# Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee 

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

Evaluation of Request for Funding: LOSP Contract Funding (Local Operating Subsidy Program)

Prepared By: Anne Romero
Loan Committee Date: September 18, 2020

| Sponsor Name: | $\begin{array}{l}\text { 2060 Folsom Housing, L.P. (Chinatown Community } \\ \text { Development Center (CCDC) \& Mission Economic } \\ \text { Development Association (MEDA) co-GPs) }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | Casa Adelante: 2060 Folsom |$\}$| 2060 Folsom (between $17^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ Streets and |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Address: | Shotwell) |

## 1. SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

2060 Folsom Housing, L.P., a California limited partnership, an affiliate of Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) \& Mission Economic Development Association (MEDA), requests up to $\$ 8,553,818$ in General Funds from the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) to subsidize operations of 29, out of a total of 127, units of permanent supportive housing for transition age youth (TAY) experiencing homelessness or at risk of experiencing homelessness at Casa Adelante: 2060 Folsom, for a period of 15 years.

CCDC and MEDA were selected to develop affordable housing at the City-owned 2060 Folsom housing site based on a proposal submitted under the $17^{\text {th }} \&$ Folsom Request for Proposals (RFP) issued on May 1, 2015. The new housing that is nearing construction completion will have 127 units including 29 units for TAY, in 9 stories. CCDC is the property manager and service provider for the families, and Larkin Street Youth Services (LSYS) is the youth service provider. The ground floor will contain community serving
uses that will face south onto the new neighborhood park, In Chan Kaajal Park, which was completed in 2017.
As included in the original proposal and consistent with MEDA's organizational mission, the project will contain community serving uses to serve the neighborhood and residents from many life phases, including infant/toddler, youth, young adult and career. The ground floor, $11,810 \mathrm{SF}$, will include an affordable child care development center operated by Good Samaritan Family Resource Center, program space for PODER, joint program and office space for Youth Speaks \& First Exposure, which extends to the second floor, and a small café adjacent to the park with public restrooms accessible by park users.

In regards to the continuous effort to expand and stabilize non-profit organizations in the Mission, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, the San Francisco Arts Commission, and Community Vision recently announced $\$ 3.1$ Million of transformation awards for multiple non-profit organizations in San Francisco. Out of the $\$ 3.1 \mathrm{M}$, the project's commercial tenants, PODER (awarded \$385K) and Youth Speak \& First Exposure (awarded \$560K) have been awarded a total of $\$ 945,000$ to partially fund the build-out of their spaces at 2060 Folsom. This award is a vital piece to their expansion and provides leverage for the non-profit organizations to continue the remaining of their fundraising effort. In addition, Good Samaritan Family Resource Center has been doing well with fundraising and has reached $90 \%$ of their fundraising target. Most of the commercial tenants will start construction of their tenant improvements in Fall of 2020. The residential Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) is anticipated to be obtained in January 2021, with residential and community-serving move-ins starting immediately thereafter.

The project will provide housing for 97 family households and 29 TAY households, including parenting households, in studios, 1-BR, 2-BR and 3-BR units. MOHCD restricts the family units to families with incomes up to $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI (the unadjusted AMI for HUD metro fair market rent area that contains San Francisco). The AHP funding further restricts some of the family units to $50 \%$ and $55 \%$ MOHCD AMI. Two of the 2BR family units are built as family childcare units that will not go through the lottery, and are restricted at $60 \% \mathrm{MOHCD}$ AMI.

MOHCD restricts the TAY units at $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI (including 22 studios and seven 1BR units for parenting TAY) who will be referred by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) through TAY Coordinated Entry. TCAC and the State Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program further restrict the TAY units to $30 \%$ TCAC AMI, which is equivalent to around $40 \%$ MOHCD AMI. In addition to income, AHP funding requires that TAY targeting include 15 units for TAY with a mental or physical Disability, 5 units for TAY recovering from abuse, and 9 units for TAY recovering from substance abuse. The TAY subpopulations were included in the AHP application and resulted in a strong score and successful award. The sponsors have initiated their lease up process, and the lottery for the 95 family units is planned for September 16, 2020.

The requested LOSP funds for the TAY supportive housing units would be provided through a new 15-year contract of up to $\$ 8,553,818$, with initial disbursement in January

2021, and final disbursement in January 2036, with contract expiration of December 31, 2036. If approved, funds would be disbursed under the contract on a calendar-year basis in accordance with the attached schedule (see Exhibit A), with possible reductions from these amounts based on operating surpluses that may occur in previous years. A total of $\$ 401,374$, in assistance is budgeted for the first year (2021). This equates to an annual per unit subsidy of $\$ 13,840$ and a monthly per unit subsidy of $\$ 1,153$, not including support services for the TAY units. Support services for the TAY units, provided by Larkin Street Youth Services, will be funded under a separate services contract with HSH. Though all LOSP 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

The 2060 Folsom operating budget request was developed based on CCDC's internal operating budget template and was tailored to the specifics of the project. It reflects minor updates from the operating budget that was reviewed at the gap loan request. The project has an operations staff of 7.7 FTE , including $24 / 7$ desk clerk coverage. The proposed operating expenses before debt and reserve deposits are $\$ 12,276$ per unit per year.

| Underwriting Standard | Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Operating Proforma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Debt Service Coverage <br> Ratio is between minimum <br> $1.10: 1$ and maximum <br> $1.15: 1$ at year 15 | N | The DSCR is 1.14:1 in Year 1 and 1.21 in Year 15, slightly <br> higher than the Underwriting Standard of a maximum of 1.15:1 <br> in year 15. The project is not sizing the residential mortgage on <br> the commercial income, per the terms of the perm loan. The <br> commercial cashflow contributes to deferred developer fee and <br> the remainder goes through the residual receipts waterfall, <br> including repayment of the MOHCD loan and ground lease <br> payment. |
| Debt Service Coverage <br> Ratio stays above 1.00:1 <br> for entirety of projected <br> 20-year cash flow | Y |  |
| Vacancy meets TCAC <br> Standards | Y |  |
| Annual Income Growth is <br> increased at 2.5\% per year | Y | Vacancy is 5\% of tenant income |
| Annual Operating <br> Expenses are increased at <br> 3.5\% per year | Y |  |
| Base year operating <br> expenses per unit are <br> reasonable per <br> comparables | Y | Total Operating Expenses are $\$ 12,276$ per unit which is within <br> standard range for family housing of this size with a portion of <br> units being permanent supportive housing; See analysis of comp <br> projects below. |
| Property Management Fee <br> is at allowable HUD <br> Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is \$99,060 or \$65 PUPM |


| Property Management <br> staffing level is reasonable <br> per comparables | Y | Proposed project staffing is 7.7 FTE including 24 hour desk clerk <br> coverage (1 FTE manager, 1 FTE assistant manager, 4.2 FTE <br> desk clerks, 1.5 FTE maintenance) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management and <br> Partnership Management <br> Fees meet standards | Y | Annual AM Fee is $\$ 14,365$ based on max fees permitted by HCD <br> Annual PM Fee is $\$ 29,425$ |
| Replacement Reserve <br> Deposits meet or exceed <br> TCAC minimum standards | Y | Annual Investor Services Fee is $\$ 5,000$ |

## 3. PROPOSED LOSP BUDGET

## Annual Operating Income Evaluation

Tenant Rent: Tenant rents for the 97 family units are based on incomes of $50 \%$ to $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI, and the TAY units will have the LOSP subsidy to support them, as those household incomes will be below $40 \%$ MOHCD AMI. The units in the project are income-restricted as follows, with the most restrictive eligible income indicated in bold:

## Unit Chart:

| Unit Size | No. of | MAXIMUM INCOME LEVEL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NON- } \\ & \text { LOTTERY } \end{aligned}$ | Units | MOHCD | TCAC | AHSC | AHP |
| Studio - TAY | 22 | 50\% SF AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30\% TCAC } \\ & \text { AMI } \end{aligned}$ | 50\% SF AMI |
| 1-BR- TAY | 7 | 50\% SF AMI | 30\% TCAC AMI | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30\% TCAC } \\ & \text { AMI } \end{aligned}$ | 50\% SF AMI |
| 2-BR - FCC | 2 | 60\% SF AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% SF AMI |
| Sub-Total | 31 |  |  |  |  |
| LOTTERY |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 BR | 8 | 60\% SF AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% SF AMI |
| 2 BR | 11 | 60\% SF AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 40\% TCAC AMI | 50\% SF AMI |
| 2-BR | 25 | 60\% SF AMI | 55\% TCAC AMI | 55\% TCAC AMI | 55\% SF AMI |
| 2-BR | 9 | 60\% SF AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% SF AMI |
| 3 BR | 6 | 60\% SF AMI | 55\% TCAC AMI | 55\% TCAC AMI | 55\% SF AMI |
| 3 BR | 36 | 60\% SF AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% TCAC AMI | 60\% SF AMI |
| Sub-Total | 95 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MANAGER } \\ & \text { UNIT } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2-BR | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| TOTAL | 127 |  |  |  |  |

TAY households will be eligible with incomes up to approximately $40 \%$ MOHCD AMI, and will pay $30 \%$ of the household monthly incomes as rent, estimated at $\$ 250$ / month.

LOSP Subsidy: The LOSP subsidy in the Year 1 Operating Budget is proposed at $\$ 401,374$ ( $\$ 13,840$ PUPA and $\$ 1,153$ PUPM). The proposed budget allocates all operating costs on a prorated basis with a $23 \% / 77 \%$ split except for desk clerk coverage, which is prorated $80 \%$ LOSP / $20 \%$ non-LOSP. This is due to cashflow needs of the project and that the 24-hour desk clerk coverage is required due to the TAY units, although all units will benefit from it.

## Commercial Space Revenue:

Commercial revenue and Common Area Maintenance (CAM) charges from the three public benefit nonprofit spaces and café total $\$ 178,757$. With a budgeted $20 \%$ vacancy, these spaces provide a Commercial Effective Gross Income of $\$ 143,006$. Commercial operating expenses are $\$ 26,682$. In addition, $\$ 72,740$ is budgeted for janitorial and maintenance of the public restrooms and maintenance of the public paseo which will be open during the same hours as the adjacent park. The commercial net revenue is $\$ 43,584$, which is the minimum commercial master lease payment to the partnership and contributes to the gross revenue of the project.

MEDA entered into a commercial space master lease with the limited partnership which will commence at TCO and last for 35 years. The annual rent will be equal to the greater of (i) $\$ 43,584$ or (ii) eighty-five percent $(85 \%)$ of the Net Sublease Income for the prior calendar year. Common Area Maintenance (CAM) Charges to subtenants total \$13,561 in Year 1.

Total Residential Revenue Stream: Between tenant rents, the LOSP subsidy, miscellaneous income and $\$ 43,584$ in commercial space rental income through the commercial space master lease, total residential rental revenue for Year 1 is $\$ 2,310,677$.

## Annual Operating Key Expenses Evaluation

Staffing Plan: The project has 7.7 FTE staffing, including a full-time property manager and assistant manager, 1.5 FTE maintenance, and 4.2 FTE desk clerks. This staffing plan represents a staff to unit/household ratio of 1 to 16 and is reasonable.

| Title | FTE | Pro-rated Salary |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Salaries |  |  |  |
| Assistant Manager | 1 | \$ | 48,000 |
| Desk Clerks | 4.2 | \$ | 189,989 |
| Subtotal | 5.2 |  |  |
| Manager's Salary |  |  |  |
| Property Manager | 1 | \$ | 68,000 |
| Subtotal | 1 |  |  |
| Repair Payroll |  |  |  |
| Maintenance Technician | 1 | \$ | 57,283 |
| Maintenance Assistant | 0.5 | \$ | 22,807 |
| Subtotal | 1.5 |  |  |
| Total FTE's and Expenses | 7.70 | \$ | 386,079 |

Supportive Services: $\$ 121,664$ is budgeted for 1 FTE service coordinator position and supervision for the non-LOSP family units, which will be filled by a CCDC staff. This line item has increased from the gap request by around $\$ 9,000$, due to increased salaries and benefits. Supportive services for the TAY units will be provided by Larkin Street Youth Services through a separate service contract with HSH, and are not included in the operating budget.
Total Annual Operating Expenses before debt and reserves: $\$ 1,559,061, \$ 12,276$ PUPA
HCD Debt Service: Mandatory debt service to HCD in the amount of $\$ 39,060$ for the AHSC loan, which is $.42 \%$ annual interest payment as required by HCD programs.
Hard Debt First Lender: $\$ 542,375$ for first mortgage, with a 35 year term at $5.03 \%$ interest rate (varies annually), which is paid wholly out of non-LOSP income.
Deferred Developer Fee: $\$ 23,394$ is budgeted in Year 1, paid from the non-LOSP units and partially taken during the first fifteen years. Total eligible deferred developer fee over time is $\$ 1,784,976$ as permitted by HCD and defined in the developer fee agreement.

## 20-Year Cash Flow

- The LOSP subsidy funds a break-even budget, thus no cash flow would be generated and available for soft loan repayments or distributions.
- Tenant rental income is escalated at $2.5 \%$ for family units and $1 \%$ for TAY supportive housing units.
- Resident vacancy rate is 5\%; there is no commercial vacancy budgeted as defined in the commercial master lease with the LP.
- All operating expenses are escalated at $3.5 \%$
- Partnership management fee is escalated $3.5 \%$ and ceases after Year 15


## 4. OPERATING COSTS COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

To evaluate the proposed budget for 2060 Folsom 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 annual operating expenses of $\$ 12,300$, 2060 Folsom is lower than the average for LOSP supportive housing projects.


Comparison to Other Projects with Similar \% 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. With $23 \%$ supportive housing units, the proposed operating costs of $\$ 12,276$ PUPA are very in line with supportive housing projects with $30 \%$ or less of LOSP units, at $\$ 12,500$ PUPA.

| \% of LOSP Units | Average PUPA <br> \# Projects | 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 127 units, proposed operating costs of 2060 Folsom at $\$ 12,276$ PUPA are somewhat higher than supportive housing projects of similar size above 100 units, which average $\$ 11,700$ PUPA.

Projected Average Operating Expenses Per Unit Per Annum (PUPA), 2020* Supportive Housing Projects
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|r|c|}\hline & & \\ & \text { \# Units } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Avg PUPA } \\ \text { Operating } \\ \text { Expenses, } \\ \text { Projects }\end{array} \\ \mathbf{2 0 2 0}\end{array}\right]$

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


## Comparison to Family Supportive Housing Projects

2060 Folsom has proposed operating costs that are lower than comparable family supportive housing projects which have an average operating cost PUPA of $\$ 15,100$. The two $100 \%$ supportive family projects have the highest operating cost PUPA which brings up the average. 1950 Mission, also presented for proposed LOSP funding, is another good comparable with 157 units, including 40 supportive housing units. Whereas 1950 Mission has a lower operating cost PUPA, its larger size at 157 units compared to 127 units provides some cost efficiencies, and the two buildings have a similar staffing plan.


## 5. SUPPORT SERVICES EVALUATION

Through a direct contract with HSH, LSYS will provide supportive services to the 29 TAY households, with separate TAY service provision spaces in place. HSH approved the proposed service plan and budget presented for 2060 Folsom at the gap request. The service plan offers diversity in services provided which is crucial in meeting the wide range of needs of youth experiencing homelessness. The service package also reflects a commitment to providing resources needed to maintain housing stability and increase selfsufficiency. HSH has full confidence in Larkin's expertise in serving youth in permanent housing and their approach in creating a strong partnership with onsite property management. The services contract will start around October 1, 2020 to help with the concurrent lease up process, for move-ins in January 2021.

The housing and services being provided to youth at 2060 Folsom will help HSH reach their goal of reducing youth homelessness in San Francisco by 50\% by 2022.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The sponsors are in good financial health per their latest MOHCD fiscal reviews dated May 13, 2019 (CCDC) and April 30, 2019 (MEDA), and there are no findings with their contract monitoring. MOHCD staff recommend approval of the request in full. The proposed operating budget has appropriate staffing and meets operating cost standards.

## 7 RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

none

## 8. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Friday, September 18, 2020 2:59 PM
Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
2060 Folsom - Loan Committee

I approve

Eric D. Shaw
Director

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, September 23, 2020 3:41 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Approval for 2060 Folsom Housing loan request |

I approve the 2060 Folsom Housing Loan request.

2060 Folsom Housing, L.P., a California limited partnership, an affiliate of Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) \& Mission Economic Development Association (MEDA), requests up to $\$ 8,553,818$ in General Funds from the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) to subsidize operations of 29, out of a total of 127, units of permanent supportive housing for transition age youth (TAY) experiencing homelessness or at risk of experiencing homelessness at Casa Adelante: 2060 Folsom, for a period of 15 years.


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, September 18, 2020 11:14 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR); Romero, Anne (MYR) |
| Subject: | 9/18/20 Loan Committee: 2060 Folsom LOSP Request Approval |

On behalf of Nadia Sesay, I approve the LOSP request for the 2060 Folsom project that was presented at the 9/18/20 Loan Committee.

## Sally Oerth

Deputy Director

office of
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT
OCII

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Van Degna, Anna (CON) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, September 18, 2020 11:13 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | 260 Folsom |

approved

## Anna Van Degna

Director, Controller's Office of Public Finance
City \& County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 336
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5956
Email: anna.vandegna@sfgov.org

## 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 for 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




## Attachment C: 20-year Operating Proforma



|  Total \# Units: <br>  45 <br> INCOME  | Losp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 45 <br> 100.00\% |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 4 } \\ 2024 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 5 \\ 2025 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 6 \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  | \% annual <br> inc LOSP | \% annual increase | $\underset{\text { Comments }}{\text { (related to annual inc assumptions) }}$ | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  | 136,000 |  | 136,000 | 137,360 |  | 137,360 | 138,733 |  | 138,733 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 811,104 |  | 811,104 | 841,608 |  | 841,608 | 873.210 |  | 873,210 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 1,292 |  | 1,292 | ${ }_{1,325}$ |  | ${ }_{1,325}$ | 1,358 |  | ${ }^{1,358}$ |
| Supportive Services Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 2,907 |  | 2.907 | 2,980 |  | 2.980 | 3,055 |  | 3,055 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | applicable |  | . |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  | 951,303 | - | 951,303 | 983,272 | . | 983,272 | 1,016,355 | . | 1,016,355 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manualy per reievant MOH | (6,800) | . | (6,800) | (6,888) |  | (6,868) | (6,937) | - | (6,937) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss-Commercal | n/a | n/a | policy; annual incrementing usually not appropriate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 944,503 |  | 944,503 | 976,404 |  | 976,404 | 1,009,419 |  | 1,009,419 |

## operating expense

| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 39.515 |  | 39.515 | 40.898 |  | 40.898 | 42,329 |  | 42,329 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 25,135 | . | 25,135 | 26,014 |  | 26,014 | 26,925 |  | 26,925 |
| Salaries/Benefits 3 Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 78,608 | . | 78,608 | 81,359 |  | ${ }^{81,359}$ | 84,207 |  | 84,207 |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{43,772}$ | . | 43,772 | 45,304 |  | 45,304 | 46,890 |  | 46,890 |
| Heatth Insurance and Other Benefitis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 125,037 | . | 125,037 | 129.413 |  | 129,413 | 133,943 |  | 133,943 |
| Other Salaries/Benefitis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 137,215 | . | 137,215 | 142.017 |  | 142,017 | 146,988 |  | 146,988 |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Salari |  |  |  | 384, |  | 384,632 | 8,094 |  | 8,094 | 2,027 |  | 412,027 |







## USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE

| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD poicy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 24,772 |  | 24,772 | 25.515 |  | 25.515 | 281 |  | ${ }^{26,281}$ |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for linits) |  |  | per MOHCD poily n a anual increase | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 7,000 |  | 7,000 |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enter comments se: anuua increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amotizing Loan Pmnt-Lender 2 |  |  | Enter comments se: anual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt <= Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 31,772 |  | 31,772 | 32,515 |  | 32,515 | 33,281 | - | 33,281 |

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

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |
| :--- |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment |
| Proposed MOCCD Residual Receipits Amount to Residual Iround |
| Lease |

Propose
Lease


| Operating Reserve Starting Balance |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Operating Reserve WithdrawalsOoerating Reserve Interest |  |
|  |  |

## OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANC

| Other Reserve 1 Deposits |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawal |

Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance
OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE

| Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance |
| :--- | :--- |
| Other Reserve 22 Deposits |

Other Resesve 2 W Withdrawals
Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance
$\square$



| Total \# Units: <br> 45 <br> INCOME | Losp | Units 0 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ 100.00 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 10 \\ 2030 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 11 \\ 2031 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 12 } \\ & 2032 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | \% annual | \% annual increase |  | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  | 144,366 |  | 144,366 | 145,810 |  | 145,810 | 147,268 |  | 147,268 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LoSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 1,011,382 |  | 1,011,382 | 1.049,078 |  | 1,049,078 | 1.088,123 |  | 1.088,123 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 1,499 |  | ${ }^{1,499}$ | 1,536 |  | ${ }^{1.536}$ | 1.575 |  | 575 |
| Supportive Services Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 3,372 |  | 3,372 | 3,456 | . | 3,456 | 3.542 |  | 3,542 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as applicable |  | . | 1,160,618 |  | . |  | 1,240,509 | . | 1,240,509 |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  | 1,160,618 |  |  |  | 1,199,880 | - | 1,199,880 |  | . |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manually per relevant MOH policy; annual incrementing usually not ppropriat | (7,218) | - | (7,218) | (7,291) | - | (7,291) | (7,363) | - | ${ }^{(7,363)}$ |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments vacancy Loss-Commercla | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  | 1,153,400 |  | 1,153,400 | 1,192,589 |  | 1,192,589 | 1,23, 145 |  | 1,233,145 |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD | ${ }^{48,574}$ | - | 48.574 | 50,274 | . | 50,274 | 52,033 | . | 52,033 |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 30,897 | - | 30,897 | 31,978 | . | ${ }^{31,978}$ | ${ }^{33,098}$ | - | 33,098 |
| Sub-total Management Expens |  |  |  | ${ }^{99,471}$ |  | 79,471 | ${ }^{82,252}$ |  | ${ }^{82,252}$ | ${ }^{85,131}$ |  | ${ }^{85,131}$ |



| Adverisisg and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 28,442 | . | 28,442 | 29,438 | - | 29,438 | ${ }^{30,468}$ |  | 30,468 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 6.814 |  | ${ }_{6,814}$ | 7,053 |  | 7,053 | 7,300 |  | 7,300 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{13,629}$ | - | ${ }^{13,629}$ | 14,106 | - | 14,106 | 14,600 | - | 14,600 |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 19,932 | - | 19,932 | 20,630 |  | 20.630 | 21,352 |  | 21,352 |
| Bad Debis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 13,704 | - | 13,704 | 14,184 | - | 14,184 | 14,680 | - | 14,680 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 82,522 | ${ }^{85,410}$ |  | ${ }^{85,410}$ | ${ }^{88,400}$ |  | 88,400 |


| Uililies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electricity | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ 3.5\% | 3.5\% ${ }^{\text {3.5\% }}$ |  | ${ }_{27,598}^{27,391}$ |  | $\frac{27,258}{25,391}$ | 28,212 |  | $\frac{28,212}{26,279}$ | $\frac{29,199}{27,99}$ |  | 29,199 27,199 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 25,621 | , | 25,621 | 26,518 |  | 26,518 | 27,446 |  | 27,446 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{34,072}$ | - | ${ }^{34,072}$ | 35,265 | . | ${ }^{35,265}$ | ${ }^{36,499}$ |  | 38,499 |
| Taxes and Licenses Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 112,342 | - | 112,342 | 116,274 | - | 116,274 | 120,344 |  | 120,344 |
| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.181 |  | 2.181 | ${ }^{2,257}$ |  | ${ }^{2} 2.257$ | ${ }_{2}, 336$ |  | 2,33 |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1.090 |  | 1,090 | 1,128 |  | 1,128 | 1,168 |  | 1,166 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 3,271 |  | 3,271 | ${ }^{3,385}$ |  | ${ }^{3,385}$ | ${ }^{3,504}$ |  | 3,504 |


| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 64,918 | - | 64,918 | 67,190 | - | 67,190 | 69,541 |  | 6, 9 ,511 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 29,393 | . | 29,393 | 30,421 | . | 30,421 | 31,486 |  | 31,486 |
| Director's \& officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 115,356 |  | 115,356 | 119,393 | . | 119,393 | 123,572 |  | 123.572 |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5.942 | - | 5,942 | 6,150 | . | 6,150 | 6,365 |  | 6,365 |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 93,474 | . | 93,474 | 96,746 | . | 96,746 | 100,132 |  | 100,132 |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 28,825 | - | 28.825 | 29,834 | - | 29,834 | 30,878 |  | 30,878 |
| Security PayrollC Contract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5.997 | - | 5.997 | 6,207 | - | 6,207 | 6.424 | - | 6,424 |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  |  | 249,594 | - | 249,59 | 256,330 | - | 258,330 | 267,372 | - | 267,372 |
| Supportive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | . | . | - |  | . | . | . |  |  |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| total operating expenses |  |  |  | 1,094,321 |  | 1,094,321 | 1,132,622 |  | 1,132,622 | 1,172,264 | - | 1,172,264 |

TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES Reserves/GL Base Ras

## Bround Lease e Base Ren <br> Operating Reseserve Depopsit

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

$\frac{\text { Required Reserve Deposit's, Commercial }}{\text { Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent Bond Fees }}$
total operating expenses ( $\boldsymbol{w} /$ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees)
NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)
DEBT SERVICEMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans)

| Hard Debt- First Lender |
| :--- |
| Hard Debt - Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lender) |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) |

Commercial Hard Deend Service TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVIICE
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Aommercial Only Cash Flow
Alocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
AVALABL CASH FLOW
USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WAT

| Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD poilicy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parthership Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD poilicy | 29.579 | . | ${ }^{29,579}$ | ${ }^{30,467}$ |  | 30.467 | ${ }^{31,381}$ |  | 31,381 |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for linits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy n a annual increase | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 7,000 |  | 7.000 | 7.000 |  | 7.000 |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enter commenis e: annual incease, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmit - Lender 2 |  |  | Enter comments re: annual increase, etc. |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt $<=$ Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  | - | - |  | . | . |  | . | - |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 36,579 |  | 36,579 | 37,467 |  | 37,467 | 38,381 | . |  |

RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD)
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receipts split tor all years. - Lender/Owner

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

| MOHCD Residual Receitts Amount Due |
| :--- |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Reeceips Amount to Residual Ground |
| Lease |

Propose
Lease



## OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANC <br> Other Reserve 1 Deposits <br> Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance

OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANC

| Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance |
| :--- | :--- |
| Other Reserve 22 Deposits |

Other Reserve 2 Withdrawals
Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance





| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 33,507 |  | 3,507 | 34,680 |  | 34,680 | 35,894 |  | 35,894 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 31,212 | . | 31,212 | 32,304 |  | 32,304 | 33,435 |  | 33,435 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 31,495 | . | 31,495 | 32,597 |  | 32,597 | ${ }^{33,738}$ |  | ${ }^{33,738}$ |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 41,884 | . | 41,884 | 43,350 | . | 43,350 | 44,867 | - | 44,867 |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 138,097 | - | 138,097 | 142,931 | $\cdot$ | 142,931 | 147,933 | - | 147,933 |
| Taxes and Licenses |  | 3.5\% |  | 2.681 |  | ${ }^{2.681}$ | 2.774 |  | ${ }^{2.774}$ | 2.871 |  | 2,871 |
| Payroll Taxes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | 2,0\%1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,0 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,340 | . | 1.340 | 1,387 |  | ${ }_{1,387}$ | 1,436 |  | 1,43 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licen |  |  |  | 4.021 |  | 4.021 | 4.162 |  | 4,162 | 4,307 |  | 4,4 |



| PUPA (w/ Reserves/GL Base RentBond Fees) |
| :--- |

Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees

| Ground Lease Base Rent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bond Monitoring Fee |
| Replacement Reserve De |

Replacement Reserve Deposit

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

Required Reserve Depositts, Commercial
Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees
total operating expenses (w/Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees)


\section*{| Hard Debt- First Lender |
| :--- |
| Hard Debt-Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lender |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | <br> $\frac{\text { Hard Dett - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or or other 3rd Lender) }}{\text { Hard Debt - Fourth Lender }}$}

TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE
Commercial Only Cash Flow Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/:non-LOSP (residual income)

|  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22,500 | . | 22,500 | 22,500 | - | 22,500 | 22,500 | - | 22,500 |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - | . | . | . | - |  | . | - |  |
| 22,500 |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  | 22.500 | 22,500 |  |  |  |  | 22,500 |



## USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) DSCR

| "Below-the-line"Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizing Loan Pmit - Lender 1 |  |  | Niter commenis re: annua increase, etc: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmit - Lender 2 |  |  | Ener comments e: annual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD

YMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD)
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receipts split tor all years. - Lender/Owner

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE


| OPERATING RESERVE-RUNNING BALANCE |
| :--- |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance <br> Operatign Reserve Deposits <br> Operating Reserve Withrawals <br> Operating Reserve Interest <br> OR Running Balance |


\section*{OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANC <br> | Other Reserve 1 Deposits |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals | <br> Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance}

OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Reseserve 2 Stating Deposits
Other Resesve 2 Withdrawals
Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance



## Attachment D: LOSP Funding Schedule A

## LOSP FUNDING SCHEDULE

| Project Address: | Casa de la Mision |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Start Date: | $5 / 1 / 2021$ |

Exhibit A

|  | Full Year <br> Funding Amount | \# Months <br> to Fund | Disbursement <br> for <br> Calendar Year | Estimated <br> Disbursement <br> Date | FY Budgeted <br> (for Disbursement) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CY-1 | 2021 | $\$ 725,807$ | 8 | $\$ 483,872$ | $4 / 1 / 2021$ | FY2020/21 |
| CY-2 | 2022 | $\$ 753,239$ | 12 | $\$ 753,239$ | $1 / 1 / 2022$ |  |
| CY-3 | 2023 | $\$ 781,660$ | 12 | $\$ 781,660$ | $1 / 1 / 2023$ | FY2021/22 |
| CY-4 | 2024 | $\$ 811,104$ | 12 | $\$ 811,104$ | $1 / 1 / 2024$ | FY2022/23 |
| CY-5 | 2025 | $\$ 841,608$ | 12 | $\$ 841,608$ | $1 / 1 / 2025$ | FY2024/24 |
| CY-6 | 2026 | $\$ 873,210$ | 12 | $\$ 873,210$ | $1 / 1 / 2026$ | FY2025/26 |
| CY-7 | 2027 | $\$ 905,947$ | 12 | $\$ 905,947$ | $1 / 1 / 2027$ | FY2026/27 |
| CY-8 | 2028 | $\$ 939,860$ | 12 | $\$ 939,860$ | $1 / 1 / 2028$ | FY2027/28 |
| CY-9 | 2029 | $\$ 974,991$ | 12 | $\$ 974,991$ | $1 / 1 / 2029$ | FY2028/29 |
| CY-10 | 2030 | $\$ 1,011,382$ | 12 | $\$ 1,011,382$ | $1 / 1 / 2030$ | FY2029/30 |
| CY-11 | 2031 | $\$ 1,049,078$ | 12 | $\$ 1,049,078$ | $1 / 1 / 2031$ | FY2030/31 |
| CY-12 | 2032 | $\$ 1,088,123$ | 12 | $\$ 1,088,123$ | $1 / 1 / 2032$ | FY2031/32 |
| CY-13 | 2033 | $\$ 1,128,567$ | 12 | $\$ 1,128,567$ | $1 / 1 / 2033$ | FY2032/33 |
| CY-14 | 2034 | $\$ 1,170,458$ | 12 | $\$ 1,170,458$ | $1 / 1 / 2034$ | FY2033/34 |
| CY-15 | 2035 | $\$ 1,213,846$ | 12 | $\$ 1,213,846$ | $1 / 1 / 2035$ | FY2034/35 |
| CY-16 | 2036 | $\$ 1,216,466$ | 12 | $\$ 1,216,466$ | $1 / 1 / 2036$ | FY2035/36 |

