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1950 Mission Housing Associates, LP, a California limited partnership

BRIDGE Housing Corporation \& Mission Housing Development Corporation

La Fenix, formally 1950 Mission
1950 Mission Street (at $16^{\text {th }}$ Street)
40 units out of 157 units
Up to $\$ 439,751$ Year 1 budget Up to $\$ 8,450,769$ for 15 years (including Year 1)
\$8,450,769

## 1. SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

1950 Mission Housing Associates, LP, a California limited partnership, an affiliate of the Sponsors, BRIDGE Housing Corporation ("BRIDGE") and Mission Housing Development Corporation ("MHDC") requests \$8,450,769 in General Funds from the Local Operating Subsidy Program ("LOSP") to subsidize the operations of 40 permanent supportive housing units for formerly homeless families, out of a total of 155 units that serve extremely low- to low- income families, for a period of 15 years.

The Sponsors began construction of 1950 Mission in December 2018. The Sponsors anticipate completing construction and receiving the temporary certificate of occupancy by September 2020 with move-ins for the supportive housing units beginning in October 2020.

Located at 1950 Mission near the intersection of $16^{\text {th }}$ and Mission Streets, the project site has a long history. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD") purchased the site from the San Francisco Unified School District after the
site was vacant and a community eyesore for several years. After MOHCD acquired the site, MOHCD worked with Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") to program the site as one of San Francisco’s early Navigation Centers. The Project name, La Fenix, means The Phoenix in English. Like the mythical bird that cyclically regenerates with the rising of the sun or out of the ash, La Fenix, with its vibrant colors on a 9-story building and murals on the pedestrian walk way, Zocalo, is a shining achievement of regeneration to permanent beauty for the community it represents, the City, and its Sponsors.

The project is a 9-story Type I (steel frame over a podium) building. The 155 units, excluding the two staff units, are a mix of studios, one-, two-, and three- bedroom units. Building amenities include property management offices, bike rooms on the upper floors, youth media lab/activity room lab, laundry rooms, a multi-purpose room that includes a kitchen and storage, exterior community courtyard, roof deck and community garden, and Zocalo. The building also includes several commercial spaces that include a restaurant/café, bike repair shop, art gallery, art studios, and child care center. BRIDGE Property Management Company ("BPMC") will be the initial property management agent. MHDC will manage the resident services components of the La Fenix and will be responsible for asset management of the retail/commercial spaces. Lutheran Social Services is the service provider designated to support the families in the LOSP units.

In addition to the MOHCD loan, other financing sources include State Housing and Community Development's ("HCD") Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program ("AHSC"), Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco’s Affordable Housing Program ("AHP"), and tax credit equity. In August 2018, the Affordable Housing Loan Committee recommended the total loan of $\$ 44.9$ million.

The Sponsors now request $\$ 439,751$ for the first year of operations (2021) and a total 15year subsidy of $\$ 8,450,769$. If approved, funds would be disbursed under the contract on a calendar-year basis in accordance with the attached schedule (see Exhibit A-1), with possible reductions from these amounts based on operating surpluses that may occur in previous years. Though all requested funds would be provided under a single, long-term contract, disbursements thereunder would be subject to annual appropriations by the Board of Supervisors, as is standard for LOSP contracts.

## 2. OPERATING COSTS SUMMARY

La Fenix operating budget request was developed based on other family projects that BPMC operates and reflects minor updates from the operating budget that was reviewed at the gap loan in August 2018 and reviewed again at the construction closing in December 2018. The project has an operations staff of 11.45 FTE, including 24 -hour desk coverage for 7 days a week and services staff, excluding services supervision for lottery residents and HSH supported services for the LOSP residents. The proposed operating expenses before debt and reserve deposits, is $\$ 11,769$ per unit per year.

## 3. PROPOSED LOSP BUDGET

### 3.1. Annual Operating Income Evaluation

The following is an evaluation of the $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget (Attachment B) and 15Year Operating Pro Forma (Attachment C) that are the basis for the overall request for LOSP funds. The $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget is for calendar year 2021 and was projected based on other family projects in BRIDGE's portfolio.

Tenant Rent: As defined in the Loan Agreement dated December 1, 2018 and the recorded Declaration of Restrictions dated December 1, 2018 and recorded December 21, 2018, the tenant rents for the 155 family units, excluding the staff units, are based on incomes of 60\% City/MOHCD Area Median Income ("AMI"). HCD AHSC supported units are restricted below MOHCD's income targets as shown below.

| Unit Type | Proposed Number of Units | Proposed Avg. Sq. Feet | $\begin{gathered} \text { Max. \% } \\ \text { MOHCD } \\ \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Target \% TCAC AMI shown with MOHCD AMI equivalent in 2020 | Rent or Operating Subsidies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1BR | 12 | 550 | 60\% | 30\% TCAC AMI/ 40\% MOHCD AMI | LOSP |
| 2BR | 23 | 800 | 60\% | 30\% TCAC AMI/ 40\% MOHCD AMI | LOSP |
| 3BR | 5 | 924 | 60\% | 30\% TCAC AMI/ 40\% MOHCD AMI | LOSP |
| Units targeted at 30\% TCAC AMI LOSP subtotal | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| studio | 3 | 423 | 60\% | 45\% TCAC AMI/ 61\%MOHCD AMI | n/a |
| 1BR | 2 | 550 | 60\% | 45\% TCAC AMI/ 61\%MOHCD AMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2BR | 4 | 800 | 60\% | 45\% TCAC AMI/ 61\%MOHCD AMI | n/a |
| 3BR | 2 | 924 | 60\% | 45\% TCAC AMI/ 61\%MOHCD AMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Units targeted at 45\% TCAC AMI subtotal | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| studio | 7 | 423 | 60\% | 50\% TCAC AMI/ 68\% MOHCD AMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 1BR | 7 | 550 | 60\% | 50\% TCAC AMI/ 68\% MOHCDAMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2BR | 14 | 800 | 60\% | 50\% TCAC AMI/ 68\% MOHCD AMI | n/a |
| 3BR | 2 | 924 | 60\% | 50\% TCAC AMI/ 68\% MOHCD AMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Units targeted at 50\% TCAC AMI subtotal | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| studio | 22 | 423 | 60\% | 60\% TCAC AMI/ 82\% MOHCD AMI | n/a |
| 1BR | 15 | 550 | 60\% | 60\% TCAC AMI/ 82\% MOHCD AMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2BR | 32 | 800 | 60\% | 60\% TCAC AMI/ 82\% MOHCD AMI | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 3BR | 5 | 924 | 60\% | 60\% TCAC AMI/ 82\% MOHCD AMI | n/a |
| Units targeted at 60\% TCAC AMI subtotal | 74 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 BR | 2 | 924 | Manager Units | N/A | N/A |


| Total Units | 157 |
| :--- | :---: |

It should be noted that while the deeper affordability restrictions are a requirement of HCD's AHSC and the deeper affordability restrictions are associated with TCAC rents, it is the Sponsors intention that the deeper targets are $45 \%, 50 \%$, and $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI, which makes the project more deeply affordable and keeps commitments made to the community. The average building AMI based on the targets set at MOHCD AMI's is 52\% MOHCD AMI/39\% TCAC AMI.

The LOSP units will be targeted at 30\% TCAC AMI/40\% MOHCD AMI and the households will pay $30 \%$ of their household monthly incomes as rent, estimated at \$300 / month as is standard for family referrals.

LOSP Subsidy: The LOSP subsidy in the Year 1 Operating Budget is $\$ 424,490$ ( $\$ 10,612$ per unit per year and $\$ 884$ per unit per month, for 40 units). This is less than a $1 \%$ increase (\$961) from the LOSP subsidy approved at the construction gap closing. The increase is due to an error in underwriting at the gap loan evaluation and construction closing whereby a portion of the residential services for lottery residents was attributed to the LOSP supported units and the replacement reserve was shown as $\$ 500$ per unit per year rather than the required HCD AHSC amount of \$600 per unit per year. With a corrections, the LOSP subsidy increased slightly. The LOSP subsidy made with this request is sized to fund a break-even budget on the LOSP units, including operating expenses, HCD debt service, replacement and operating reserve deposits, partnership management fees, bond issuer fees and investor service fees.

Continuum of Care Rental Assistance: Not applicable - CoC rental assistance has not been awarded to La Fenix.

Commercial Income: La Fenix has several commercial spaces. The Borrower and owner, 1950 Mission Housing Associates, LP, a California limited partnership, has entered into a master lease with MHDC, co-Sponsor. The MOHCD proforma shows that the project would benefit from $\$ 9,095$ in commercial cash flow that will be distributed after debt service. However, it should be noted that the gap closing underwriting has only \$100 annually contributed to the residential portion of the property and the $\$ 100$ in annual cash paid to the property is consistent with the master lease rent. With the property not relying on commercial income for debt service, occupancy of the commercial spaces fulfills community expectations and activates the streets as a community benefit. Below is a description of the secured or proposed commercial tenants and the status of their leases.

- Mission Neighborhood Center, Inc., signed a sublease with the master lessor/landlord, MHDC, dated December 1, 2018 for \$7,500 per month, and plans to occupy the building by spring 2021.
- Originally planned for Accion Latina with an estimated lease of approximately\$1.50 per square feet ("sf") for the art studios and gallery totaling a combined 1,480 sf. As COVID-19 has impacted Accion Latina’s approach to gallery spaces, MHDC continues its ongoing discussions with them.
- Commercial Café space does not have a planned or proposed tenant. MHDC has hired a broker that will begin marketing the café space after the building receives the temporary certificate of occupancy. Marketing this commercial space during Shelter-In-Place to prevent the spread of COVID-19 has been challenging. MHDC is doing soft marketing and having discussion with potential vendors and interested parties already located the Mission neighborhood.

Total Residential Revenue Stream Excluding Commercial Income: Total residential rental revenue for Year 1 is $\$ 2,482,813$ and includes tenant rents, LOSP subsidy, and laundry income of $\$ 16,946$, and excludes commercial income.

### 3.2. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation

Operating assumptions were evaluated at the gap loan evaluation request in August 2018 and prior to the construction loan closing in December 2018, and are shown in Exhibit B-2 and B-3 of the Loan Agreement executed December 1, 2018. The operating assumptions with this LOSP loan request are as follows:

| Operating Proforma |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? $(Y / N)$ | Notes |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio is between minimum 1.10:1 in year 1 and maximum 1.00:1 in year 17 | Y | DSCR in Year 1 is 1.24 DSCR is 1.10 in Year 17. <br> The DSCR was approved at the gap closing and it is in the loan agreement |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays above 1.00:1 for entirety of projected 20-year cash flow | Y | $\text { DSCR is } 1.02 \text { in Year } 20 .$ <br> The DSCR in Year 20 at the gap loan closing was 1.14. The decrease in the DSCR can be attributed to (1) an increase in the supportive services line item by $\$ 58,577$, and (2) at gap closing a proportional split of the supportive services line item was incorrectly proportioned to the LOSP units. Please see Section 5 - Supportive Services for discussion about residential supportive services. |
| Vacancy meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy is $5 \%$ on LOSP and non-LOSP units <br> (Commercial Vacancy is 50\%) |
| Annual Income Growth is increased at 2.5\% per year | Y |  |
| Annual Operating Expenses are increased at 3.5\% per year | Y |  |


| Commercial Operating Expenses are increased at 3.5\% per year | Y |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base year operating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | Y | Total Operating Expenses, including Commercial OpEx, are \$11,769 per unit per year (not including reserves) <br> The per unit per year operating expenses excluding reserves represents a $\$ 742$ per unit per year increase since the construction loan closing and shown as Exhibit B-2 and B-3 in the Loan Agreement, primarily attributed to an increase in resident services wholly supported by the non-LOSP units. |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is \$94,200 or \$50 PUPM standard allowed by HUD for Northern California for multifamily rental properties. |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | Operating Budget includes the following full-time employees (11.45 FTE): <br> 1 Manager <br> 1 Asst Manager <br> 1 Recert Admin <br> 1 Maint. Supervisor <br> 1 Maint Technician <br> 1 Janitor <br> 4.20 Desk Clerk Coverage for 24 hours a day <br> for 7 days a week <br> 1.25 FTE services staff, excludes services supervisor position |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Asset Management Fee: \$16,549 (before debt payment) <br> Partnership Management Fee: \$27,131 (after debt payment) and is trended $3.5 \%$ annually <br> The combined total of Asset Management <br> Fee and Partnership Management Fee represents a $\$ 1,921$ decrease total combined Fees at construction closing. |
| Commercial Expenses | Y | \$68,600 annual and includes utilities, real estate taxes, insurance, common area maintenance costs and $\$ 21,100$ commercial Asset Management Fee to MHDC. This amount is consistent with the amount approved at the construction loan closing. |
| Ground Lease Base Rent | Y | \$15,000 annually |
| Bond Monitoring Fee | Y | \$9,160 annually and is based on .125\% of permanent debt and BNY Mellon: \$1,750 |

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or } \\ \text { exceed TCAC minimum standards }\end{array} & \text { Y } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Replacement Reserves are \$600 per unit per } \\ \text { year meets HCD's 2017 Uniform } \\ \text { Multifamily Regulations ("UMR") is the } \\ \text { minimum requirement shown in HCD's } \\ \text { AHSC Standard Agreement. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Operating Reserve Deposits } & \text { Y } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \$0.00 - Operating reserves are not allowed } \\ \text { on new construction development. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Hard Debt- First Lender } & \text { N/A } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \$359,015 and is not assessed on the LOSP } \\ \text { units }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Hard Debt - Second Lender } \\ \text { (HCD Program 0.42\% payment or other } \\ 2^{\text {nd }} \text { Lender) }\end{array} & \text { Y } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \$42,000 and is proportionally split with the } \\ \text { LOSP units. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Limited Partnership Asset Management } \\ \text { Fee meets standards }\end{array} & \text { N } & \begin{array}{c}\text { LP Asset Management Fee is } \$ 8,500 \\ \text { annually after debt and this amount is flat for } \\ 15 \text { years. However, the amount exceeds } \\ \text { MOHCD policy and is a \$3,500 increase } \\ \text { from the gap loan evaluation. Staff }\end{array} \\ \text { approved this increase at the gap closing and } \\ \text { it is in the loan agreement. }\end{array}\right\}$

Operating Expenses - Security Expenses: On the proforma the Security/Payroll Contract includes fire alarm monitoring. The security cost of $\$ 267,080$ for 24 -hour desk clerk 7 days a week is split $65 \%$ LOSP/35\% non-LOSP. The splitis consistent with the agreement negotiated and documented in the gap loan evaluation dated August 2018. Fire alarm monitoring cost of $\$ 21,648$ is proportionally split $25 \%$ LOSP/75\% non-LOSP.

Replacement Reserve Deposit: Please note that the replacement reserve deposits total $\$ 78,500$ or $\$ 500$ PUPY. As written in Loan Agreement Section 12.1(b) - Residential Replacement Reserve Account, "After the Project’s first ten (10) years of operations, Borrower may request adjustments every five (5) years based on its most recently approved CNA."

## 4. OPERATING COSTS COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

To evaluate the proposed budget for La Fenix under a new LOSP contract and its relative cost to other family and supportive housing projects of similar size, MOHCD staff compared the project's proposed operating expenses to the operating expenses of other projects in MOHCD's portfolio.

## Comparison with Other Supportive Housing

During 2018, MOHCD's portfolio had a total of 32 supportive housing LOSP projects. Average total operating expenses (before replacement reserve deposits and hard debt service), averaged $\$ 14,600$ per unit per annum ("PUPA"), with a range from $\$ 8,600$ to $\$ 24,800$ PUPA. One of the greatest determinants of PUPA operating expenses is project size, with PUPA operating expenses higher for smaller and scattered site buildings and lower for larger buildings. With proposed per unit operating expenses of \$11,769, La Fenix is lower than the average for LOSP supportive housing projects.

## Average Operating Expenses Supportive Housing Projects, 2018

| Project | 2018 PUPA Operating Expenses |
| ---: | ---: |
| Portfolio Avg. of 32 LOSP Projects | $\$ 14,600$ |
| La Fenix | $\$ 11,769$ |

Estimated 2020 PUPA Operating Expenses of LOSP Projects, based on 2018 Operating Expenses


Comparison to Other Projects with Similar Percentage of LOSP Units
Within the portfolio of projects supported by LOSP, the percentage of units in each project that are set aside for homeless households varies from $20 \%$ to $100 \%$. MOHCD staff analyzed the average PUPA operating costs within three subsets of the LOSP portfolio, based on the percentage of LOSP units within a project. Buildings with a higher percentage of LOSP units have higher operating costs on a per unit basis. La Fenix has $25 \%$ of its total units set-aside as permanent supportive housing units and the operating cost of $\$ 11,769$ are consistent with the average operating cost of supportive housing projects with $30 \%$ or less of LOSP units.

| $\%$ of LOSP Units | \# Projects | Average PUPA <br> Operating Expenses |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $80 \%$ or more LOSP Units | 5 | $\$ 19,200$ |
| $31 \%-79 \%$ LOSP Units | 13 | $\$ 13,800$ |
| $30 \%$ or less LOSP Units | 8 | $\$ 12,500$ |
| All | 26 | $\$ 14,400$ |

*Operating Expenses inflated annually by $3.5 \%$.

## Comparison to Other Projects of Similar Size

On the other hand, at 157 units, proposed operating costs of La Fenix at $\$ 11,769$ are very close to the average of supportive housing projects of similar size, above 100 units.

Projected Average Operating Expenses Per Unit Per Annum (PUPA), 2020*
Supportive Housing Projects
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|r|c|}\hline & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Avg PUPA } \\ \text { Operating } \\ \text { \# Units }\end{array} \\ & & \begin{array}{c}\# \\ \text { Projects }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { 2020 }\end{array}\right]$

* Based on 2018 actuals, escalated 3.5\% annually.

Comparison to Family Supportive Housing Projects
La Fenix has proposed operating costs that are somewhat lower than comparable family projects. Of these projects, the best comparable projects family housing developments with a set aside for TAY or families experiencing homelessness are:

- Bayview Hills Gardens, 73 units including 44 supportive housing units;
- Arnett Watson Apartments, 83 units including 70 supportive housing units;
- 1100 Ocean, 71 units including 19 units for transition age youth;
- $10^{\text {th }} \&$ Mission, 136 units including 44 supportive housing units;
- $11804^{\text {th }}$ Street, 150 units including 50 supportive housing units, and;
- 2060 Folsom, 127 units including 29 unit for transition age youth.



## 5. SUPPORT SERVICES EVALUATION

As the responsible party of the services programming, MHDC partnered with Lutheran Social Services ("LSS") to provide programs and services for children, youth and families residing at the Project. MHDC will lead the supportive services for the general population and LSS for the formerly homeless families. MHDC and LSS have executed a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") delineating roles and responsibilities. MHDC, LSS, HSH, and BPMC are developing an MOU to delineate responsibilities at the property and roles related to marketing, leasing, and resident retention, housing stability, and increase self-sufficiency. The parties plan to execute the MOU in early September 2020 and prior to leasing of the LOSP units.

HSH has reviewed and approved the overall services plan that includes LOSP units. HSH will fund services provided by LSS. HSH's services contract with LSS is for \$236,480 and is not part of the La Fenix operating budget. MHDC's non-LOSP residential services cost approved in the overall services plan is $\$ 140,953, \$ 58,577$ more than the budget approved before construction closing and shown in the Loan Agreement dated December 1, 2018 in Exhibit B-3 and B-4. Please note that MOHCD did not review the approved services plan as it relates to the non-LOSP residential services until this LOSP loan evaluation. As the services plan has been approved by HSH and is comprehensive and incorporates both LSS and MHDC's services, MHDC's services budget is paid for by non-LOSP tenants only, even though MHDC’s residential services are available to LOSP residents. It should be noted that that typically the non-LOSP service provided consults with MOHCD before making a change to the service budget that is significantly different that the construction gap loan closing assumptions in the loan agreement. MOHCD typically seeks a services ratio for lottery units/non-LOSP at 1:100. Here, there are 1.25 FTE for 117 units because
the 0.5 services supervisor is provided in-kind to La Fenix. The services staff ratio excluding supervision is $1: 94$ ratio and $100 \%$ of the residential services costs is paid for by the non-LOSP units.

## Personnel

| Staff Position Title | QTY |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resident Service Coordinator | 1.00 FTE |  | \$45,000 |
| Youth Coordinator | 0.25 FTE |  | \$10,000 |
| Computer Lab Monitor |  |  | In Kind |
| Resident Services Supervisor | 0.50 FTE |  | In Kind |
|  |  | Subtotal Salaries | \$55,000 |
| Fringe Benefits @ $27.5 \%$ |  |  | \$15,125 |
|  |  | Total Personnel Expenses | \$70,125 |

Program Costs

| Item |  | Total Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Program Supplies |  | $\$ 3,000$ |
| Office Supplies |  | $\$ 3,000$ |
| Equipment |  | $\$ 1,800$ |
| Communication |  | $\$ 3,000$ |
| IT Support |  | $\$ 2,500$ |
| Community Building Activities |  | $\$ 15,000$ |
| Incentives |  | $\$ 2,500$ |
| Transportation |  | $\$ 1,000$ |
| Special Events |  | $\$ 5,000$ |
| Professional Development |  | $\$ 1,500$ |
|  |  | $\$ \mathbf{T o t a l}$ Program Expense |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 8 , 4 2 5}$ |

Administrative Overhead

| Indirect Cost (15\%) |  | $\$ 16,264$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Admin (15\%) |  | $\$ 16,264$ |
|  | Total Residential Non-LOSP Services Budget | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 0 , 9 5 3}$ |
|  |  |  |

## 6. CONCLUSION

Staff recommends approval of the full LOSP loan request. The proposed operating budget, excluding services, has appropriate staffing and meets the operating costs standards of comparable projects.

## 7. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

None

## 8. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Mon 8/10/2020 12:53 PM
To: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Cc: Gotthelf, Felicia (MYR) [felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org](mailto:felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org)
Sorry about that
I approve 681 Florida
I approve 1950 LOSP contract

From: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 12:07 PM
To: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Cc: Gotthelf, Felicia (MYR) [felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org](mailto:felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org)
Subject: Loan Committee Approvals from 8-7-2020

Hello Eric,
When you have a moment, if you could please provide your approvals on 681 Florida St (Request for Permanent Financing) and 1950 Mission (Request for LOSP Contract) as discussed at Loan Committee on 8/7/2020.

Thank you,
Rosie Chavez

Assistant Housing Loan Administrator
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103


#### Abstract

\section*{RE: Loan Committee Approvals from 8-7-2020}


8／11／2020， $10: 26$ AM


## 1950 Mission

Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org)
Mon 8/10/2020 3:48 PM
To: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Cc: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Hi Rosanna,
I would like to provide my approval for the 1950 Mission project.
Best,
Salvador


## Salvador Menjivar

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

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

From: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org); Gotthelf, Felicia (MYR) [felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org](mailto:felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org); Oerth, Sally (CII) [sally.oerth@sfgov.org](mailto:sally.oerth@sfgov.org); Jones, Natasha (CII) [natasha.jones@sfgov.org](mailto:natasha.jones@sfgov.org); White, Jeffrey (CII) [jeffrey.white@sfgov.org](mailto:jeffrey.white@sfgov.org); Sesay, Nadia (CII) [nadia.sesay@sfgov.org](mailto:nadia.sesay@sfgov.org); Van Degna, Anna (CON) [anna.vandegna@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.vandegna@sfgov.org); Leditjut@sfha.org; Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org)
Cc: Ely, Lydia (MYR) [lydia.ely@sfgov.org](mailto:lydia.ely@sfgov.org); Carson, Erin (MYR) [erin.carson@sfgov.org](mailto:erin.carson@sfgov.org); Lee, Jonah (MYR) [jonah.lee@sfgov.org](mailto:jonah.lee@sfgov.org); Miller, Theodore (MYR) [Theodore.Miller@sfgov.org](mailto:Theodore.Miller@sfgov.org); Blitzer, Mara (MYR) [mara.blitzer@sfgov.org](mailto:mara.blitzer@sfgov.org); Defiesta, Agnes (MYR) [agnes.defiesta@sfgov.org](mailto:agnes.defiesta@sfgov.org); Nusser, Sarah (MYR) [sarah.nusser@sfgov.org](mailto:sarah.nusser@sfgov.org); Heavens, Cindy (MYR) [cindy.heavens@sfgov.org](mailto:cindy.heavens@sfgov.org); Amaral, Sara (MYR) [sara.amaral@sfgov.org](mailto:sara.amaral@sfgov.org); Lopez, Viviana (MYR) [viviana.lopez@sfgov.org](mailto:viviana.lopez@sfgov.org); Slen, Joyce (MYR) [joyce.slen@sfgov.org](mailto:joyce.slen@sfgov.org); Gagen, Jonathan (MYR)
[jonathan.gagen@sfgov.org](mailto:jonathan.gagen@sfgov.org); McCormack, Caroline (MYR) [caroline.mccormack@sfgov.org](mailto:caroline.mccormack@sfgov.org); Romero, Anne (MYR) [anne.romero@sfgov.org](mailto:anne.romero@sfgov.org); Sims, Pam (CII) [pam.sims@sfgov.org](mailto:pam.sims@sfgov.org); Colomello, Elizabeth (CII) [elizabeth.colomello@sfgov.org](mailto:elizabeth.colomello@sfgov.org); Wong, Annie (CII) [annie.h.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:annie.h.wong@sfgov.org); Obstfeld, Kimberly (CII) [kimberly.obstfeld@sfgov.org](mailto:kimberly.obstfeld@sfgov.org)
Subject: Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee - Friday, August 7, 2020, 11:30 a.m.

Dear Loan Committee, MOHCD staff and Community Partners,
Attached are the agenda and Loan Evaluations for this week's meeting, which will be held Friday, August 7, 2020 at 11:30 a.m. via Microsoft Teams. You can join via the link or the phone number below. Within Teams you will have the option to mute your microphone and hide your video. If this will be your first time using Teams, please sign into the meeting a few minutes early.

Join Microsoft Teams Meeting
+1 415-906-4659 United States, San Francisco (Toll)
Conference ID: 598690 253\#

Local numbers | Reset PIN | Learn more about Teams | Meeting options

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Rosie Chavez

Due to public health orders I'm currently working remotely.
I can be reached via call or text to 415-640-8071, but e-mail is the best way to reach me.
Assistant Housing Loan Administrator, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
$8 / 11 / 2020,10: 25 \mathrm{AM}$
(2020, $10: 25$ AM



## 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 and Community Development
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

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

Nadia Sesay, Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Anna Van Degna, Director
Controller's Office of Public Finance

Attachments: A. LOSP Program Description
B. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget
C. 20-Year Operating Pro Forma
D. LOSP Funding and Disbursement Schedules A-1 and A-2

## Attachment A: LOSP Program Description

As part of the City and County of San Francisco's effort to address the needs of the growing homeless population, the City has prioritized the development of non-profit owned and operated permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless individuals and families. While capital financing can be leveraged for this population, stakeholders realized these units cannot be feasibly operated at the scale needed if they rely solely on scarce federal or state operating subsidies.

In June 2004, the City launched its Ten Year Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness (the 2004 10-Year Plan), a multifaceted approach that included a locally funded operating subsidy as a key element and established the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) in 2006 to support the creation of permanent supportive housing at a large scale. The operating subsidy leverages capital financing by integrating homeless units into Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects without burdening them with operating deficits. LOSP was created by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) in partnership with the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Human Services Agency (HSA).

On July 1, 2016, the City's diverse programs addressing homelessness were brought under the new Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), which combines key homeless-serving programs and contracts previously located across several City departments. The new department consolidates the functions of DPH Direct Access to Housing (DAH) and HSA Housing \& Homeless programs. San Francisco is developing a Coordinated Entry System (CES) for all homeless populations to best match households to the appropriate intervention and ensure those with the highest needs are prioritized.

Through grant agreements with MOHCD, which are subject to annual appropriations by the Board of Supervisors, LOSP pays the difference between the cost of operating housing for homeless persons and all other sources of operating revenue for a given project, such as tenant rental payments, commercial space lease payments, or other operating subsidies. HSH refers homeless applicants to the housing units as well as provides services funding to the projects under a separate contract.

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




Year 1 is a full year, i.e. 12 months of operations): 2020


| Management | Alternative LOSP Split | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management Fee | Management Fee |  |  |  |
| Asset Management Fee | Asset Management Fee |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Management Expenses | - |  |  |  |
| Salaries/Benefits | Alternative Losp Split | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| Manager's Salary | Manager's Salary |  |  |  |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefits | Health Insurance and Other Benefits |  |  |  |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | Other Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | Administrative Rent-Free Unit |  |  |  |


Insurance Sub-total Taxes and Licenses


| Sinterestotal insurance |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payroll | Projected LosP Split | Losp | non-Losp | (Only acceptable it LOSP-specific expenses are being tracked |
| Supplies | Supplies | 25.00\% | 75.00\% | at enty leve in the projects accounting system) |
| Contracts | Contracts | 26.95\% | ${ }^{73.05 \%}$ |  |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | Alternative LoSP Split | LoSP | non-LOSP | Approved By (read) |
| Security Payroll/ Contract | Security PayrollC ontract | 62.14\% | 37.86\% |  |

HVAC Repairs and Maintenance
Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs
$\frac{\text { Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses }}{\text { Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses }}$
Supportive Services
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES W/O RESERVES/GL BAS

| Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond Monitoring Fee | Alternative LOSP Split | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| Replacement Reserve Deposit | Replacement Reserve Deposit |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Deposit | Operating Reserve Deposit |  |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit | Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit |  |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 2 Depososit |  |  |  |  |
| ired Reserv |  |  |  |  |

Total operating expenses wi reserves/gl base
net operating income (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

| DEBT SERVICE ("hard debt'/amortized loans) | Alternative LOSP Split | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (read) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard Debt - First Lender | Hard Debt- -irst Lender | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| Hard Debt - Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd L | LHHard Dett- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.420 | 42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lender) |  |  |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | Hard Dett - Third Lender (Other HCD Program | , or other 3rd Lender) |  |  |
| Hard Debt - Fourth Lender | Hard Debt-Fourth Lend |  |  |  |

Commercial Hard Debt Service TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)

| Commercial Only Cash Flow |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LoPS/non-LOSP (residual income) | Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) |  |

AVAILABLE CASH FLOW
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL
"Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy)
Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits)

| nvestor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) | Alternative LOSP Split | Losp | non-LOSP | Approved By (reqa) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other Payments | Other Payments |  |  |  |
| Von-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 (select lender in comments field) | Non-amorizizg Loan Pmnt-Lender 1 (select lender in comments field) |  |  |  |
| Von-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 (select lender in comments field) |  |  |  |  |


total payments preceding mohcd
RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS
PRECEDING MOHCD)
Residual Receipts Calculation
oees Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
of Residual Reeeintser FeelBorrower $\%$ of Residual Receipts in Yr 1 Sum of DD F from LOSP and non-LOSS.


MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |
| :--- |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment |

Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Leas
REMAINING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS
debt Service


## REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are

Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee
Final Balance (should be zero)

## Attachment C: 20-year Operating Proforma









## Attachment D: LOSP Funding Schedule A

MOHCD Proforma - Exhibit A

| LOSP FUNDING SCHEDULE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Project Address: | 1950 Mission |  |
|  | Project Start Date: | $10 / 1 / 2020$ |  |

Exhibit A

| Calendar Year |  | Full Year Funding Amount | \# Months to Fund | Total <br> Disbursement <br> for <br> Calendar Year | Estimated Disbursement Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CY-1 | 2020 | \$424,490 | 3 | \$106,122 | 9/1/2020 |
| CY-2 | 2021 | \$439,751 | 12 | \$439,751 | 1/1/2021 |
| CY-3 | 2022 | \$455,364 | 12 | \$455,364 | 1/1/2022 |
| CY-4 | 2023 | \$471,565 | 12 | \$471,565 | 1/1/2023 |
| CY-5 | 2024 | \$488,375 | 12 | \$488,375 | 1/1/2024 |
| CY-6 | 2025 | \$505,816 | 12 | \$505,816 | 1/1/2025 |
| CY-7 | 2026 | \$523,912 | 12 | \$523,912 | 1/1/2026 |
| CY-8 | 2027 | \$542,686 | 12 | \$542,686 | 1/1/2027 |
| CY-9 | 2028 | \$562,163 | 12 | \$562,163 | 1/1/2028 |
| CY-10 | 2029 | \$582,370 | 12 | \$582,370 | 1/1/2029 |
| CY-11 | 2030 | \$603,333 | 12 | \$603,333 | 1/1/2030 |
| CY-12 | 2031 | \$625,079 | 12 | \$625,079 | 1/1/2031 |
| CY-13 | 2032 | \$647,637 | 12 | \$647,637 | 1/1/2032 |
| CY-14 | 2033 | \$671,037 | 12 | \$671,037 | 1/1/2033 |
| CY-15 | 2034 | \$695,310 | 12 | \$695,310 | 1/1/2034 |
| CY-16 | 2035 | \$706,999 | 12 | \$706,999 | 1/1/2035 |
| Total Contract Amount: |  |  |  | \$8,627,518 |  |

