:1 through Year 17 | Y | The proposed Project does not <br> leverage debt. Cash flow stays positive <br> through Year 20. |
| For TCAC projects: Vacancy rate <br> meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy rate is 5\% |$|$| For non-TCAC existing |
| :--- |
| projects: Vacancy rate is based on |
| project's historical actuals |$\quad$| Vals |
| :--- |


| Annual Operating Expense escalation is based on project's historical actuals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base year operating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | Y | Total Operating Expenses are \$13,250 per unit, including ground lease base rent, replacement reserve deposits, and bond monitoring fee |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is $\$ 102,912$ or $\$ 64$ PUPM. |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | Proposed staffing, includes: <br> 1 FTE Senior Property Manager (PM) <br> .5 FTE Assistant PM <br> 4.5 FTE Front Desk Coverage <br> 1 FTE Maintenance Manager <br> 1 FTE Maintenance Tech 2 FTE Janitors |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Annual AM Fee is $\$ 23,460 / \mathrm{yr}$ Annual PM Fee is $\$ 23,450 / \mathrm{yr}$ |
| For TCAC projects: <br> Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or exceed TCAC minimum standards <br> For non-TCAC existing projects: Replacement Reserve Deposits meet project needs based on CNA | Y | Replacement Reserves are $\$ 500$ per unit per year |
| Limited Partnership Asset Management Fee meets standards | Y | \$5,000/year with no escalation |

7.3. Staffing Summary. Staffing will be further evaluated during predevelopment as the project size and design are developed.
7.4. Capital Needs Assessment \& Replacement Reserve Analysis. N/A.
7.5. Income Restrictions for All Sources.

| UNIT SIZE |  | MAXIMUM INCOME LEVEL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NON-LOTTERY | No. of Units | MOHCD | TCAC | HCD |
| Studio - LOSP | 13 | 30\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| 1 BR - LOSP | 14 | 30\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| Studio - PLUS | 4 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| 1 BR - PLUS | 3 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | 34 |  |  |  |
| LOTTERY |  |  |  |  |
| Studio - SOS | 10 | 15\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| Studio -SOS | 10 | 25\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| Studio | 19 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| Studio | 10 | 55\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | 49 |  |  |  |
| 1 BR - SOS | 10 | 15\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| 1 BR - SOS | 10 | 25\% MOHCD AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI |
| 1 BR | 30 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI |
| Sub-Total | 50 |  |  |  |
| STAFF UNITS |  |  |  |  |
| 2 BR | 1 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 134 |  |  |  |
| PROJECT AVERAGE |  | 37\% MOHCD AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI | 35\% TCAC AMI |
| AVERAGE FOR LOTTERY UNITS ONLY |  | 36\% MOHCD AMI | 39\% TCAC AMI | 34\% TCAC AMI |

### 7.6. MOHCD Restrictions.

| Unit <br> Size | No. of <br> Units | Maximum Income <br> Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio | 10 | $15 \%$ of Median Income |
| Studio | 10 | $25 \%$ of Median Income |
| Studio | 13 | $30 \%$ of Median Income |
| Studio | 23 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |
| Studio | 10 | $55 \%$ of Median Income |
| 1 BR | 10 | $15 \%$ of Median Income |
| 1 BR | 10 | $25 \%$ of Median Income |
| 1 BR | 14 | $30 \%$ of Median Income |
| 1 BR | 33 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |
| 2 BR | 1 | Manager's Unit |

If the LOSP or SOS subsidies are reduced or terminated at no fault of the Sponsor, rent levels may rise to cover debt service and operations to breakeven, and up to a maximum of $60 \%$ AMI as defined by TCAC to the extent necessary to maintain financial feasibility, except where further limited due to restrictions of other funding agencies.

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

### 8.1. Services Plan.

Mercy Housing and Openhouse will offer permanent housing, health, economic and social support that aims to allow residents to successfully remain in their homes, and to age in place with dignity and choice. Health service coordination will be provided to all residents, offering the following services: basic health \& needs assessments, ADL support \& screening, health benefit acquisition, health education \& risk reduction, physical activities, access to food, wellbeing checks, transition planning, and linkages to preventative and behavioral health care.

The Sponsor proposes to staff services for the building with 1 FTE Resident Services Coordinator (RSC) for the 107 general population units and 1.34 FTE Case Manager for the 27 LOSP units. The latter is a staffing ratio of 1 to 20 , per the requirements of the Multisite RFQ.

Openhouse will provide 1.34 FTE case management staffing and Mercy will provide 1 FTE RSC staffing, replicating the services staffing models at 55 and 95 Laguna. Case management will focus on supporting individual needs, with special attention to the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ seniors, while the RSC will focus on delivering and overseeing building-wide programming, supporting engagement with Openhouse staff, and ensuring services and linkages are offered to residents in a culturally competent manner.

While not included in the current budget, the Sponsor has recently added a partial FTE Housing Support Specialist (HSS) position to their existing permanent supportive housing developments. The purpose of the HSS is to provide system-led interventions that support residents in maintaining housing stability, with a focus on implementing equitable policies and practices and utilizing restorative justice (rather than punitive) approaches to lease violations. The inclusion of this position in this Project budget will be an ongoing conversation between the Sponsor and MOHCD.

### 8.2. Services Budget.

The 1 FTE RSC will be funded from the operating budget, which includes $\$ 90,000$ for RSC staffing in Year 1. This conforms to MOHCD's Underwriting Guidelines. The 1.34 FTE Case Management will be funded through a separate services contract between the Sponsor and HSH. The Project will receive HSH's Tier 5 annual services funding level, which is $\$ 5,711$ /unit or \$154,197 total.

### 8.3. HSH Assessment of Service Plan and Budget.

The MOHCD Project Manager has begun to discuss the Project with Ali Shlageter, HSH Supportive Housing Team Supervisor, and has confirmed the services funding tier for the project. Per the Loan Conditions below, MOHCD, HSH, and the Sponsor will meet early in the predevelopment period to further discuss staffing model and other LOSP planning concerns.
9. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

### 9.1. Proposed Loan/Grant Terms

Financial Description of Proposed Loan

| Loan Amount: | $\$ 4,000,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Term: | 3 years (note: may be consolidated with 57- <br> year term permanent loan at construction <br> closing) |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2024 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Deferred |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $3 \%$ |
| Date Loan Committee approves prior <br> expenses can be paid: | July 1, 2021 |

### 9.2. Recommended Loan Conditions

## During Predevelopment:

- Sponsor must provide MOHCD with detailed monthly updates on Community Outreach completed, outcomes achieved related to racial equity goals, and commercial-use programming (this may be included in the standard MOHCD monthly report form).
- Sponsor to work with MOHCD and HSH to establish the number of LOSP units at the Project, the LOSP budget, LOSP unit income restrictions, building staffing model, and services plan and budget.
- Sponsor to work with MOHCD to maximize competitiveness for HCD programs and CDLAC/CTCAC while meeting the goals of the Project.

By December 31, 2021:

- Sponsor must provide a community outreach plan that meets all of the requirements outlined in Section 3.2.

Prior to Site Permit Submittal:

- Sponsor must submit application to the Planning Department for SB35 and Site Permit review.
- Sponsor must submit a preliminary commercial space plan, commercial financial assumptions, and commercial development timeline for MOHCD review and approval.

Prior to Preliminary Gap Request for the Project's MHP and CDLACTCAC Application:

- Sponsor must receive approval from MOHCD and HSH on the number of LOSP units at the Project, the income restrictions for MHP, the building staffing model, and the service plan for the LOSP units.

Prior to Gap Loan Request:

- Sponsor must provide operating and development budgets that meet MOHCD underwriting guidelines and commercial space policy requirements.
- Sponsor must: a) provide for MOHCD review of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for equity investors and lenders before it is finalized and distributed; b) provide for MOHCD review of all raw financial data from developer or financial consultant prior to selection; c) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all selected investors and lenders; and, d) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all Letters of Intent from financial partners.
- Sponsor must provide an executed Letter of Intent (LOI) with the neighborhood serving commercial tenant, a commercial development timeline, and a preliminary tenant improvement plan for MOHCD review and approval.

Prior to Marketing \& Lease Up:

- Mercy must make good on their commitment to hire a local staff person dedicated to marketing and lease up.
- Sponsor must provide initial draft marketing plan that meets all MOHCD marketing requirements within 12 months of anticipated

TCO, including outlining the affirmative steps they will take to market the project to the City's preference program participants, including COP Holders, Displaced Tenants, and Neighborhood Residents, as well as how the marketing is consistent with the Mayor's Racial Equity statement and promotion of positive outcomes for African American San Franciscans.

- Sponsor must submit an updated $1^{\text {st }}$ year operating budget and 20year cash flow - if any changes have occurred - by November $1^{\text {st }}$ before the year the project will achieve TCO so that MOHCD may request the LOSP subsidy.
- Sponsor must enter into a services contract with HSH at least 3 months prior to TCO.


## 10.LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

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

Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Sally Oerth, Interim 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
F. Site Map with amenities
G. Elevations and Floor Plans, if available
H. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments
I. Predevelopment Budget
J. Development Budget
K. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget
L. 20-year Operating Pro Forma

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Ely, Lydia (MYR) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, November 14, 2021 1:27 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Subject: | 11/5/21 Loan Committte - 1939 Market |

Dear Rosie,
I approve of the predevelopment loan for 1939 Market presented to the Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee on $111 / 5 / 21$.

Thank you,
Lydia

Lydia Ely
Deputy- Housing
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Work from home: (415) 2252936
** My work hours may not be your work hours. Please do not feel obligated to respond to my email if you receive it outside of your regular work hours. **

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, November 8, 2021 2:26 PM |
| To: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Cc: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Subject: | 1939 Market Street |

I approve the request for predevelopment funds in the amount of \$4,000,000 for 1939 Market Street proposed 134 units of housing.

Best,
salvador


Salvador Menjivar
Director of Housing
Pronouns: He/Him
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org | 415-308-2843

Learn: 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.

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Oerth, Sally (CII) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, November 5, 2021 11:34 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Nusser, Sarah (MYR) |
| Subject: | 1939 Market predev loan - 11.5.21 Loan Committee |

I approve the predevelopment loan request for the 1939 Market St project, as presented at the 11.5.21 Loan Committee

office of
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT
and INFRASTRUCTURE
OCII
Sally Oerth
Interim Executive Director
P One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
, 415.749.2588
ก www.sfocii.org

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From:<br>Sent:<br>Katz, Bridget (CON)<br>To:<br>Subject:<br>Friday, November 5, 2021 11:30 AM<br>Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)<br>1939 Market

Approve

## Bridget Katz

Development Finance Specialist, 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

| No. | Performance Milestone | Estimated or Actual Date | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) |  |  |
| 1 | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | 11/5/21 |  |
| 2. | Site Acquisition | 5/2020 |  |
| 3. | Development Team Selection |  |  |
| a. | Architect | 11/2021 |  |
| b. | General Contractor | 12/2021 |  |
| c. | Owner's Representative | 11/2021 |  |
| d. | Property Manager | 2/2021 |  |
| e. | Service Provider | 2/2021 |  |
| 4. | Design |  |  |
| a. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Estimate | 3/2022 |  |
| b. | Submittal of Design Development \& Cost Estimate | 4/2022 |  |
| c. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | 9/2022 |  |
| d. | Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate (75\%- $80 \%$ CDs) | 1/2023 |  |
| 5. | Commercial Space |  |  |
| a. | Commercial Space Plan Submission | 7/2022 |  |
| b. | LOI/s Executed | 11/2023 |  |
| 6. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | SB 35 Application Submission | 4/2022 |  |
| b. | CEQA Environ Review Submission | NA |  |
| c. | NEPA Environ Review Submission | TBD |  |
| d. | CUP/PUD/Variances Submission | NA |  |
| 7. | PUC/PG\&E |  |  |
| a. | Temp Power Application Submission | 7/2022 |  |
| b. | Perm Power Application Submission | 7/2022 |  |
| 8. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | 7/2022 |  |
| b. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | 2/2023 |  |


| c. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | $\underline{2 / 2023}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. | Request for Bids Issued | 2/2023 |  |
| 10. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | 5/2022 |  |
| b. | Final | 5/2023 |  |
| 11. | Additional City Financing |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary Gap Financing Application | 10/2022 |  |
| b. | Gap Financing Application | 11/2023 |  |
| 12. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | HCD Application | 4/2023 |  |
| b. | Construction Financing RFP | 10/2023 |  |
| c. | AHP Application | TBD |  |
| d. | CDLAC Application | 9/2023 |  |
| e. | TCAC Application | 9/2023 |  |
| f. | Other Financing Application | TBD |  |
| g . | LOSP Funding Request | $\underline{7 / 2023}$ |  |
| 13. | Closing |  |  |
| a. | Construction Loan Closing | 5/2024 |  |
| b. | Conversion of Construction Loan to Permanent Financing | 5/2026 |  |
| 14. | Construction |  |  |
| a. | Notice to Proceed | 5/2024 |  |
| b. | Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Cert of Substantial Completion | 4/2026 |  |
| 15. | Marketing/Rent-up |  |  |
| a. | Marketing Plan Submission | 3/2025 |  |
| b. | Commence Marketing | 6/2025 |  |
| c. | 95\% Occupancy | 6/2026 |  |
| 16. | Cost Certification/8609 | 1/2027 |  |
| 17. | Close Out MOH/OCII Loan(s) | 3/2027 |  |

## Attachment B: Borrower Org Chart



## Attachment C: Development Staff Resumes

Clare Murphy, Project Developer has been part of the Mercy Housing development team for nearly 7 years. Clare has completed several occupied renovation projects including two senior buildings and most recently managed the completion of a new construction supportive senior building located in San Francisco's Mission District. Clare is currently managing the development of two projects in San Francisco in addition to the completion of an occupied rehabilitation in Alameda County.

Ahmed Almahbashi, Assistant Project Manager will be supporting project manager in securing predevelopment financing and assist in all phases of development for this project. Before Mercy, Ahmed completed a year of experience with a non-profit housing developer working as an Assistant Project Manager on new construction projects.

Sharon Christen, Associate Director of Permanent Supportive Housing, has been part of the Mercy Housing development team for nearly 20 years. Sharon supports MHC's growing development portfolio of supportive housing projects, and project managed the first two modular supportive housing communities in San Francisco. She also worked closely with Openhouse on construction and marketing/lease-up for 55 Laguna.

Barbara Gualco, Regional Director of Development, serves as MHC's Director of Development. Barbara has been with MHC since its founding and has directly overseen the completion of over 1,000 units. Barbara is particularly adept at structuring complex deals serving special needs populations and long-term ground leases. With the support of two Associate Directors, Barbara is currently supervising the development of ten projects in San Francisco.

Dr. Karyn Skultety, Executive Director, has been leading Openhouse for 4 years and has over 20 years of experience in aging services and senior housing experience. Karyn oversaw the opening of the buildings in the Mercy/Openhouse Laguna Project and ensured a successful development, lease-up and ongoing service model was created for LGBTQ+ seniors. Although Karyn recently announced she will be leaving Openhouse in May of 2021, the Openhouse Board is steeped in housing development and aging services expertise and has already begun a search for the new Executive Director. Karyn and the Openhouse Board are working closely with Mercy Housing on a strong leadership transition for our existing partnership buildings and the plans for expansion.
Michelle Alcedo, Director of Programs, is responsible for all programs and services that Openhouse provides for LGBTQ+ seniors. She has been with the organization for over 13 years and was integral in the creation of the Mercy/Openhouse partnership and development, lease-up and service model at 55 and 95 Laguna. Michelle has led Openhouse's growth in programs over the past ten years and now oversees multiple programs and over 20 direct service staff. She also created the curriculum that is now utilized nation-wide in improving senior service providers skills in serving LGBTQ+ seniors.

Matthew Cimino, Director of Operations is responsible for finance, operations, human resources, information technology and facilities at Openhouse. He has been at Openhouse for almost 10 years and ensures that Openhouse programs have high quality infrastructure and support to ensure they are run efficiently and effectively. He oversaw the construction of the Openhouse service spaces at 65 and 75 Laguna and coordinates all facilities/construction needs with Mercy staff.

## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

Mercy Housing California (MHC) will assume asset management duties for 1939 Market Street. Asset Management falls under the National Portfolio Management department of Mercy Housing Inc, which is led by Senior Vice President Melissa Clayton.

Total Number of Projects and Average Number of Units Per Project Currently in Developer's Asset Management Portfolio
California represents the largest portion of the portfolio with 154 operating properties across the state; 53 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 Director of Asset Management at Mercy Housing where she has worked for the past 20 years, 8 of which in the Asset Management Department, and is responsible for a portfolio of real estate assets serving families, seniors, and special needs individuals. She leads a team of five Asset Managers, four in San Francisco, one in Sacramento. Two Asset Management Analysts and one Commercial Asset Management Analyst based in the National Office in Denver, CO, and one Commercial Asset Manager based in San Francisco are supporting Yelena's team. In addition, there are two Asset Managers overseeing other regions in CA and one Capital Project Investment Manager, reporting directly to Melissa Clayton.
Yelena is located in the San Francisco office and interfaces directly with Doug Shoemaker, President of Mercy Housing California (MHC), and Jennifer Dolin, Vice President of Operations of MHC. Yelena and her team act as Mercy Housing's representatives in relation to the physical and financial status of each asset and protect its financial health and long-term viability.
Mercy's portfolio management also includes Transaction Team comprised of 2 staff devoted to other specialized needs such as the Year 15 buy out and the refinance of properties.

All positions are currently filled and they are all full time. The breakdown of the Bay Area asset management staff positions is as follows:
(1) Director 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 1939 Market 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 154 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.

## Attachment E: Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria

## MINIMUM EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS

Respondents must meet the following minimum development team characteristics, experience, and capacity requirements in order to qualify to be scored and ranked under this RFQ. For Minimum Qualifications for respondents applying for $100 \%$ housing for homeless adults please refer to Sections III.D and IV.C.

Racial Equity Capacity: The proposed Development team must document its capacity to successfully plan, design, and develop racial equity strategies that will lower barriers to obtaining quality affordable housing for communities of color through employment of staff with appropriate experience and capacity, contracted services, and/or collaboration with other organizations. Respondents should submit demographic data of the Boards of Directors of member organizations of the Development Team and of the staff of the various organizations that make up the respondent team.

## Minimum Development Team Characteristics

The proposed development team must include members able to work with MOHCD to create developments that are responsive to populations disproportionately impacted by systemic racism; implement a culturally competent approach throughout the development process; align the development program with City policies on anti-displacement, racially inclusive communities, and creation of stable housing for vulnerable populations; and create opportunities for Black- and Brown-led developers to be competitive within the RFQ process.

The proposed Development Team must include:

- At least one San Francisco-based non-profit development entity whose mission includes the development of affordable housing in low-income communities with experience developing housing for the identified priority populations (such as Certificate of Preference Holders, displaced tenants, neighborhood residents, San Francisco residents, seniors, families, Plus Housing waitlist households and/or formerly homeless households) acting either as sole developer or as a partner in a joint venture, or joint-venture partner, defined as a nonprofit organization;
- A property owner entity with experience owning housing for low-income communities, including for priority populations (such as COP Holders, displaced tenants, neighborhood residents, San Francisco residents, seniors, families, Plus Housing waitlist households and/or formerly homeless households);
- A property management entity with experience managing housing for low-income communities, including for priority populations (such as COP Holders, displaced tenants, neighborhood residents, San Francisco residents, seniors, families, Plus Housing waitlist households and/or formerly homeless households);
- At least one services-providing entity with experience providing services appropriate for the intended target population(s) of each site. Letters of Intent or Memoranda of Understanding from service providers and property management entities that are not affiliated with the developer must be submitted with the application.


## Minimum Development Team Experience

Minimum experience must be demonstrated by identifying specific Qualifying Projects in which team members have participated, as further described below. The proposed Development Team must submit Attachment 4 - Qualifying Project Form, to document how the Qualifying Project
characteristics meet each of the experience categories below (developer, owner, property manager, service provider.)

To demonstrate the minimum required development team experience, each team should submit one project for each experience category. When appropriate, teams may submit the same project as evidence of experience across multiple experience categories or may use different projects to demonstrate experience across categories. In all cases, no more than four (4) total Qualifying Projects should be submitted. Qualifying Projects will not be scored but are used to determine if the proposed Development Team meets the minimum development team experience required to develop the Site.

For Developer and Owner, a Qualifying Project must have all of the following characteristics:

- New construction in either a Type V over I or Type III over I construction type (not a requirement for Minimum Property Manager and Service Provision Experience)
- At least 75 units in size
- Majority multiple-bedrooms, only for family projects
- Mixed-use including residential (not a requirement for Minimum Service Provision Experience)
- Affordable to low- and very low-income households ${ }^{1}$, formerly homeless residents, families and/or seniors
- Financed with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits.


## a. Minimum Development Experience:

The proposed Developer must have completed within the past ten years at least one Qualifying Project located in San Francisco. "Completed" means the Project must have received its Temporary Certificate of Occupancy by the date of the issuance of the RFQ.

For joint venture Developer teams, the experience of the lead entity may suffice for the joint-venture partnership. A signed Memorandum of Understanding or Term Sheet between joint-venture Development partners that outlines roles and responsibilities, proposed ownership structure, etc. must be submitted with the application. Furthermore, a Respondent can qualify for development experience by contracting with a development consultant for comprehensive project management services. Finally, the requirement to have served formerly homeless residents may be satisfied in a non- Type V over I or Type III over I building. In such a case, the proposed Developer must provide evidence of having completed a partially Type V over I or Type III over I affordable housing building, and separately, an affordable housing building that serves formerly homeless residents.
b. Minimum Ownership Experience: The proposed Owner must have owned at least one Qualifying Project for at least four years prior to the Submittal Deadline of this RFQ. For purposes of this requirement, the member of the general partner of the tax credit partnership that will own the completed project is the proposed "Owner."
c. Minimum Property Management Experience: The proposed Property Manager must have managed at least one Qualifying Project for at least 24 months.
d. Minimum Service Provision Experience: The proposed service provider(s) must have at least 36 months experience providing services to low-income family residents, communities of color, homeless persons and/or senior citizens within a Qualifying Project.

[^0]Note Regarding Experience: For any Respondent team member, the experience of key staff members may be substituted for the experience of the organization as a whole as long as the staff members' experience in other firms was substantive and involved responsibilities similar to those that they are anticipated to perform during the proposed development of the site. Any substitution should be clearly identified in Attachment 4, Qualifying Project Form.

## Minimum Developer and Owner Capacity Requirements

The proposed Developer and Owner must demonstrate the financial and staffing capacity to successfully complete the project and manage the asset in the long-term, as further described below.
a. Financial Capacity: The proposed Developer (or Guarantor where another entity is providing required guarantees) must demonstrate its ability to obtain competitive financing, as evidenced by submitting the latest (2) years of either signed federal income tax returns (including schedules or attachments, if any); or audited financial statements (with management letters, if any). The proposed Developer must also submit Attachment 5 - Financing Terms for Developer's Qualifying Project documenting the equity pricing and debt terms for the Qualifying Project submitted under Minimum Developer Experience.
b. Staffing Capacity: The proposed Developer must document its capacity to successfully plan, design, and develop the Project, throughout the period of development, either through staff with appropriate experience and capacity, contracted services, or collaboration with other organizations. To document this, the proposed Developer must submit a written narrative no more than one page (in Times New Roman font, 12 font size, and 1 -inch margins) to document the experience and capacity of key staff, their workloads, and the organizational structure for supporting staff. The proposed Developer must also submit Attachment 6 - Projected Staffing Workload Form to document the work assignments (existing or contemplated) associated with each staff person expected to work on the Project for Developer.
c. Asset Management Capacity: The proposed Owner must document its capacity to successfully manage real estate assets in compliance with City regulatory agreements and restrictions. To document this, the proposed Owner must submit a recent Real Estate Owned (REO) schedule, stating the number of projects and average number of units/project currently in Owner's asset management portfolio, proposed Owner's current asset management staffing noting job titles, FTEs, and status of each position (filled/vacant) and proposed Owner's organizational chart.
d. Racial Equity Capacity: The proposed Developer must document its capacity to successfully plan, design, and develop racial equity strategy that will lower barriers to obtaining quality affordable housing for communities of color through staff with appropriate experience and capacity, contracted services, or collaboration with other organizations. Documentation should include information evidencing the Developer's capacity to achieve the goals of this RFQ (see especially pages 4-5).

- Select partners that are able to work with MOHCD to deploy city resources, tools and expertise to create developments that are responsive to populations disproportionately impacted by systemic racism;
- Ensure that development teams are working within a culturally competent approach through the development process;
- Align each Project with the implementation of City policies on anti-displacement, racially inclusive communities, and creating stable housing for vulnerable populations;
- Create opportunities for growth of smaller and Black, Indigenous and people of color, (BIPOC)-led organizations in development role or as member of development team
- Submit demographic data for the Boards of Directors of each Development Team member and for the staff of each organization represented on the Team.

MINIMUM EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDENTS APPLYING FOR 100\% SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR HOMELESS ADULTS

## Team Member Specific Minimum Requirements

a. Minimum Developer Requirements - Lead Developer itself or in partnership with other co-developers must provide evidence of the following experience:

- New construction of at least two affordable housing developments that are both highdensity infill sites, with an aggregate unit count of approximately 75 units or more
- Development of at least one supportive affordable housing development for formerly homeless adults and/or formerly homeless seniors (may be new construction or substantial rehabilitation of an existing building)
- Use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credit financing

For joint-venture Development partners, the experience of either entity may suffice for the joint-venture partnership. A Memorandum of Understanding between joint-venture Development partners must be submitted with the application.

Furthermore, a Respondent can qualify for development experience by contracting with a development consultant for comprehensive project management services. Project management services should include financial packaging, selection of other consultants, selection of construction contractor and property management agent, oversight of architectural design, construction management, and consultation on major aspects of the development process. The contract for development services must be submitted with the RFQ response and must be acceptable to MOHCD.
b. Minimum Ownership Experience - The proposed Owner of the Project must have owned at least one supportive formerly homeless project in San Francisco for at least 5 years prior to the Submittal Deadline of this RFQ. In addition, each proposed Owner must provide evidence of experience with owning housing financed with Low Income Housing Tax credits. This experience does not have to be on the same project that satisfies the 5 -year ownership requirement. If the Selected Developer entity is not the same entity as the proposed Owner, MOHCD reserves the right to require that certain members of the Selected Developer remain active in the ownership for whatever length of time MOHCD deems necessary to ensure operating and financial stability.

For purposes of this requirement, the managing general partner of the tax credit partnership intended to take ownership of the completed Project and to provide asset management for the Project is the proposed "Owner".
c. Minimum Property Manager Requirements - The proposed property manager for the Project must have managed at least three supportive formerly homeless or supportive senior rental projects, including at least one in San Francisco, each for at least 36 months. In addition, the Property Manager for the Project must provide evidence of experience with managing housing financed with Low Income Housing Tax credits.
d. Minimum Service Provision Requirements - The proposed service provider(s) must have at least 36 months' experience providing supportive services to formerly homeless adults and/or formerly homeless seniors including case management and comprehensive services for homeless households in a residential setting in San Francisco. The proposed service provider(s) must have the infrastructure to supervise and train the onsite staff and their supervisors. The service provider must also have experience with and capacity to bill Medi-Cal.
e. Other Consultants - For any Respondent team, the experience of key staff members or "other consultants" may be substituted for the experience of the organization as a whole as long as the staff member's or consultant's experience in other firms was substantive and involved responsibilities similar to what they are anticipated to perform as a member of the Respondent's team.

## SELECTION CRITERIA AND SCORING

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

|  | Category | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | EXPERIENCE: | 40 |
| i. | Developer (12 pts) <br> > Experience with the following: <br> o Completing projects on time and on budget <br> o Obtaining competitive financing terms <br> o Developing Type V/I or III/I construction <br> o Developing housing for low-income families, seniors, or the homeless <br> > Building community support through outreach <br> > Current staff capacity and experience to take on this project type |  |
| ii. | Owner (4 pts) <br> Track record successfully owning housing financed with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits <br> o Experience owning affordable housing for lowincome families, seniors and/or the homeless <br> Current asset management structure, staffing, and portfolio <br> Capacity for assuming asset management of an expanded portfolio once the development is complete |  |
| iii. | Property Manager (8 pts) <br> > Experience managing property for target populations <br> $>$ Experience achieving high rates of housing retention <br> > Implements low barrier tenant selection policies <br> > Contributes to long-term sustainability of the development |  |



|  | Indicates particular groups served by the programs and spaces (tots, children, teens, homeless people, young adults, adults, elderly, disabled etc.). <br> Describes how the program will contribute to lowering barriers to persons of color seeking and retaining quality housing. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ii. | Community Engagement Strategy (10 pts) <br> Describes community engagement strategy and includes: <br> o The team's philosophy on community engagement; <br> o Process for establishing and/or building positive relationships with surrounding neighbors and the larger community; <br> o Efforts designed to engage all interested community members, including monolingual non-English speaking members of the community; <br> o How the Development Team intends to comply with the City's Language Access Ordinance. <br> Describes the Team's approach to achieving entitlements for the project expeditiously and the Team's approach to maintaining and building community relationships after entitlements have been achieved and the development is in operations. <br> Indicate how particular community engagement strategy will address the historical exclusion of communities of color from quality housing, including but not limited to marketing to attract target populations. |  |
| iii. | Services Delivery Strategy ( 10 pts ) <br> > Describes the Development Team's services delivery strategy and includes: <br> o The overall service philosophy; <br> o Model for providing any anticipated services to formerly homeless residents (including case management ratio and provision of amenities such as front desk clerks, if applicable); <br> o The services goals of the proposed vision. <br> A brief description of the desired outcome of the services to be provided and innovative approaches to services provision, including the strategy of engaging residents and encouraging access to services. <br> Describes how services for residents will be coordinated with the existing network of services in the neighborhood and community. |  |
| iv. | Finance \& Cost Containment Approach (10 pts) Narration that describes the Development Team's financing approach to the project. |  |


|  | Includes the Team's process for structuring the project and controlling development costs. <br> Includes innovative strategies intended to minimize MOHCD's projected capital gap financing. <br> Describes any innovative (i.e. non-standard, routine or commonly used) direct or indirect cost-cutting strategies relevant to overall development, construction or operating expenses. <br> Do not include proforma financials. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v. | Racial Equity Strategy ( 10 pts) <br> Describes proposed resident services program, including the activities or types of services, how they will be provided, and the approach (such as timeline, hours and days of operation, examples, and best practices). Explain how the Development Team's model removes barriers to intergenerational wealth, self-sufficiency and resiliency for persons of color, particularly COP holders, African American households and/or households in historically African American neighborhoods. <br> > Explain how the strategy aligns with the four primary goals of this RFQ set forth in the Introduction. |  |
|  | TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS | 100 |

## Attachment F: Site Map with amenities

## 1939 Market St Amenities Map



## Attachment G: Elevations and Floor Plans

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

 DevelopmentsSee attached.

| Affordable Multifamily Housing New Construction Cost Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Updated 10/28/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Local Sussidy | Total Dev. Cost w/oland | Notes or Financing | Comments |
| PROJECTS COMPLETED |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  | Total Dev. Costw/land |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name | Address | Lot sq.f. | Compl Date | \# of Units | \#of $8 \mathrm{R}^{\prime}$ | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Res. | Total | Acq. Cost3 | Constr. Cost4 | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dr. George Davis Senior Comm. | 11551 Caroli Ave | 80,209 | Jun-16 | 121 | 125 | ${ }^{90,475}$ | 62,340 | 152.815 | s 4,991,545 | S 55,420,517 | 11,57,097 | s 71,969,159 | s 26,22, 201 | 66,97, 614 |  |  |
| ${ }^{95 \text { Lagun Senior }} 12080$ | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\text {95 Laguna }}$ | $\frac{14,300}{11.667}$ | May-19 | ${ }_{79}^{79}$ | ${ }_{9}^{82}$ | ${ }_{\text {59,765 }}^{66.153}$ | 7.316 | ${ }_{6}^{67,101} 6$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 9\% LHTC |  |
| Completed Projects: | Averag: | 35,392 |  | ${ }_{98}$ | 100 | ${ }_{72,138}$ | 23,219 | ${ }_{95,356}$ | ${ }^{3,661,548}$ | ${ }^{47,472,902}$ | 8,779,888 | $\stackrel{\text { 5 }}{ }{ }_{5}^{59,864,337}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { 25,089,072 }}$ | $56,252,789$ |  |  |
| PROJECTS UN | CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  | Building | Square |  |  | al Project Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name | Address | Lot sa.ft | Compl Date | \# of Units | \#of ER' | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Res. | Total | Cost 3 | Constr. Cost4 | Soft cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Dev. Cost } \\ & \text { w/land } \end{aligned}$ | -ocal Susidy 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Dev. Cost w/o } \\ & \text { land } \end{aligned}$ | Notes on Financing | Comments |
| 53 Colton (Pumbers Union DA) | $3^{3}$ Colton ${ }^{\text {Average: }}$ | $\frac{7,780}{780}$ | Jul-22 | $\frac{96}{96}$ | ${ }_{96}^{96}$ | 4799999 | 0 | ${ }_{4}^{47,969}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ - 171.1097 |  | $\frac{16,721,274}{16.721274}$ | S $\frac{51,788,610}{51788.610}$ |  | s $\quad 51.616,913$ | 44\%, HCD MHP, AHP, S10M GM | Typeellif over Typel I podium and basement, 6 stories, constraned sit, efficiency stuios |


| PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  | Total Dev. Costw/land | Local Subsidy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Dev. Cost w/o } \\ & \text { land } \end{aligned}$ | Notes on Financing | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Address | sq.ft | Start Date (anticipated) | \# of Units | \#of8R' | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Res. | Total | Acc. Cost3 | Cost | Soft cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| 180 Jones Street | ${ }^{1880}$ Onosestreet | ${ }_{\text {4, } 4.53}^{16738}$ | ${ }_{\text {Febe-22 }}^{\text {Feb-22 }}$ | ${ }_{90}^{70}$ | ${ }^{70}$ | 34863 <br> 7850 |  | 388,167 | $\frac{100000}{1064390}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r}17,576,236 \\ \hline 20.569\end{array}$ | ¢54.43.006 | $\xrightarrow{15,200000}$ | ${ }_{\text {F3,323006 }}$ | 480 LHTC+ MHP |  |
| 772 Pasific Avenue | 772 Pacific Avenue | 9,219 | ${ }_{\text {Apre2 }}$ | ${ }_{86}$ | ${ }_{86}$ | 45,458 | ${ }_{8,847}$ | 54.305 |  | 58.265 .200 s | 20,120,912 | 75,995,122 | 25,176,182 | s ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ | $4{ }^{46}$ C Credisis: MHP, AHP |  |
| In Predevelopment | Average: | 10,270 |  | 85 | ${ }^{85}$ | ${ }_{52,950}$ | 4,449 | 57,400 | 3,721,456 | s 49,09,377 | 18,247,582 | ¢ 70,978,416 | ${ }^{22,682,184}$ | s 67,256,960 |  | 边 |




## Attachment I: Predevelopment Budget

See attached.


## Attachment J: Development Budget

See attached.

| Application Date: | 10112021 |  |  | \# Units: | 134 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | 1939 Market Stree |  |  | \# Bedrooms: | 135 |  |  | Losp Project |  |
| Project Address: | 1939 Market Stree |  |  | \# Beds: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Sponsor: | Mercy Housing C | California | ill in D135:D138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | total Sources | Comments |  |
| SOURCES | 31,028,625 | 20,000,000 | 750,000 | 1,250,000 | 24,535,265 | 8,470,007 | 86,033,897 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Deferred fee |  |  |  |
| Name of Sources: | MOHCD/OCII | HCD - MHP | HCD-1IG | AHP | Equity | ${ }_{\text {contribution }}^{\text {and }}$ |  |  |  |
| USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACQuISITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquisision costor value |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Legal/ Closing costs / Broker's Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holding Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Transter Tax |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| TOTAL ACQUISITİO |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| CONSTRUCTION (HARD COSTS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Unit Construction/Rehab | 10,693,044 | 15,000,000 |  | 1,250,000 | 21,034,711 |  | 47,977,755 |  |  |
| * Commercial Shell Construction | 771,469 |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{771,469}{570331}$ |  |  |
| * Demolition ${ }^{\text {Environmental Remediation }}$ |  |  | 570,331 |  |  |  | 570,331 |  |  |
| * Onsight Improvements/Landscaping |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| * Offisite Improvements |  | 1,126,826 |  |  |  |  | 1,126,826 |  | Construction |
| * Infrastucture Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Parking |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GC Bond Premium/GC Insurance/GC Taxes | $1,288,457$ $1,627,09$ |  | 48,184 53,37 |  |  |  | ${ }^{1,336,642} 1$ |  | ${ }_{3.0 \%}^{2.4 \%}$ |
| CG General Conditions | 2,081,047 |  | 78,147 |  |  |  | 2,159,194 |  | 3.9\% |
| Sub-total Construction Costs | 16,461,025 | 16,126,826 | 750,000 | 1,250,000 | 21,034,711 | 0 | 55,622,562 |  |  |
| Design Contingency (remove at DD) | 2,456,556 |  |  |  |  |  | 2,456,556 |  | 4.4\% |
| Bid Contingency (remove at bid) | 1,529,644 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,529,644 |  | ${ }^{2.8 \%}$ |
| Plan Check Contingency (removelreduce during Plan Revic | 999,768 |  |  |  |  |  | 999,768 |  | 1.8\% |
| Hard Cost Construction Contingency |  | 3,030,093 |  |  |  |  | 3,030,093 5 | $5 \%+$ includes $\$ 230,000$ to meet public art requirement |  |
| Sub-total Construction Contingenciess | 4,985,968 | 3,030,093 | - 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 8,016,0611 |  |  |

## SOFT COSTS

| Architecture \& Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Architect design fees | 2,309,688 | 351,787 |  |  |  | $\square$ | 2,661,475 | $\square$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reimbursables | 50,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Architecture \& Design | 2,359,688 | 766,437 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3,126,125 |  |  |
| Engineering \& Environmental Studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Survey | 52,657 |  |  |  |  |  | 52,657 |  |  |
| Geotechnical studies | 89,525 |  |  |  |  |  | 89,525 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other environmental consultants | 15.000 |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{15,000}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Loan Interest | 2,427,403 |  |  |  |  |  | 2,427,403 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender Inspections | 36,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 36,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent Loan Origination Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Perm, Financing Costs Total Financing Costs | 15,000 $2.478,403$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 784,947 | 0 | 15,000 $3,263,350$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borrower Legal fees | 75,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 75,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Owners title policy, recording, lender's policy | 34,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 34,000 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} \\ \text { Other Development Costs } & \text { Total Legal Costs } & \\ \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Furnishings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Financial Consultant fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL SOFT Costs | 9,031,631 | 843,081 | 0 | 0 | 1,091,675 | 0 | 10,966,387 |  |  |




TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST
Development CostUnit by
Development CostlUnit by Source
Development CostUnit as \% of TDC by Source
Acquisition CostUUnit by Source
Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency)/unit By Source
Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency)/SF
*Possible non-eligible GO Bond/COP Amount
City Subsidy/Unit


Tax Credit Equity Pricing:
Construction Bond Amount:
Construction Loan Term (in months):
Construction Loan Interest Rate (as $\%$ )
$\begin{array}{r}12,995,538 \\ \hline 231,557 \\ \hline\end{array}$


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

See attached.


Application Date:
otal \# Units:
10/1/2021
Firitst ear of operations (provide data assuming that
Year 1 is a full year, ie. 12 months of operations):


Sub-total Taxes and Licenses


Total operating Expenses (w/ Reservesicl Res Rent Bond

Net operating income (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

| DEBT SERVICEIMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt/amotized loans) | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard Debt - First Lender | 0.0008 | 100.00\% |  |
| Hard Debt- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Len | k2\% pymt, or other 2nd Lende |  |  |
| Hard Debt- Third Lender ( Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | p.or other 3 3d Lender) |  |  |
| Hard Debt-Fourth Lender |  |  |  |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service |  |  |  |
| TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE |  |  |  |
| CASH FLow (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) |  |  |  |
| Commercial Only Cash fiow |  |  |  |
| Alloction of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) | $\underline{n-\text { OSP (residual }}$ |  |  |
| AVALABLE CASHLL ${ }^{\text {U }}$ USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) |  |  |  |
| USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL |  |  |  |
| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) |  |  |  |
| Partnership Management Fee (see poicicy for linits) |  |  |  |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) | Losp | non-LOSP | Approved By (read) |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizizg Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 (select lender in comments fied) | ender in comments fied) |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 (select lender in comments field) |  |  |  |

total payments preceding mohcd
RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS
PRECEDING MOHCD)
RECEDING MOHCD)
Residual Receipts Calaluation
Does Proiect have a Morto Resicual Receipt Obligation?

${ }^{48,224}$

```
oft Debt Lenders with Residual Receipts obligations
OHCDOCIII - Soft Debit Loans
HCD (soft debt loan) - Lender 3
```

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVIC

REMAINING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEEPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipts Amount Du
Lender 5 Resididal Receipits Due
Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service

## REMAINDER (Should be zero uniess hinere

distributions below)
Ohter Distibutions SSes
Final Balance (should be zero)

## Attachment L: 20-year Operating Proforma

See attached.


| Total \＃Units： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $27$ | $\underbrace{107}_{\text {80006\％}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Year } 4 \\ 2029}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 5 \\ & 2030 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Yeara } 6 \\ 2031}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Yearr } \\ 2032}}$ |
| Income | \％oamual |  |  | non－LOSP | Total | Losp | Losp | Total | Losp | sp | Total | Losp | Losp |
| Resionemil－Tenant Rens |  | 25\％ |  |  |  |  | 1．30，982 | ${ }_{\text {1．3212 } 23}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6,8,87}$ | ${ }_{\text {1，}}^{1,38,746}$ | ${ }_{\text {Potar }}^{1.05627}$ | 62， 69 | ${ }_{\text {1，372 }}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ |  |  | ${ }^{3429297}$ | ${ }^{355.1255}$ |  | ${ }^{355,185}$ | ${ }^{367 \text { 988 }}$ |  | ${ }^{367} 7888$ | 381.50 |  |
| Commerial Space | n／a | 25\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sidenil Paxko | ${ }_{\text {25，}}^{25 \%}$ | ${ }^{255 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stuporive senveses h hoome |  |  |  | 539，955 | 539，95 |  | 560，971 | 56，971 |  | 583,409 | 53.409 |  | ${ }^{60,776}$ |
| Ineasth home Proped | ${ }^{25 \%}$ |  |  | 6．903 | 8.629 | ${ }^{1,76}$ | 7．076 | 8.845 | 1.813 | ${ }_{7} 723$ | 9，066 | ${ }_{1}^{1.859}$ | $\xrightarrow{7,344}$ |
| Tenant Charges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| asand | 2．5\％ | 25. | ＇Commercial Op．Budget＇Worksheet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohere Commercial locome | na | 25\％ |  |  | ${ }_{7}^{7,54}$ |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{294}$ |  |  | 8.46 |  |  |
| Withtrawal tom Capilized Resene（deposit oopenating account） | na | na | Comen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss－Resisidential Tenant Rents Gross Potential lica | ${ }^{\text {n／a }}$ | na |  |  |  | $\frac{418,27}{[3,388)}$ | $\underbrace{(6,599)}_{\text {，} 1879.999}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{43,56}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {445，402 }}^{[8,120}$ |  |
|  | na | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ | policy，annual incrementing usually not appropriate |  |  |  |  | （1，599） |  |  | （1，2929） |  |  |
| EFFECTVE Gross wcome |  |  |  | ${ }^{1,76,1,36}$ | ${ }^{2,168,824}$ | ${ }^{415,54}$ | ${ }^{1,813,470}$ | 2234，982 | ${ }^{428,482}$ | 1，867，221 | 2,302220 | ${ }^{422}$ | ${ }^{1,922}$ |
| OPERATING EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee <br> Asset Management Fee | ${ }_{3.5 \%}^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }_{3.5 \%}^{3.5 \%}$ | er MOHCD policy | $\begin{array}{r} 91,280 \\ \hline 20,808 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{114,100}{26,011} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{23,619}{5,3844}$ | $\frac{94,475}{21,537}$ | $\frac{18,094}{26,21}$ | $\frac{24,445}{5.573}$ | ${ }_{\text {972722 }}^{22200}$ | $\frac{122,297}{27,83}$ |  |  |
| toal |  |  |  |  |  | 2 2，003 |  |  | 30，018 |  |  | 2069 |  |
| Offre Starase | ${ }^{5,5 \%}$ | ${ }^{355 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{186,356}$ | ${ }^{232999}$ | ${ }^{48224}$ | ${ }^{1029857}$ | ${ }^{241.0722}$ | ${ }^{\text {499092 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {199607 }}$ | ${ }^{294.5909}$ | ${ }_{51,688}^{5045}$ | ${ }^{206.594}$ |
| Menagers salay Heath humance and oneer Benentis |  |  |  |  | －${ }_{\text {92245 }}^{12240}$ |  |  |  |  | ¢， |  | ${ }_{\text {20，45 }}^{27.12}$ |  |
| Salariss Benefits | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {3．3\％\％}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aaminstatave RentFFree Unit Sub－otal Salariesisenefits | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3．5\％ |  | ${ }_{\text {358，054 }}$ | ${ }^{47,567}$ | ${ }^{92,466}$ | ${ }^{37,586}$ | ${ }_{463,23}$ | ${ }_{95,89}$ | ${ }^{33,556}$ | 479,45 | ${ }_{99,295}$ | 336，981 |
| strat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aaversisingand Maketing | ${ }^{\text {3，55\％}}$ | ${ }^{3.556}$ |  | ${ }_{4,4,45}^{4}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5.54}$ | ${ }^{1.488}$ | ${ }_{\text {4．593 }}$ | ${ }^{5.7389}$ | ${ }_{\text {1．128，}}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4.55}$ | ${ }_{5}^{59,989}$ | ${ }^{1222}$ | ${ }^{4.9,97}$ |
| Office Expenses | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }^{80.60}$ |  | 66，754 |  |  |  | 88,68 |  |  |
| Leapl Expense－Property | ${ }^{\text {3，5\％\％}}$ | ${ }^{\text {3，5\％\％}}$ |  | ${ }_{1,386}$ | 5．544 | 4.303 | 1.384 | 5.738 | ${ }_{4.554}$ | ${ }_{1,485}$ | 5.988 | 4.68 | 1.537 |
|  | \％ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{1,333 \\ 2383}}^{1+1}$ |  |  | （1，288 | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{2.488 \\ 4.988}}$ | ， | （12，38 | ${ }_{\substack{2.513 \\ 56,63}}$ | $\xrightarrow{10.50}$ |
| Bac oens |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtoral Administration Expe |  |  |  | 98．088 | ${ }^{126,322}$ | 2，304 | 101，439 | ${ }^{13,743}$ | ${ }^{30,30}$ | 10，9，9 | ${ }^{135,39}$ | ${ }_{3,3,31}$ | ${ }_{\text {10，}}^{10,64}$ |
| Eleatricty | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  | ${ }^{83,154}$ | ${ }^{110.872}$ | ${ }^{26,689}$ | ${ }^{86,064}$ | ${ }^{114.752}$ | ${ }^{29,92}$ | 89.976 | ${ }^{118,789}$ | ${ }^{30,731}$ | ${ }^{92194}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sever | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes and Licenses Sub－talulutilies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{229,055}$ | ${ }_{53,46}$ |  | ${ }^{27,537}$ | ${ }_{5,316}$ | ${ }^{10,535}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {Real }}$ State Texes |  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{3.56 \%}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{2295 \\ 1223}}$ | ¢， | ¢1，475 | ${ }_{2}^{2,385}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{11,37 \\ 6,533}}^{\text {c，}}$ |  |  |
| Misclineos Texes．LLeenses and Pemis | ${ }_{\text {3 }}$ | ${ }_{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{\text {L2083 }}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { 50，590 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {5，738 }}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {4．551 }}$ |  | ${ }^{12229}$ |  |
| Insurance ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Sub－otal Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{620088}$ | r，6io | 16，065 | ${ }^{64,261}$ | ${ }^{80,327}$ | 16，628 | 66，510 | ${ }^{\text {83，138 }}$ | 17，20 |  |
| Property non Labilit hnurane |  | ${ }^{3.5 \%}{ }^{3.56}$ |  | ${ }^{155221}$ | ${ }^{1940,086}$ | ${ }^{40.163}$ | ${ }^{160,683}$ | ${ }^{200.877}$ | 41.59 | 166276 | ${ }^{207,85}$ | ${ }^{43} 024$ | ${ }^{1720.086}$ |
| Weretrs Compensaion | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3} 56 \%}$ |  | 20.40 | ${ }^{25.50}$ | $5_{527}^{5}$ | ${ }^{2} 2.1 .14$ | ${ }^{26,933}$ | 5468 | 21.85 | 27.377 | 5.655 | 22668 |
| Sub－total Isurance |  |  |  | ${ }^{175,621}$ | ${ }^{219,926}$ | 45,42 | ${ }^{181}$ | 227，210 | 47,0 | ${ }_{18,13}$ | ${ }^{235,62}$ | 88，67 | 199，7i4 |
| Mamenance Repar | 3．5\％ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{192} 70$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％ |  | 18.50 | 220， | 6， 6.5 | 155， 2 | 22.32 | 4， | ， | 20，62 | 4， |  |
| Contacts |  |  |  | 109384 | ${ }^{138,705}$ | ${ }^{2829}$ | 113,192 | 14.489 | 29288 | ${ }^{177153}$ | 146,42 | 30331 |  |
| Geamag and rash Removal | $\frac{3,5}{35}$ | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3} 56 \%}$ |  | （62088 |  | ${ }^{16065}$ | ${ }^{64826}$ | ${ }^{80037}$ | ${ }^{16688}$ | ${ }^{66.5}$ |  | $\frac{1720}{}$ |  |
| Hexac Feparis sand Manterance | ${ }_{3}^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {cose }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {4，} 4 \text { as }}$ | $\xrightarrow{9,180}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {4，5901 }}$ | ， |  | ${ }_{4}^{47,507}$ | ， | ， |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub－toal Maintenance \＆Repair Expense |  |  |  | ${ }_{43,373}$ | 541，842 | ${ }^{122,161}$ | 429，965 | ${ }_{50,006}^{20,06}$ | 116，087 | 468，37 | ${ }_{50,434}$ | ${ }^{120,150}$ | ${ }^{880.599}$ |
| Supporive Serives | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  | 99785 | 99.75 |  | ${ }^{103277}$ | 10327］ |  | 106892 | 106.82 |  | 120.6 |
| mmercial Expenses |  |  |  |  | 399 |  |  | ${ }_{413}$ |  |  | ${ }^{28}$ |  |  |
| total operating expenses |  |  |  | 1．500，969 | 1，874，905 | 378，261 | ${ }^{1,563,55}$ | 1，900，527 | ${ }^{38,430}$ | 1，618，580 | ${ }^{2008,45}$ | 403，50 | 1，675．23 |
| Reseresestround Lease Pase enentisond fees |  |  |  |  |  | crtan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 12.200 | ${ }^{15.5000}$ | 3.00 | ${ }^{122000}$ | 15，000 | 3. | ${ }^{12,000}$ | 15．000 | 3.000 | ${ }^{120}$ |
| Repocementineseeve Dopessit |  |  |  |  | 6，000 | ${ }_{\text {13400 }}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {6，7，000 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {13，4a }}$ |  | ${ }^{2} 67000$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { 13，} 300}$ | ${ }_{53,0 .}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Onter Reavired Reseseve 2 De |  |  | commeamo mumewneme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| （ed Reseeve Peposits Commercial |  |  | cememe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub－total Reserevesticrund Lease Ease RentBond Fees |  |  |  | 67，600 | ${ }^{84,500}$ | 16.900 | 67，600 | ${ }^{84,500}$ | 16，900 | 67，600 | 4,500 | 12.500 | 67，600 |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES（w／Reserves／GL Base Rent／Bond F PUPA（w／Reserves／GL Base Rent／Bond Fees） |  |  |  | 578，599 | 959，05 | 393，61 | 1，631，453 | 2025 ，27 | 406,3 | 686，29 | 2．022，945 | 419,960 | 2，772， |
| NET OPERating INCoME（INCOME minus of expenses） |  |  |  | 132776 | 210,419 | 21，93 | 182,017 | 2，955 | ${ }^{22,15}$ | 182,03 | ${ }^{2092} 275$ | ${ }^{22,318}$ | ${ }^{177,815}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Yelor | each | 隹 | agna |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Eene | 67，200 | 84,00 | 16.800 | 67，200 | 84.00 | 16.600 | 67200 | 84.00 | 16.600 | 6，200 |
|  |  |  | Etere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commerial Hard Deht Sevice |  |  | 边 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | citer |  | （1，8000 |  |  | $\substack{1,6,300 \\ 535}$ |  |  | （1，600 |  |
| Commercial Only Cash Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {c，099 }}^{1252,25}$ | 5，18 |  |
| Alace |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1,8981}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{1.5280}$ |  | ${ }_{125,275}$ | ${ }_{6}^{1.7247}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2991 |  |  |
|  |  |  | wotco paler |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pateremer |  | 3．9\％ | armore | $\frac{20800}{4000}$ | $\frac{25.999}{5.000}$ |  | $\frac{21.588}{4000}$ | $\frac{26.909}{6.000}$ | ${ }_{\text {5 }}^{5100}$ | $\frac{22281}{4000}$ |  |  | $\frac{\text { 2000 }}{4.000}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 47.710 | 47.70 |  | 47.023 | 47.023 |  | 46.212 | 46.212 |  | 45.272 |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{725510}$ |  | ${ }^{6.382}$ | $\xrightarrow{72.551}$ | $\xrightarrow{78,932}$ | 6.50 | ${ }^{12,433}$ | $\frac{79.063}{40212}$ | ${ }^{6,765}$ | ${ }^{12,333}$ |
|  | монс） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{45} 2$ |
| Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation？ Will Project Defer Developer Fee？ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1st Residual Receipts Spit－Lender／Deferred Developer Fee 2nd Residual Receipts Spit－Lender／Owner |  |  | 2nd Residual Receipts Split 2034 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Deferra | reed oever |  | Seit |  | 477710 <br> 192950 <br> 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCO RESIIUAL RECEITS debi service |  | Deit Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{55} .16 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment <br> Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground |  |  |  |  | 26.39 |  |  | 25.950 |  |  | ${ }^{25493}$ |  |  |
| Lease |  |  | Remen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NON－MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |  |  |  |  | 21，391 |  |  | 21.083 |  |  | 20，79 |  |  |
| Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toat Non－MOHCCD Residual Receipis Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REMANDER（Should be ereo unless there are elistriutions below） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner Distributions／Ince Distributions／Uses |  |  | － |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| Final Balance（should be zero） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REPLACEMENT RESERVE－RUNNING BALANCE <br> Replacement Reserve Starting Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits <br> Replacement Reserve Withdrawals（ideally tied to CNA） |  |  |  |  | 67，000 |  |  | ${ }^{67,000}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Interest <br> RR Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {335，000 }}$ |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| operating reserve－runnmg balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance Operating Reserve Deposits |  |  | ， |  | $\vdots$ |  |  | $\vdots$ |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Withdrawals <br> Operating Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | OR Batance |  |  | 0．0\％ |  |  | 0．0\％ |  |  | 0．0\％ |  |  |
| OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 －RUNNING BALANCE Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance |  |  | － |  | ． |  |  | ． |  |  | － |  |  |
| 隹 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． |  |  | ． |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Interest <br> Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Deposits |  |  | － |  | $\div$ |  |  | $\div$ |  |  | $\div$ |  |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Interes <br> Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |







[^0]:    1 "Low Income" is defined as $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI and below. "Extremely Low Income" is defined as $30 \%$ MOHCD AMI and below.

