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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 

## Sponsor Information:

| Project <br> Name: | 53 Colton | Sponsor(s): | Community Housing Partnership ("CHP") and Strada Investment Group ("Strada") |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | 53 Colton Street, San Francisco, CA | Ultimate | 53 Colton, L.P. |
| Address (w/ | 94103 | Borrower |  |
| cross St): | (Between Brady St \& Colusa Plaza) (Block 3505, Lot 052) | Entity: |  |

## Project Summary:

Community Housing Partnership ("CHP") and Strada Investment Group ("Strada"), through 53 Colton, L.P. (the "Partnership"), are requesting up to $\$ 4,000,000$ in permanent financing for 53 Colton (the "Site" or the "Project"), a 96-unit new construction supportive housing project for formerly homeless adults. 53 Colton is part of a larger 2.2-acre mixed-use development at 1629 Market Street (the "Master Plan Development") developed by Strada. As documented by a Development Agreement (DA) with the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF), Strada is contributing the Site, co-developing the Project with CHP, and contributing \$10MM to develop the Project at the discretion of the developer.

53 Colton will be comprised of 96 furnished studios, restricted at 60\% Area Median Income ("MOHCD AMI"), and subsidized through the City’s Local Operating Subsidy Program ("LOSP"). Tenants will be referred to the Project through the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") Coordinated Entry System (CES). Approximately 35 units at the Project will be reserved for permanent residents from the Civic Center Hotel.

The Project will be financed with State Tax Credits, 4\% Federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, a State of California Housing \& Community Development (HCD) Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) loan, tax-exempt bonds, general partner equity in developer fee and from Strada, and this MOHCD Loan. The Project is scheduled to start construction in October 2020 and complete construction in April 2022.

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | Type V over two levels of Type I podium with basement | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Stories: | 6 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 0.18 acres / 7,780 sf |
| Number of Units: | 96 | Architect: | David Baker Architects |
| Total Residential Area: | 28,831 square feet ("sf") | General Contractor: | Suffolk Construction |
| Total Commercial Area: | Not Applicable - 0 sf | Property Manager: | CHP |
| Total Building Area: | 47,969 sf | Supervisor and District: | Matt Haney (D6) |
| Land Owner: | U.A. Local 38 Pension Trust Fund |  |  |
| Total Development Cost (TDC): | \$51,778,619 | Total Acquisition Cost: | \$171,697 |
| TDC/unit: | \$539,361 | TDC less land cost/unit: | \$537,676 |
| Loan Amount Requested: | \$4,000,000 | Request Amount / unit: | \$41,666 |
| HOME Funds? | No | Parking? | None |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

1. Bond \& Tax Credit Allocation Expiration Date - The Project received a bond and tax credit allocation award from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) and California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC) on April 14, 2020. The bond allocation needs to be assigned and issued within 180 days of the allocation date, which is October 13, 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the Project's initial financing assumptions, in turn, reducing tax credit pricing and creating a gap in the Project's financing that MOHCD is funding; and a delay in selecting the Project's construction lender and tax credit investor (now selected as of July 2020). Closing calls are underway and all financing parties are aware of the short timeline to meet the October deadline. As a loan condition, the Sponsors must close on bond financing prior to MOHCD disbursement of funds to the Project. Section 6.4.1 Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative, and Section 11.3
Recommended conditions prior to financing gap.
2. Federal Home Loan Bank - Affordable Housing Program (FHLB -AHP) - The Partnership will apply for AHP next March 2021 to repay MOHCD's $\$ 1.25 \mathrm{MM}$ bridge loan. The lowest approved score from the latest 2020 AHP round is 72.68, deeming the Project's self-score of 81 highly competitive for a $\$ 1.25 \mathrm{MM}$ AHP request. As a loan condition, the Partnership will apply for AHP funds in 2021 to repay MOHCD's bridge loan. See Section 6.4.1(2) MOHCD - AHP Bridge Loan for more information and Section 11.3 Recommended conditions prior to financing gap.
3. Accessibility Review - MOHCD funds were not anticipated to fund the Project. The building was designed to meet California Building Code (CBC) Chapters 11(A) and 11(B), per TCAC regulations. Projects receiving MOHCD funding are reviewed and approved by the Mayor's Office on Disability ("MOD"). MOD can delegate accessibility review of the Project to the Department of Building Inspections (DBI), but is not required to do so. Sponsors are working closely with MOHCD staff to obtain a letter from MOD delegating review to DBI prior to the Project's Addendum 3 for Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) and Architectural resubmittal. Sponsors should consider the potential impact on the Project should MOD choose not to delegate their accessibility review authority to DBI. Any cost increase associated with MOD changes will not be paid by MOHCD. See Section 4.3 Construction Representative's Evaluation and Section 11.3 Recommended conditions prior to financing gap.
4. Permit Status - The Project team has not received permit approval on their Addendum 1 (Excavation \& Foundation) and Addendum 2 (Superstructure), and the necessary BART approvals required to close construction financing. Addendum 3 (MEP \& Architectural) was recently submitted to DBI for review. With 60 days out from the CDLAC allocation deadline, the Sponsors will work with MOHCD and other City partners to obtain the necessary permit approvals for construction closing and MOD's review deferral letter to DBI prior to the Project's Addendum 3 resubmittal. See Section 4.3 Construction Representative's Evaluation and Section 11.3 Recommended conditions prior to financing gap.
5. LOSP Operating Budget - The Project's per unit per annum ("PUPA") on operating cost is slightly higher compared to MOHCD's LOSP portfolio. As a loan condition, CHP will work with MOHCD to lower operating costs prior to the Project's LOSP contract approval request. See Section 7.3 Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation and Section 11.3 Recommended conditions prior to financing gap.
6. Land Ownership - Given the a-typical structure of this transaction, in which the City does not own the land, as well as MOHCD's late entry into the financing structure for this deal, MOHCD seeks an Option to Purchase the land upon the expiration of the Ground Lease in 97 years. Section 4.1.1 Proposed Property Ownership Structure and Section 11.3 Recommended conditions prior to financing gap.

## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD - GAP | $\$ 2,750,000$ | 57 yrs @ 3.0\% / Res <br> Rec | This Request |
| MOHCD - AHP Bridge <br> Loan | $\$ 1,250,000$ | 3 yrs @ 3.0\% / Res <br> Rec | This Request |
| HCD - MHP | $\$ 11,530,497$ | 55 yrs @ 3.0\% $/ 0.42 \%$ <br> \& Res Rec | Committed |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 17,048,314$ | $\$ 0.885$ per Credit | LOI |
| Certified State Tax <br> Credits | $\$ 5,612,200$ | $\$ 0.880$ per Credit | LOI |
| General Partner Equity <br> (Strada) | $\$ 10,000,000$ |  | Committed |
| General Partner Equity <br> (Developer Fee) | $\$ 3,597,608$ |  | Committed |
| Total | $\$ 51,788,619$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 171,697$ | $\$ 1,789$ | $\$ 4$ |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 34,895,639$ | $\$ 363,496$ | $\$ 727$ |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 10,132,111$ | $\$ 105,543$ | $\$ 211$ |
| Reserves | $\$ 791,564$ | $\$ 8,245$ | $\$ 17$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 5,797,608$ | $\$ 60,392$ | $\$ 121$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 5 1 , 7 8 8 , 6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 3 9 , 4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 8 0}$ |

## 1. BACKGROUND

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

## 1629 Market Street Master Plan Development

Pursuant to Ordinance No. 242-17 in 2017, the Board of Supervisors approved a Development Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and Strada Brady, LLC, a California limited liability company (and affiliate to Strada Investment Group) for the mixed-use development project to an approximately 2.2-acre site located at Market, $12^{\text {th }}$, Stevenson, Chase Court, and Brady Streets, (the "Master Plan Area" or "Master Plan Development"). The Master Plan Area is owned by the U.A. Local 38 Pension Trust Fund and currently comprised of three buildings, four surface parking lots, the San Francisco Local 38 Plumbers Union Hall, existing retail uses, and residential
uses like the Civic Center Hotel, a Single Room Occupancy ("SRO") Hotel-- operating as a 93 -bed Navigation Center for individuals experiencing homelessness.

The Master Plan Development will consist of five residential buildings with 580 units of market rate and $26-28 \%$ below market rate ("BMR") units, including 96 supportive housing units at 53 Colton. There will be a below-grade parking garage to hold 316 parking spaces, 13,000 sf of ground-floor retail and restaurant use, $23,400 \mathrm{sf}$ of privately-owned public open space, which includes the Joseph P. Mazzola Gardens, a plaza, and mid-block passes, and the 30,000 sf union facility replacement for the Local 38 Plumbers Union Hall. The Civic Center Hotel will be renovated as part of the Master Plan Area after the 53 Colton development is complete. Existing Civic Center Hotel residents will be relocated to 53 Colton in approximately 35 units to avoid off-site displacement.

The 53 Colton parcel is owned by the U.A. Local 38 Pension Trust Fund and ground leased to Strada Brady, LLC for a 99-year term and $\$ 1$ annual payment. In November 2017, Strada and CHP entered into a Limited Liability Company Agreement to codevelop, construct, own, and operate the 53 Colton permanently affordable, supportive housing project. Per this Agreement, Strada has committed to provide a \$10MM general partner contribution to the Project. Approximately 35 units at the Project will be reserved for permeant residents from the Civic Center Hotel. All tenants will income qualify under TCAC regulatory requirements and earn less than $60 \%$ TCAC AMI. As original tenants from Civic Center Hotel move out, units will be filled by referrals from the CES.

Building A, a 190-unit development on Market Street and Brady Street is now under construction, as the first development in the Master Plan Area. 53 Colton Street will follow as the second development to start in October 2020. The Master Plan Development is scheduled to complete construction in 2024.
1.2. Borrower/Grantee Profile. (See Attachment B for Borrower Org Chart; See Attachment C for Developer Resume and Attachment D for Asset Management Analysis)
The borrower entity is 53 Colton, L.P. CHP Colton, LLC is the managing General Partner/Managing member. At construction closing, Enterprise Community Partners, the Project's tax-credit investor, will be the limited partner and own a 99.99\% interest in the borrower entity.
Founded in 1990, Community Housing Partnership (CHP) is a San Francisco nonprofit dedicated to helping homeless people secure housing and become selfsufficient. CHP develops, property manages, provides services to supportive residential properties. CHP currently owns, manages and/or provides support services in 16 buildings in San Francisco - a total of over 1,100 units, with 303 more in development. Together they house more than 1,500 formerly homeless individuals. CHP also delivers comprehensive services to its residents. Through individualized case management, employment programs, health services, youth and family programs, and civic engagement initiatives, CHP helps residents become active members of their community.

Strada Investment Group is a real estate investment and development firm focused on urban infill, transit-oriented locations in California. The firm was founded in 2010 in San Francisco on the premise that successful real estate development in high barrier-to-
entry markets can best be achieved by applying a combination of public and private sector experience. Strada has experience in ground-up development and the adaptive reuse and repositioning of existing buildings. Strada has acquired and actively managed over $\$ 250 \mathrm{MM}$ worth of real estate with top-tier capital partners. The firm has a fully integrated development team with deep experience entitling, financing, building, and operating a wide variety of asset types, including market-rate and affordable housing. Strada currently has more than 1,000 residential units under various stages of development in the Bay Area.

CHP and Strada co-manage the Project's entitlements and development process, and cosecure the Project's financing. CHP will manage all lease up and operational start up activities, while Strada will manage all construction close out and punch list issues. CHP will be the owner, property manager, and service provider of 53 Colton post permanent loan conversion. The Project's development fee percentage is split $33.33 \%$ to Strada and $66.67 \%$ to CHP, respectively.

The project management staffing breakdown are as follows:

| Name | Role | FTE \% of Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Serena Callaway | Director of Real Estate Development (CHP) | $20 \%$ |
| Danielle Thoe | Senior Project Manager (CHP) | $40 \%$ |
| Will Goodman | Managing Director (Strada) | $20 \%$ |
| Steven Danforth | VP of Construction (Strada) | $30 \%$ |
| Lih-Chuin Loh | Director of Design \& Development (Strada) | $30 \%$ |
| Kathryn Hofstetter | Senior Associate (Strada) | $30 \%$ |

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

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning: | NCT-3 - Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit <br> District |
| Maximum units allowed by <br> current zoning (N/A if rehab): | Bock 3505, Lot 052 - N/A. Due to special use district zoning <br> overlay, the building needs to fit 95-100 housing units. |
| Seismic (if applicable): | Seismic Zone 4 |
| Soil type: | On June 24, 2016, Langan Treadwell Rollo completed an <br> Environmental Sampling Results memo for the proposed 1629 <br> Market Street development. The Site soils include a top layer of <br> approximately 6 feet of earthquake fill consisting of sand with a <br> mix of varying quantities of brick, glass, and other debris. <br> Beneath this lie layers of wind-deposited sand, a Marsh Deposit <br> layer consisting of a mixture mainly of clay and sand, and the <br> Colma Formation, which general consists of sands with varying <br> silt and clay contents. Based on nearby borings, the Colma <br> Formation is anticipated to extend to a depth of approximately <br> 194 feet. There is an underlain by residual soils and Franciscan <br> Complex bedrock. |
| Environmental Review: | A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed <br> on August 8, 2019 by Langan. A Phase II ESA was completed on <br> August 16, 2019 also by Langan. A Site Mitigation Plan was |
| approved by the Department of Public Health (DPH) on April 17, |  |
| 2020. See Section 2.4 below for more information. |  |


|  | a small-scale neighborhood serving commercial and retail <br> buildings. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjacent uses (South): | Mixed-use residential and high-rise building. |
| Adjacent uses (East): | Warehouse and surface parking lot. |
| Adjacent uses (West): | Residential buildings that front Brady Street and Colton Street. |
| Neighborhood Amenities <br> within 0.5 miles: | Walgreens Pharmacy, HealthRIGHT360 Medical Clinic, San <br> Francisco Main Public Library, Koshland Park, Whole Foods <br> Grocery, and City College of San Francisco - Civic Center <br> campus. |
| Public Transportation within <br> 0.5 miles: | MUNI Underground Light-Rail Station (J-Church, K-Ingleside, <br> L-Taraval, M-Ocean, N-Judy, T-Third Street). Bus Lines: 6, 7, <br> 47, and 59. |
| Article 34: | Not exempt. Project received authorization August 2019. |
| Article 38: | Not Exempt. The Site is within the Article 38 zone and <br> complying with Article 38. |
| Accessibility: | 96 total units. 10\% (10 units) of the total units include mobility <br> features and the remaining 90\% (86 units) are adaptable. 4 of the <br> adaptable units (4\% of the total unit count) also have <br> communications features; all of which are per TCAC <br> accessibility requirements. |
| Green Building: | Green Point Rated; 120 points targeted. |
| Recycled Water: | Exempt. |
| Storm Water Management: | The Development team received approval of Preliminary Storm <br> Water Management Plan at Site Permit approval and have <br> received comments on the current Plan. |

2.1. Zoning.

See above.
2.2. Probable Maximum Loss.

N/A, new construction.
2.3. Local/Federal Environmental Review.

The Project received full entitlements and CEQA approvals as part of the Master Plan Development in 2017 and 2018. On October 19, 2017, the Planning Commission approved the following items in Motion No. 20033, Case No. 2015005848ENV/GPA/PCA/MAP/DVA/CUA for the 1629 Market Street Master Plan Development:

1. Approval of the Amendments to the General Plan;
2. Approval of the Zoning Map Amendments;
3. Approval of the Planning Code Text Amendment to establish the 1629 Market Street Special Use District ("1629 Market Street Special Use District") (Ordinance No. 241-17);
4. Approval of the Development Agreement (Ordinance No. 242-17); and
5. Approval of a Final Environmental Impact Report Certification and adopted CEQA findings.
The Site lies over the BART tunnel. An easement is recorded against the land, authorizing the excavation and development of the 53 Colton parcel. CHP and Strada are seeking BART's final sign off and approval of the Project development, required prior to the Project's construction closing.

### 2.4. Environmental Issues.

- Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("ESA") was completed on August 8, 2019 by Langan. The Site was a laundry facility with approximately six storage tanks from 1913 until 1949, and then a wire and iron works shop and a metal fabricating shop till the 1970s. Since 1984, the Site sat vacant, then operated as a parking lot, and now a staging area for Strada’s Building A development. Soil samples determined a presence of total petroleum hydrocarbons ("TPH-d") and low levels of heavy metals, indicating the potential for contaminated fill material to be encountered during the future site development. However, native material below the fill layers do not contain hazardous levels of contaminants.

The Site is within the San Francisco Health Code ("SF HC") Article 22A Maher Zone. Construction projects in the Maher Zone that disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil are required to complete a Phase II ESA identifying the fill material that will be encountered during construction. The Project will excavate approximately 12 feet below grade to build out the Project's basement and foundation.

A Phase II ESA was completed on August 16, 2019. Groundwater was encountered approximately 21 feet below the Site and boring testing characterized Site material as Class II non-hazardous waste. Langan recommended a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) and a Health \& Safety Plan be completed prior to construction, per the Maher Ordinance.

In September 2019, additional Environmental Site Characterization was completed to address soil, groundwater, and soil vapor concerns at the Site, as well as Ground Penetrating Radar utilized to evaluate the presence of the Underground Storage Tanks ("USTs").
The SMP approved by DPH on April 17, 2020 outlined the Project team's plan for soil management activities, groundwater management, odor control, dust control, asbestos airborne, toxic control measure compliance, health and safety, and contingency procedures for unanticipated hazardous materials.

- Potential/Known Hazards.

Soil testing described in the previous section indicates hazardous fill material on Site. A Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) test identified one unknown anomaly at a depth of approximately 4 feet. The Sponsor's Environmental consultant recently completed excavation work to investigate the anomaly and determined no UST was discovered.
2.5. Adjacent uses and neighborhood amenities.

The area surround the Project includes a variety of office buildings, residential buildings with ground-floor neighborhood-serving retail. The Civic Center neighborhood northeast of the Project has cultural institutions and schools like the Asian Art Museum, Herbst Theatre, Davies Symphony Hall, the San Francisco Main Public Library, and the City College of San Francisco's Civic Center campus. For the formerly homeless population at 53 Colton, HealthRIGHT 360's drop-in medical clinic is two blocks away from the Site.
2.6. Green Building.

The Project is designed to be an all-electric building, with energy-efficient lighting, water-saving fixtures, and a fully operable Solar Photovoltaic (PV) system on the building's rooftop. The Project is targeting a GreenPoint Rated score of 120 points.

## 3. OTHER ENTITLEMENTS ISSUES

### 3.1. Community Support.

For the past five years, Strada and CHP have deeply engaged the community surrounding 53 Colton Street. Engagement activities include dozens of neighborhood presentations, individual stakeholder meetings, and briefings with the Market Octavia Community Advisory Committee ("CAC"), Western South of Market Area ("SoMa") neighbors, and neighbor groups living on Brady Street. These groups came out in support of the Project during the entitlements for the Master Plan Development in 2016 to 2018. Strada and CHP have continued to update surrounding neighbors in preparation for construction activities and held an open community forum on March 10, 2020. Strada and CHP intend to hold another community forum this fall prior to the Project's construction start.

Neighborhood notification for the Project is required under Proposition I and will occur after Loan Committee's approval of this gap loan request.

## 4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

### 4.1. Site Control.

### 4.1.1.Proposed Property Ownership Structure

U.A. Local 38 Pension Trust Fund is the fee owner of the 53 Colton Street parcel and on January 1, 2018, entered into a 99-year ground lease with Strada Brady, LLC (an affiliate of Strada), for an annual base rent of \$1. On July 1, 2019, Strada Colton, LLC, the related parties of the joint venture between Strada and CHP, entered into an Option to Ground Lease agreement with Strada Brady, LLC. Prior to construction closing, Strada Brady, LLC will assign the leasehold interest, along with all its rights and obligations to the ground lease terms and conditions, to 53 Colton, L.P. The Partnership will own the 53 Colton improvements.

Given the a-typical structure of this transaction, in which the City does not own the land, as well as MOHCD's late entry into the financing structure for this deal, MOHCD seeks an Option to Purchase the land upon the expiration of the Ground Lease in 97 years.
4.2. Proposed Design.

The Project is a single, six-story 96-unit residential building with elevator access and a basement. It will be five stories of Type V wood construction over a Type I concrete first floor and basement level, on a mat foundation. Since the Project is situated above BART's zone of influence, special consideration was made to the building's design in order to not add weight over the existing BART tunnel; specifically, the excavation of the basement podium level.

The ground floor and basement provide an opportunity for a larger services suite, containing both common areas and building amenities:

- Two service staff counseling/offices,
- Staff lounge,
- Workshop area for staff trainings and meetings or small group residential programming,
- Bedbug mitigation rooms (for clean and dirty storage),
- Community room,
- Community kitchen with a pantry,
- Lounge area,
- Shared laundry room,
- A 487 sf exterior courtyard, accessed through the community room, and a
- Bike Room

Exterior building finishes include fiber cement board siding and board textured concrete, as well as a storefront and vinyl windows. Staff offices and 6 residential units are on the ground floor. By incorporating higher ceiling heights in the community room (located in the basement) and positioning six ground floor units above the basement area, the six units are raised, bringing additional light into the basement community room, while minimizing visibility into the tenants' units. No parking is available at the Project, as the Site is in a transit-rich location near Market Street and Van Ness Street.

All 96 units are designed as efficiency studio units, which will contain a full bathroom, kitchenette with cooktop, microwave, sink and refrigerator (no stove) and closet area. There is no manager unit since the property's operations will entail 24-hour desk clerk coverage and full-time on-site property management staff. Units on the second through sixth floors stack to allow for maximum cost efficiency. Each floor has a janitorial closet with a mop sink for easier maintenance, and trash chute access for residents. The basement trash room has an elevator lift to an exclusive entrance to bring trash outside for pick-up. As mentioned in Section 2.6, the Project is designed to be an all-electric building, with energy-efficient lighting, water-saving fixtures, and a fully operable Solar Photovoltaic (PV) system on the building's rooftop-promoting future cost savings in building operations.

| Average Unit SF by type: | 289 sf average for Typical Units (Adaptable); <br> 319 sf average for Mobility Features Units |
| :--- | :--- |
| Residential SF: | 28,831 sf |
| Circulation SF: | $9,686 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Common Area SF: | $6,329 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Services Suite SF: | $1,176 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Exterior Courtyard SF (exterior, not <br> included in building total): | 487 sf |
| Building Total SF: | $\mathbf{4 7 , 9 6 9} \mathbf{~ s f}$ |

### 4.3. Construction Representative's Evaluation

MOHCD funds were not anticipated to fund the Project. Therefore, the MOHCD Construction Representative has only recently evaluated the design and has limited opportunity for input at this time, with commencement of construction pending. The Construction Cost estimate for this development is based upon 30\% Construction Drawings ("CD") and reflects real-time design build proposals from subcontractors factoring potential COVID-19 impacts. The request for bids based upon the Project's $70 \%$ CDs is currently being issued and the final hard cost has therefore not been determined. A draft Guaranteed Maximum Price ("GMP") budget from the Project’s General Contractor, Suffolk Construction, will be provided to MOHCD for review and approval in early September. The final construction schedule and GMP budget will take into account COVID-related impacts (including reduced productivity to enforce social distancing, potential stoppages of trades due to exposures and testing periods, additional
sanitization and health check protocols), adding cost to the budget and 6-8 weeks onto the construction schedule.

The Construction Cost estimate at $\$ 363,496$ per unit and $\$ 727$ per square foot, is comparable to other buildings of this type and size, serving this population. The estimated per square foot cost is slightly higher than average but within an expected range to projects of this type and size. The per unit total development cost ("TDC") and per bedroom cost is slightly lower however. These factors are attributed to the Sponsor having availed itself of the cost efficiencies of a master planned site development. Cost efficiencies can be realized within a larger development, from competitive pricing from contractors seeking a long-term project commitment, to material procurement pricing. Further, the building is efficiently designed, with stacked efficient studios, making good use of space, including a basement level where much of the services and community space is located. The Sponsors requested MOHCD assistance in value engineering the window material to vinyl and relief from the recycled water ordinance, which MOHCD supported and facilitated with Planning and the Public Utilities Commission ("PUC"), respectively.

The Project team has applied for and have not received the Addendum 1 (excavation \& foundation) and Addendum 2 (superstructure) building permits, nor and the necessary BART approvals required to close on construction financing. Addendum 3 (MEP \& Architectural) was recently submitted to DBI for review. The building was designed to meet CBC 11(A) and 11(B), per TCAC regulations; which are incorporated into the permit application submitted for DBI review and approval. It was not reviewed by MOD however, as is typical for MOHCD funded developments. MOHCD will coordinate with the Sponsors to facilitate the request that MOD delegate their review authority to DBI. Should this request be declined, the cost increase associated with MOD changes shall be borne by the Borrower.

As a condition of loan closing, the Construction Representative recommends requiring the resolution of the MOD plan review delegation, prior to the Project's Addendum 3 (MEP \& Architectural) resubmittal.
4.4. Commercial Space.

None.
4.5. Service Space.

The 1,176 sf services suite is accessed directly from the building's main entrance lobby. The four onsite resident services staff will have desks overlooking the main basement staircase. There are two staff counseling/offices for greater privacy and a large conference room for trainings and meetings with staff or for small group residential programming. See Attachment F - Elevations \& Floor Plans for visuals.
4.6. Target Population.

All tenants of 53 Colton will be formerly homeless single adults referred from the Coordinated Entry System (CES). Approximately 35 units at 53 Colton will serve permanent tenants with leases from the neighboring Civic Center SRO Hotel. All tenants will earn less than $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI. As original tenants from Civic Center Hotel move out from 53 Colton, those units will be filled by referrals from the CES. All 96 total units will be restricted at $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI and subsidized by LOSP.
4.7. Marketing \& Occupancy Preferences

All units at 53 Colton will be referred by HSH via the CES, prioritized based on length of homelessness and level of need. All referred applicants will be persons experiencing
homelessness in San Francisco. HSH will work with MOHCD to give first priority to Certificate of Preference holders, assuming that the Certificate holder meets all other tenant eligibility criteria.
4.8. Relocation.

There is no relocation associated with the Site and no residents will be displaced in order to construct the Site. Until recently, the Site was a vacant surface parking lot. The commercial tenant was a parking vendor who up until March 31, 2020 operated the Site's parking lot on a month-to-month lease. The parking vendor chose not to renew their lease and vacated the Site in April 2020. Strada is now utilizing the Site as a temporary staging area for the Building A of the Master Plan Development project, currently under construction.

## 5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consultant Type | Name | SBE/LBE | Outstanding <br> Procurement <br> Issues |
| Architect | David Baker Architects | N | N |
| Landscape Architect | CMG | N | N |
| General Contractor | Suffolk Construction | N | N |
| Financial Consultant | CHPC | N | N |
| Legal | Gubb \& Barshay | N | N |
| Structural Engineer (Design Build) | DCI Engineers | N | N |
| Mechanical Engineer (Design Build) | Bay City Mechanical | N | N |
| Electrical Engineer (Design Build) | EJ Weber Electric | N | N |
| Plumbing Engineer (Design Build) | Broadway Mechanical | N | N |
| Geotechnical \& Environmental Engineer | Langan | N | N |
| Shoring (Design Build) | Brierley Associates | N | N |
| Fire Protection (Design Build) | Westates Mechanical | N | N |

Under the CCSF and Strada DA, the Project is subject to First Source Hiring, prevailing wage, and a 17\% Local Business Enterprise (LBE) participation goal. The Sponsors are confirming whether the Project's electrical subcontractor, EJ Weber Electric qualify as a LBE. If they do, the $17 \%$ goal will be met since the Project has a robust electrical scope for the future all-electric project. However, if EJ Weber Electric does not qualify as a LBE, the Sponsors will continue in good faith to meet the LBE goal through future procurement.
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 (this project and historical for the project):

None. Project costs reimbursable under this loan will be allowed as of July 1, 2020.

### 6.2. Disbursement Status. <br> N/A

### 6.3. Fulfillment of Loan Conditions. <br> N/A

6.4. Permanent Financing.
6.4.1.Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative:

1) MOHCD - Gap Loan $(\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 5 0 , 0 0 0})$ - MOHCD's gap loan is projected to be $\$ 2,750,000$ or $\$ 28,646 /$ unit, at up to $3.0 \%$ interest with a 55 -year term, and residual receipts repayment.

As a loan condition, Sponsors must use best efforts to secure non-City funds to replace City gap loan and provide evidence of infeasibility of other options.
2) MOHCD - AHP Bridge Loan ( $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 5 0 , 0 0 0 )}$ - The Partnership will apply for AHP funds next March 2021 at an assumed at $\$ 13,021 /$ unit. In the interim, the MOHCD Gap loan will bridge the amount of the potential AHP award. If awarded, the Sponsors will draw the AHP funds during construction and repay the bridged amount in MOHCD's Gap loan.

AHP could provide approximately $\$ 1.25 \mathrm{MM}$ to the Project. The lowest approved score from the latest 2020 AHP round is 72.68 , deeming the Project's self-score of 81 highly competitive for the $\$ 1.25 \mathrm{MM}$ AHP request.
3) HCD - Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) Loan $(\$ 11,530,497)$ While the Project qualified for the maximum MHP award of \$20MM, the Sponsors reduced their MHP ask per MOHCD's request to allow more projects to be funded in Round 1 of MHP, which included two projects located in San Francisco and sponsored by MOHCD. CHP and Strada received Round 1 MHP funds of $\$ 11,530,497$ or $\$ 120,109 /$ unit, at $3.0 \%$ interest with a 55 -year term, and $0.42 \%$ annual repayment and residual receipts repayment. The MHP loan will partially pay off the construction loan at the Project's permanent loan conversion, staying as a permanent loan in the Project.
4) Tax Credit Equity $\mathbf{( \$ 1 7 , 0 4 8 , 3 1 4 )}$ - The Partnership received a letter of intent from Enterprise Community Partners as the equity partner for the Project, investing both in the state and federal tax credits. Federal 4\% LowIncome Housing Tax Credits is $\$ 17,048,314$ or $\$ 177,587 /$ unit, assuming a credit pricing of $\$ 0.885$ per credit.
5) Certified State Tax Credits $\mathbf{( \$ 5 , 6 1 2 , 2 0 0 )}$ - The Sponsors received a competitive award for State Low-Income Housing Tax Credits in the amount of $\$ 5,612,200$ or $\$ 58,460 /$ unit. Enterprise will pay $\$ 0.880$ per credit.
6) General Partner Equity - Strada $\mathbf{( \$ 1 0 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0 )}$ - Strada will provide a general partner equity contribution of $\$ 10 \mathrm{MM}$ or $\$ 104 \mathrm{~K} /$ unit that will stay in the Project.
7) General Partner Contribution $\mathbf{( \$ 3 , 5 9 7 , 6 0 8 ) ~ - ~ T h e ~ P a r t n e r s h i p ~ w i l l ~ p r o v i d e ~ a ~}$ general partner capital contribution, generating \$3,597,608 in eligible basis and approximately $\$ 1,274,827$ in tax credit equity (Approx. $\$ 3.6 \mathrm{MM} \times 3.08 \%$ tax rate $\mathrm{x} \$ 0.885$ credit pricing x $130 \%$ DDA/QCT x 10 years).

Construction Loan (\$29,520,000) - The Partnership executed a letter of intent for a construction loan with Merchants Capital, funded with tax-exempt bonds. The loan will be approximately $\$ 29,520,000$ with a $3.70 \%$ interest rate (rate include a $0.75 \%$ cushion for changes to the index) for a 36 -month term. The Project received a bond allocation from the CDLAC Committee on April 20, 2020 and has 180 days to issue the bond before the allocation expires on October 13, 2020. The Project's financing team, including MOHCD staff is
aware of the 60-day closing timeline and working towards meeting the CDLAC deadline. As a loan condition, staff recommends the Sponsors must close on bond financing prior to MOHCD disbursement of funds to the Project.

### 6.4.2.Permanent Uses Evaluation:

|  | Development Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit are within |  |  |
| standards |  |  |$\quad$ Y $\quad$ \$363,496 per unit.

## Residential Developer Fee Breakdown

| Amount of Developer Fee allocated as <br> Project Management (PM) Fee available <br> during predevelopment and construction: | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Amount of Developer Fee allocated as <br> Project Management Fee available at risk <br> (the "At-Risk Fee"): | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| General Partner Equity | $\$ 3,597,608$ | Meets $\$ 500 \mathrm{~K}$ minimum. |
| Total Developer Fee |  | $\$ 5,797,608$ |

The Project's development budget includes a total of \$5,787,608 of total developer fee, which exceeds MOHCD's Developer Fee Policy of a maximum total fee that may be included in basis-- lessor of \$4MM or $10 \%$ of eligible basis. MOHCD staff recommends Loan Committee waive this policy to allow for the total developer fee to increase tax credit equity and lower MOHCD's gap loan by approximately $\$ 636,990$ ( $\$ 5,787,608$ total developer fee - $\$ 4 \mathrm{MM}$ maximum policy allows $=\$ 1,787,608 \times 3.08 \%$ tax rate x $\$ 0.885$ tax credit pricing x $130 \%$ QCT/DDA boost x 10 years). MOHCD staff recommends granting this waiver request. This waiver request does not result in an increase in cash-out developer fee paid to the Sponsors or a waiver of that part of the policy.

Residential Developer Fee Disbursement Schedule

| Payment Milestone | \% of <br> Project <br> Mgmt Fee | Amount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PM Fee: During Predevelopment (already paid) | $33 \%$ | $\$ 360,000$ |
| PM Fee: During Predevelopment (anticipated prior to <br> close) | $8 \%$ | $\$ 90,000$ |
| PM Fee: Construction Close | $16 \%$ | $\$ 175,000$ |
| PM Fee: During or at End of Construction | $34 \%$ | $\$ 375,000$ |
| PM Fee: At Project Close Out | $9 \%$ | $\$ 100,000$ |
| Total Project Management Fee |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| At Risk: Draft Cost Certification | $30 \%$ | $\$ 1,100,000$ |
| At Risk: Permanent Loan Closing/Conversion (Final <br> Cost Certification Audit) | $50 \%$ | $\$ 530,000$ |
| At Risk: Project Close Out | $20 \%$ | $\$ 220,000$ |
| Total At Risk |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Total Cash-Out Fee |  | $\$ 1,100,000$ |
| GP Equity |  | $\$ 2,200,000$ |
| Total Developer Fee |  |  |

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

### 7.1. Annual Operating Budget

7.2. Income

| Unit <br> Type | Proposed <br> Number of <br> Units | Proposed <br> Avg. Sq. <br> Feet | Max. <br> Rent | Max <br> MOHCD <br> \% AMI | Rent or <br> Operating <br> Subsidies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| studio | 10 | 289 | $\$ 300$ | $60 \%$ | LOSP |
| studio | 20 | 289 | $\$ 300$ | $60 \%$ | LOSP |
| studio | 46 | 289 | $\$ 300$ | $60 \%$ | LOSP |
| studio | 15 | 289 | $\$ 300$ | $60 \%$ | LOSP |
| studio | 3 | 289 | $\$ 300$ | $60 \%$ | LOSP |


| studio | 2 | 289 | $\$ 300$ | $60 \%$ | LOSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Units | $\mathbf{9 6}$ |  |  |  |  |

Tenants will pay $30 \%$ of their monthly income toward rent, which is an estimated $\$ 300$ per month. All 96 units will be subsidized by a 15-year LOSP contract and restricted to $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI, but may float up to $60 \%$ TCAC AMI for project feasibility to meet the Project's true debt test. The Project's HCD-MHP loan is the most income restrictive source to 91 units--requiring the 91 units to be below $35 \%$ TCAC AMI, considerably lower than 60\% MOHCD AMI
7.3. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation.

CHP's operating budget is compliant with MOHCD policies except for the PUPA, which is noticeably a higher level than other similar projects for the following reasons:

- Costs are escalated to reflect the first full year of 2023 operating costs;
- CHP's staff are a mix of unionized and non-unionized based on job classification and accounted for in the operating budget; and the
o Project's property and liability insurance cost are based off CHP's 100\% LOSP buildings at Richardson Apartments and Rene Cazenave Apartments (RCA) CHP is in the process of updating the Project's insurance quote reflecting a 2022 stabilization year.

The Project's operating budget includes a staffing plan as follows:

| Position | Compensation (Salary) | \# of Positions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senior Site Manager | $\$ 70,700$ | 1.0 FTE |
| Assistant Manager | $\$ 53,561$ | 1.0 FTE |
| Janitors | $\$ 68,181$ | 1.8 FTE |
| Front Desk Clerk (24/7) | $\$ 164,188$ | 4.6 FTE |
| Repair/Maintenance | $\$ 129,931$ | 2.0 FTE |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 6 , 5 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 4 ~ F T E}$ |

As a loan condition, the Sponsors will work with MOHCD to lower operating costs prior the Project's LOSP contract approval request.

|  | Operating Proforma |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays <br> above 1:1 through Year 17 | N/A | The Project is 100\% LOSP and will not <br> support permanent debt. |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays <br> above 1.00:1 for entirety of <br> projected 20-year cash flow | N/A | DSCR is above 1.1 for entirety of projected <br> $20-$-year cash flow. |
| Vacancy meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy is 5\%. |


| Annual Income Growth is increased at $2.5 \%$ per year | Y | Income escalation factor is $2.5 \%$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Operating Expenses are increased at 3.5\% per year | Y | Operating expense escalation factor is $3.5 \%$. |
| Base year operating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | N | Total Operating Expenses are $\$ 15,385$ PUPA, excluding reserves. This is higher than other LOSP projects of a similar size. However, the high PUPA is escalated to reflect 2023 operating costs and the points stated above. <br> 24-hour desk clerk coverage, with security alarm, and contract security is included in the operating budget ( $\$ 2,187 /$ unit $)$, in part, driving up costs/unit. <br> Projects in Construction: <br> - 1064-68 Mission Street (250 units, $100 \%$ LOSP, construction start March 2020) $\$ 14,386$ PUPA <br> - 410 China Basin Street (141 units, 100\% LOSP, construction start August 2020), $\$ 13,053$ PUPA <br> Projects in Operation: <br> (Comps Based on 2018 Estimates with 3.5\% inflater) <br> - Plaza Apartments (106 units, 100\% LOSP, compl 2005) \$14,100 PUPA <br> - Richardson Apartments (120 units, 100\% LOSP, compl 2011) \$14,400 PUPA <br> - RCA (120 units, 100\% LOSP, compl 2013) $\$ 13,800$ PUPA |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | N | Total Property Management Fee is \$99,958 or $\$ 87$ PUPM. The higher PUPM is escalated from \$81 PUPM (allowable under HUD) at 3.5\% a year. |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | Staffing plan includes: <br> - 1.0 FTE Senior Site Manager <br> - 1.0 FTE Assistant Manager <br> - 1.8 FTE Janitors <br> - 4.6 FTE Desk Clerk (24/7) <br> - 2.0 FTE Repair/Maintenance staff |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Reflects a 2023 operating start Annual AM Fee is $\$ 23,460 / \mathrm{yr}$ |


|  |  | Annual PM Fee is \$23,450/yr <br> Totaling \$46,910. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits <br> meet or exceed TCAC minimum <br> standards | Y | Maximum Total Project Sponsor AM and <br> PM fee in 2022 is \$46,910, per MOHCD's <br> Operating Fees Policy. |
| Limited Partnership Asset <br> MCD funding requirement. <br> Management Fee meets standards per | $\mathbf{N}$ | Enterprise is requiring \$5,000/yr, with 3.5\% <br> annual escalation |

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

8.1. Services Plan.

HSH and its predecessor agencies have funded many supportive services contracts with CHP over the organization’s long history serving San Franciscans experiencing homelessness. CHP will provide services designed to support formerly homeless people, including resident engagement, case management, behavioral health services and housing retention services. The HSH contract will initially fund up to approximately \$5,656 per household, representing 96 units in the first year of operations, for a total of $\$ 542,929$. See next Section 8.2 Service Budget for budget breakdown. The HSH contract will run for a period of up to five years and escalate at a rate of $2.5 \%$ per year, at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors.

The overall resident services staff assigned to the site is 5.4 FTE. Case management is provided at a ratio of $1: 25$. Positions are as follows:

| Onsite Staff |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Position | FTE |
| Resident Services Team Lead | 1.0 FTE |
| Resident Services Counselor | 2.0 FTE |
| Clinical Services Manager | 0.25 FTE |
| Clinical Services Manager | 1.0 FTE |
| Roving/Offsite |  |
| Position | FTE |
| Director of Resident Services | 0.1 FTE |
| Resident Services Manager | 0.5 FTE |
| Senior Programs Director | 0.25 FTE |
| Contracts/Evaluations Director | 0.10 FTE |
| Programs Associate | 0.15 FTE |
| Total Services Staff | $\mathbf{5 . 4 ~ F T E}$ |

8.2. Service Budget.

Annual CHP services expenses are estimated to total $\$ 542,929$ per year. This will be funded by an HSH contract. The budget is estimated in the table below:

| Expenditure | HSH <br> Contract | Total | Per Unit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries | $\$ 302,940$ | $\$ 302,940$ | $\$ 3,156$ |
| Benefits | $\$ 90,882$ | $\$ 90,882$ | $\$ 947$ |
| Operating Expenses | $\$ 78,290$ | $\$ 78,290$ | $\$ 816$ |
| Indirect Costs | $\$ 70,817$ | $\$ 70,817$ | $\$ 738$ |
| Total | $\$ 542,929$ | $\$ 542,929$ | $\$ 5,656$ |

8.3. HSH Assessment of Service Plan and Budget.

The Sponsors met with HSH staff several times during predevelopment period to review the Project's services budget and staffing plan. HSH provided a letter of support for the Project's services plan and budget for the Project's MHP application submittal in August 2019 and again in January 2020 for the Project CDLAC and TCAC application submittal. Staff recommends the Sponsors provide an updated budget and services staffing plan for HSH's final review and approval, prior to executing the HSH services contract.

## 9. THRESHOLD ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS <br> Not applicable.

## 10. RANKING CRITERIA

Not applicable.

## 11. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1. Proposed Loan Term

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan - Gap Loan Note A |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | Up to $\$ 2,750,000$ |
| Loan Term: | Minimum 55 years |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2075 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Residual Receipts |
| Loan Interest Rate: | Up to 3\% |


| Financial Description of Proposed Loan - AHP Bridge Loan Note B |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | $1,250,000$ |
| Loan Term: | 3 years |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2023 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | At term |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $3 \%$ |
|  |  |

11.2. Recommended disbursement conditions/schedule
11.3. Recommended conditions prior to loan closing:

1. Sponsor must provide evidence of Limited Partnership formation.
2. Sponsors must close on bond financing prior to MOHCD disbursing funds to the Project.
3. Sponsors must use best efforts to secure non-City funds to replace City gap loan and provide evidence of infeasibility of other options.
4. Sponsors to seek Option to Purchase land for City after expiration of ground lease.
5. Sponsors must seek resolution of the MOD plan review delegation prior to the Project's Addendum 3 for Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) and Architectural resubmittal.
6. Sponsors must provide final true debt and capital accounts test analysis by September 30, 2020 to determine MOHCD’s final interest rate.

Post-Closing Conditions:
7. Sponsors must use best efforts to apply for AHP funds in March 2021 to repay MOHCD's AHP bridge loan at permanent loan conversion.
8. Sponsors must use best efforts to lower operating costs prior to the Project's LOSP contract approval request.
9. Sponsors will submit a final services plan and budget by January 2021 for HSH's final approval, prior to executing the HSH services contract.

## 12. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Friday, August 21, 2020 11:39 AM
Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
53 Colton Loan Committee

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: | Thursday, August 27, 2020 10:37 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | RE: Loan Committee Approvals 53 Colton |

I am sorry Rosanna,

I approve the loan to the 53 Colton 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: 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: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 4:40 PM
To: Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org)
Subject: Loan Committee Approvals from 8/21/2020

Hello Salvador,

I hope you are doing well. I wanted to follow up with you regarding the Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee Agenda items that were up for approval on August 21, 2020. If you could please submit, in separate emails, for the following:

53 Colton
180 Jones
Hunters View Phase III

Also please note Loan Committee scheduled for September $4^{\text {th }}$ has been cancelled.

Thank you,

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Oerth, Sally (CII) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, August 21, 2020 11:21 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR); Slen, Joyce (MYR) |
| Subject: | 8/21/20 Loan Committee: 53 Colton Bridge \& Gap Loan Request |

On behalf of Nadia Sesay, I approve the bridge and gap loan request for 53 Colton St presented at the 8/21/20 Loan Committee.

Sally Oerth
Deputy Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Van Degna, Anna (CON) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, August 21, 2020 11:22 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | 53 Colton |

approved

Anna Van Degna
Public Finance Director
Controller's Office
City \& County of San Francisco
Ph. (415)-554-5956

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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


Date: $\qquad$
Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Nadia Sesay, Executive Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.
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G. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments
H. Sources and Uses
I. Development Budget
J. 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget
K. 20-year Operating Pro Forma

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

| No. | Performance Milestone | Estimated or Actual Date | Contractual Deadline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) | 10/31/20 |  |
| 1 | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | n/a |  |
| 2. | Site Acquisition | 1/1/18 |  |
| 3. | Development Team Selection |  |  |
| a. | Architect | 1/1/18 |  |
| b. | General Contractor | 5/1/20 |  |
| c. | Owner's Representative | N/A |  |
| d. | Property Manager | N/A |  |
| e. | Service Provider | N/A |  |
| 4. | Design |  |  |
| a. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Estimate | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{2 / 15 / 20} \\ & \text { (complete) } \end{aligned}$ | - |
| b. | Submittal of Design Development \& Cost Estimate | $\begin{gathered} 4 / 20 / 20 \\ \text { (complete) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| c. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | 6/15/20 |  |
| d. | Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate (75\%-80\% CDs) | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{7 / 15 / 20} \\ & \text { (complete) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 5. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | CEQA Environ Review Submission | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (complete) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| b. | NEPA Environ Review Submission | N/A |  |
| c. | CUP/PUD/Variances Submission | $\begin{gathered} \text { (complete) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 6. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | $\begin{gathered} \underline{11 / 4 / 19} \\ \text { (complete) } \end{gathered}$ | - |
| b. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | $\begin{gathered} 4 / 28 / 20 \\ \text { (complete) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| c. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | $\begin{gathered} 4 / 28 / 20 \\ \text { (complete) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 7. | Request for Bids Issued | $\begin{gathered} 8 / 1 / 20 \\ \text { (complete) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 8. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | $\begin{gathered} \frac{8 / 1 / 2019}{\text { (complete) }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| b. | Interim | $\begin{gathered} 1 / 15 / 20 \\ \text { (complete) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| c. | Update | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 20 / 20 \\ \text { (complete) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 9. | Additional City Financing |  |  |
| a. | Predevelopment Financing Application \#2 | N/A |  |
| b. | Gap Financing Application | $\frac{8 / 21 / 20}{(t h i s ~ r e q u e s t)}$ |  |
| 10. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | Construction Financing RFP | 4/29/20 |  |



## Attachment B: Borrower Org Chart



## Attachment C: Developer Resume

## COMMUNITY HOUSING PARTNERSHIP

CHP is a San Francisco non-profit organization founded in 1990 to create and implement solutions to homelessness. CHP's total portfolio consists of over 1,300 units of supportive housing across 16 buildings, housing over 1,500 individuals. CHP has acted as co-developer, owner, property manager, and services provider at several comparable supportive housing sites:

- Richardson Apartments: 120 units of newly constructed supportive housing, located in Hayes Valley, and built in collaboration with Mercy Housing. The project was completed in 2011.
- Rene Cazenave Apartments: 120 units of newly constructed supportive housing, located in Transbay, and built in collaboration with BRIDGE. The project was completed in 2013.
- Mission Bay South Block 9: 141 units of newly constructed supportive housing, located in Mission Bay, and built in collaboration with BRIDGE. The project is commencing construction in August 2020 and will be completed by 2022.

Serena Callaway, Director of Real Estate Development
Since joining CHP in January 2018, Ms. Callaway has overseen the predevelopment, construction and stabilization of nearly 500 units of permanent supportive and affordable housing in San Francisco. Prior to CHP, Ms. Callaway worked as a Vice President of Community Development Finance at Silicon Valley Bank where she conducted debt underwriting for affordable housing, sponsored AHP funding applications and handled construction loan management. Previously, Ms. Callaway was a Senior Project Manager for Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) where she managed construction and renovation for numerous San Francisco projects including Franciscan Towers, Willie B. Kennedy Apartments, the Aarti Hotel, and Civic Center Residence. Prior to joining TNDC, she was a Project Manager at AF Evans overseeing acquisitions and new construction projects in Oakland and San Francisco. Ms. Callaway holds a M.C.P. from the University of California at Berkeley and a B.A. from Mount Holyoke College.

Danielle Thoe, Senior Project Manager
Danielle joined CHP in July 2020 as a Senior Project Manager. Prior to CHP Danielle worked at the City of Alameda Housing Authority managing the master plan and redevelopment of 12 acres at the former Naval Air Station. Danielle previously also worked as a regulator and funder of affordable housing development at the City of San Mateo’s Housing Division administering the CDBG and HOME programs. Danielle holds a Master in Urban Planning from the University of Michigan with a Graduate Certificate in Real Estate Development as well as a Bachelor of Science in Public and Nonprofit Management from Indiana University.

## STRADA INVESTMENT GROUP

Headquartered in San Francisco, Strada is a vertically-integrated real estate investment company devoted exclusively to real estate investment, development, and advisory services. Since its founding in 2010, Strada has managed more than $\$ 1$ billion of real estate assets with top-tier institutional capital partners, and currently has more than 2 million square feet in the development pipeline.

Strada has an exceptionally strong track record in both ground-up development and the adaptive reuse use and repositioning of existing buildings. Strada currently has more than 1,300 residential
units under various stages of development and currently owns and operates more than 1 million square feet of office. Website: www.stradasf.com

Key Strada Staff Members Include:
William Goodman, Managing Director
Will is a Managing Director at Strada, focusing on entitlement and development projects. Prior to joining Strada in 2014, Will was a Project Manager and the Chief of Staff at Jonathan Rose Companies, where he worked on acquisitions and development of office, multifamily, and mixeduse buildings across the country, including several LIHTC developments and rehabs. At Strada, Will has managed the 1629 Market Street mixed-use project in San Francisco and the T-5/6 development in downtown Oakland. Will has an M.A. in urban planning and real estate development from Harvard University and a B.A. from Brown University.

## Steven Danforth, Vice President of Construction

Steven currently serves as the Head of Construction Management at 1629 Market Street. Prior to joining Strada, Steven was a Senior Construction Manager at Equity Residential, where he focused on Construction Management and Development of mixed-use, multi-family projects. Prior to this Steven worked at Avalon Bay Communities and Toll Brothers Condo Division. Steven has a BS in Construction Management from Wentworth University in Boston, Massachusetts.

Lih-Chuin Loh, Director of Design and Development
Lih focuses on design execution for development projects at Strada. Prior to joining Strada, Lih was a Project Manager at Poly Development and Holdings and RAD Urban where he focused on entitlements and design of high-rise multifamily projects in California. Prior to this, Lih worked at several architecture firms including Solomon Cordwell Buenz and WRNS Studio. Lih has a B.A. and M.A. in Architecture from the University of California, Berkeley and is a Registered Architect in the State of California.

Kathryn Hofstetter, Senior Associate
Katie concentrates on development, acquisitions, asset management, property management and marketing at Strada. She is involved in all stages of the development process, from initial diligence to entitlements to construction of a project. Katie earned a B.S. in journalism from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

CHP's asset management portfolio consists of 16 properties totaling approximately 1,300 units, with an average building size of 75 units. Sizes range from 24 units at Edward II to 120 units at both Richardson Apartments and Rene Cazenave Apartments. CHP's asset management team is managed by the Chief Financial Officer and consists of two Asset Managers, both fairly new to their roles having joined CHP in 2019. For the 2019/2020 fiscal year, the asset management division budget is $\$ 276,000$. Funding for the department is from its property-related asset and partnership management fees.

The asset management staff oversees the organization's ownership related responsibilities for its LIHTC properties in which CHP is the general partner, master leases in which CHP operates resident services and commercial spaces within its residential properties. The asset management team regularly coordinates budget preparation and finalization with the housing operations staff as well as interfaces with the accounting, facilities and compliance staff within the organization. In order to improve CHP's financial and property reporting, CHP recently converted its accounting systems to YARDI.

Over the next five years, CHP expects to grow its portfolio by at least an additional 350 housing units with three buildings (Mission Bay South Block 9, 53 Colton and Treasure Island) coming online.

## Attachment E: Site Map with amenities



## Attachment F: Elevations and Floor Plans

See attached.

## BASEMENT







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

See attached.




| TS Comp |  | Acquisition by Unit／Bed／SF |  |  | Construction by Unit／Eed／SF |  |  | Soft Costs By Unit／Bed／SF |  |  |  | Total Development Cost（Incl．Land） |  |  |  | Subsidy |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Compl．Date | Equmit | 保 | Acclolo sq．t｜ | nstunit | cons | Constss．t．t | sotunit | Sottir | sottrs．th |  | Ss iocini |  |  | bross Tocisq．f6 |  |  | Leveraging＇ |
| 隹 | ootr18 | 63．030 | ${ }_{4}^{414296}$ | ${ }^{365}$ | ${ }^{467.199}$ | ${ }^{306,765}$ | ${ }_{413}^{413}$ | ${ }_{7}^{7,482}$ | 49.130 |  | ${ }_{66}^{68}$ | ${ }_{605}^{605}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{39,321}$ | 53 | s | ${ }^{201.186}$ | $6_{6,706}$ |
| Eadye ayor Ramiy Housng | Jun－19 |  |  |  | ， 088 |  | ${ }_{505}$ | $\xrightarrow{132,535}$ | $\underset{\substack{70.320 \\ 60.50}}{ }$ |  | ， | ${ }_{\text {cin }}$ | ${ }_{5}$ | $\xrightarrow{3 \text { cise，}}$ | 58 | ${ }^{8}$ |  |  |
| Completec Projects： | Average | ${ }^{72,690}$ | ${ }_{42,751}$ | 391 | 499，532 | 307，389 | 452 | ${ }^{9,552}$ | 60,07 |  | ${ }_{131}$ | ${ }_{645,935}$ | 5 | ${ }^{394,843}$ |  | s | ${ }^{185,935}$ | ${ }^{71 \%}$ |


| PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION |  | Acquisition |  |  | Construction |  |  | Soft Costs |  |  | Total Development Cost（lncl．Land） |  |  | Subsidy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Compl．Date | Acquunit | Ac¢IER | Accllot sa，tit | Constunit | Constibr | Constsq．t．t | sotrumit | sottre | sotlta， 46 | ${ }^{\text {cross }}$ TDCIMunit | Gross TDCIBr | Gross Tocisq， | Subsis／y／ | Leveraging ${ }^{\text { }}$ |
| 40 Sout Van Ness | Sep－20 | ${ }^{228.35}$ | ${ }_{\text {125893 }}$ | ${ }^{1.298}$ |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{541}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {siluges }}^{515}$ | 166 |  | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{98}$ |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {and }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Noocer } 21}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{3,9,97}$ | ${ }_{96} 96$ |  | ${ }_{\text {320，897 }}^{20.65}$ | ¢ ${ }_{4}^{596}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{7040453}$ | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{7}^{685}$ |  |  |
| Under Construction： | Average： | 102，607 | ${ }_{6,7723}$ | 554 | 528，900 | ${ }^{326,430}$ | 522 | 179，351 | 109，632 | ${ }_{178}$ | 810，859 | 502,785 | 802 | 314，323 | 619 |


| PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT |  | Acquisition |  |  | Construction |  |  | Soft Costs |  |  | Total Development Cost（lncl．Land） |  |  | Subsidy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Start Date （anticipated） | Acqunut | Acqifr | Acclolo sq．t．t | nostunit | Costbr | Sus， $\mathrm{t}^{6}$ | Sotumit | Sotiter | sotlsq．t6 | colunit | Gross TDCIBR | Gross TDCIsq．f6 | Susisiy／unit | Leveraging＇ |
|  | $\xrightarrow{\text { Febr22 }}$ Nor20 | 962 | ${ }^{629}$ |  |  | 393000 <br> $\substack{350083}$ | ¢599 |  | $\xrightarrow{78,783} 1$ |  | $\frac{943527}{69020}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{760 \\ 664}}^{\text {cid }}$ | $\xrightarrow{5657.74}$ | 400\％ |
|  | ${ }^{\text {Norvor }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{5359962 \\ 69292}}$ | 350，083 <br> 418,38 | ${ }_{518}^{518}$ | ${ }^{\text {IT8，045 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {1032 }}^{102651}$ |  | －896，122 | 454．969 | 6 | ${ }_{\substack{202777}}^{20204}$ | \％ $70.00 \%$ |
| ${ }^{\text {athand Folsom }}$ | $\frac{\text { Dec．} 21}{\text { Jun－21 }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1.901 \\ 39}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1.344 \\ 39}}^{\text {and }}$ | 16 |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{140.843}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{911,322 \\ 79656}}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{1.025}$ |  | － |
| 6007t Streer | Apr－22 | 50 | 迷 |  | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{452889}$ |  |  | ${ }^{2022383}$ | ${ }^{201.651}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {74，282 }}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {，} 975}$ | ${ }_{\text {220，751 }}^{2029}$ | ${ }^{20.196}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5} 54$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {855，562 }}$ |  | \％i．60 |  | $\frac{14.49}{6740}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |









## Attachment H: Sources and Uses

See attached.


## Attachment I: Development Budget

See attached.


## Attachment J: 1 $\underline{\text { st }} \underline{\text { Year Operating Budget }}$

See attached.


| Income |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 100.00\% |  | non-Losp |  | Approved By (read) |
|  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Residential - Losp tenant Assistance Payments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Space |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Losp |  | non-Losp |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income |  |  |  | Approved By (read) |  |
| Supporive Sevices Income |  | 100.00\% |  |  |  | 0.00 |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | Losp |  | non-LOSP |  | (only acceptable if LOSP-specific expenses are beingtracked at entry level in the project's accounting system) |
| Laundry and Vending |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Charges |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscelaneous Residential Income | Losp |  | non-LOSP |  | Approved By (read) |
| Withdrawal f fom Capitaized Reserve (deposit to operating account) |  | 100.00\% |  | 0.008 |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Resididential - Tenant Assistance Payments |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Commercial EEFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  |  |  |
| operating expenses |  |  | non-LOSP |  | Approved By (reqd) |
| Management | Losp |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee |  | 100.00\% |  | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| Asset Management Fee |  | 100.00\% |  | $0.00 \%$ |  |
| SalariesIBenefits Sub-total Management Expens | Losp |  | non-LOSP |  | Approved By (requ) |
| Office Salaries |  | 100.00\% |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary |  | 100.00\% |  | 0.0006 |  |
| Heath Insurance and Other Benefits |  | 100.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| Othe Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administraive Rent-Free Unit |  |  |  |  |  |


Supportive Services $\square$



IET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

| DEBT SERVICEIMUST PAY PAYMENTS (hard debt'amortized loans) | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (reqd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard Debt- First Lender | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| Hard Dett- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lee | en 4220 pymt, or other 2nd Lende |  |  |
| Hard Dett - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | 2, or ofter 3rdd Lender) |  |  |
| Hard Dett- - Fourth Lender |  |  |  |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service |  |  |  |
| TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE <br> CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) |  |  |  |
| Allocaion of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residua i income) | n-LoSP (residual income) |  |  |


| Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/Mon-LoSP (residual income) | SP (residual income) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AVAILABLE CASH FLOW <br> 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 policy for limits) |  |  |  |
| nvestor Sevice Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for linits) | Losp | non-Losp | Approved By (reqd) |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 (select lender in comments field) | ender in comments field) |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt <= Max Fee from cell 1130 ) | 0.00\% |  |  |

TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD

RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS
PRECEDING MOHCD)
Residual Receipts Calculatio
Will Project Defer Developer $F$ Fee?
Max Deferred Developer FeelBorover $\%$ of Residual Receipts in Y 1 :
$\%$ of Residual Receipts available for distribution to soft debt lenders in
Soft Debt Lenders with Residual Receipts Obligations
$\qquad$

MOHCD RESSIDVAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts $A$ mount to Loan Repayment
Proposed MOHCD Residual Receits $A$ Amount to Residual Ground Lease
REMAINING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEEPTS
DEBT SERVIICE
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEEPTS DEBT SERVICE
CD Resicual Receipts Amount D
$\frac{\text { ender } 5 \text { Residual Receipist Due }}{\text { Total Non-MoHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service }}$
REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are
distributions Selow)
Ouner Distributoonsllncentive Management Fee
Final Balance (should be zero)

## Attachment K: 20-year Operating Proforma

See attached.



OTHER RESERVE Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance

| Total \# Units: | $\underset{\text { Losp }}{\text { Lunts }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-LosPP } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{96}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 100.000 \end{gathered}$ | $0$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 4$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 5$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 6 \\ 2028 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| income | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inc } \\ & \text { Losp } \end{aligned}$ | $\%$ annual | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-Losp | Total | LOSP | non-Losp | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  | 356,072 |  | 356,072 | 359,633 |  | 359,633 | 36, 229 |  | 363,229 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 1,349,735 |  | 1,349,735 | 1,403,665 |  | 1,403,665 | 1,459,567 |  | 1,459,567 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supporive Services Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  | 1,705, 807 |  | 1,705,807 | 1,763,298 |  | 1,763,298 | 1,822,996 | - | 1,822,796 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a |  | (17,804) |  | (17,804) | (17,982) |  | (17,982) | (18,161) |  | (18,161) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a | appropriate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 1,68,004 |  | 1,688,004 | 1,745,316 |  | 1,745,316 | 1,804,635 |  |  |


| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 110,825 |  | 110,825 | 114,704 |  | 114,704 | 118,719 |  | 118,719 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 26,011 | . | 26,011 | 26,921 |  | 26,921 | 27,863 |  | 27,863 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 137.772 | - | ${ }^{137,772}$ | 142.594 |  | 142.594 | 147.584 |  | ${ }^{147.584}$ |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 107,892 |  | 107,892 | 111,669 |  | 111,669 | 115,577 |  | 115,577 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  | 245,664 |  | 245,664 | 254,262 |  | 254,262 | 263,161 |  | 263,16 |



| Electricity | 3.50 | 3.5\% |  | 88.060 |  | 88.060 | 91.142 | . | 91142 | 94,332 |  | ${ }^{94} 332$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 44,838 |  | 44,838 | 46,407 |  | 46,407 | 48,031 |  | 48,031 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 70,346 |  | 70,346 | 72,808 | - | 72,808 | 75,356 |  | 75,356 |
| Taxes and Licenses 3 Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 45,584 |  | 45,584 | 47, 180 |  | 47,180 | 48,831 |  | 48,831 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5.626 |  | 5.626 | 5.823 |  | 5.823 | 6.027 |  | 6.027 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licen |  |  |  | 6,573 |  | 66,573 | 68,903 |  | 8,903 | 71,315 |  | ${ }^{71,315}$ |




TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

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



Hard Debt - Fourth Lender
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)


|  | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2,500 |  | 2.500 | 2.500 | - | 2.500 | 2.500 | - | 2.500 |
|  | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | - | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ |  | - |  |
|  | ${ }^{50,501}$ | - | 50,501 | 50,501 | - | 50,501 | 50,501 | - | 50,501 |
|  | 1,688,004 | - | 1,688,004 | 1,745,316 | - | 1,745,316 | 1,804,635 | - | 1,804,635 |



TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD
ECEDING MOHCD)
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receits split for all years.

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

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

Lease
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipis Amount Due
Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
$\frac{\text { Lender } 5 \text { Residual Receipts Due }}{\text { Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service }}$


REMADDER (Sho
below)
Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee
Other Distributions/Uses
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE - RUNNING BALANC
Replacement Reserve Starting
Replacement Reserve Deposits
operating reserve - running balanc


## OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1-RUNNING BALANC

| Other Resesveve 1 Stating Bepalanc |
| :--- |
| Other Reservesits 1 1 |

Other Reserve 1 Deposthts
Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance
OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANG

$\square$


OR Balance as a\% of Prior Yr Op Exps + Debt Servic


$\square$ $\square$

| (12000 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |


0.0\%
0.0\%



| Electricity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 97,633 |  | ${ }^{97,633}$ | $\frac{101,051}{5152}$ | - | 101,051 | 104,587 |  | 104,587 |
| Water | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | 49,712 |  | 49,712 | 51,452 |  | 51,452 | 53,253 |  | 53,253 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 77,993 | . | 77,993 | 80,723 | . | 80,723 | 8,5488 | . | 83,548 |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 225,339 |  | 225,339 | 233,226 |  | 233,226 | 241,389 |  | 241,389 |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 17,033 |  | 17,033 | 17,629 |  | 17,629 | 18,246 |  | 18,246 |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 50.540 |  | ${ }_{50,540}$ | 52,309 | - | 52,309 | 54,140 |  | ${ }_{54,140}$ |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits ${ }_{\text {Sub-total Taxes and Licenses }}$ | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 6,238 <br> 73 | - | 6,238 <br> 7301 | ${ }^{6,456}$ |  | 6,456 | 6,682 |  | 6,688 |
|  |  |  |  | 73,811 |  | 73,811 | 76,394 |  | 76,394 | ${ }^{79,068}$ |  | 79,06 |




TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

## DEBT SERVICEMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"lamortized loans)

| Hard Debt- - First Lender |
| :--- |
| Hard Debt - Scond Lender (HCD Program $0.42 \%$ pymt, or other 2nd Lender |
| Hard Debt - - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or ot oter 3rd Lender) | | Hard Debt- Fourth Lender |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cormmercial Hard Debt Service |

CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
AVAILABL CASH FOW

(Enter amt $t=$ Max Fee from row 131 )
TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD

|  | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2,500 |  | 2.500 | 2.500 | - | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | 2.500 |
|  | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . | - | . | . | - | - |  | - |  |
|  | . | $\cdots$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | 5,501 |  | 50,501 | 50,501 | - | 50,501 | 5,501 |  | 50,501 |
|  | 1,866,029 |  | 1,866,029 | 1,929,573 | - | 1,929,573 | 1,995,340 | - | 1,995,340 |



ING MOHCD
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receits split for all years.

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment
Proposed MOHCD Residual Receits Amount to Residual Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipis Amount Due
Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
$\frac{\text { Lender } 5 \text { Residual Receipts Due }}{\text { Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service }}$


REMAMDER (Sho
below)
Owner DistributionsIIncentive Management Fee
Other Distributions/Uses
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANC
Replacement Reserve Starting
Replacement Reserve Deposits
operating reserve - running balanc


OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANC
Other Reserve 1 Statring Balanc

| Ont |
| :--- |
| Other Reserverv 1 Depositis |
| Other Resenve 1 Ithdrawals |

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

45.16\% Allocation per pro rata share of all soft debt$\square$$\square$
0.0\% $\qquad$

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Total \# Units: } \\ 96 \end{gathered}$ | Losp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 100.000 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 10 \\ & 2032 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 11 } \\ & 2033 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 12 \\ 2034 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  | inc inc Losp | \% annual | Comments(related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-Losp |  |  | non-Losp |  |  | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | Losp | increase |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Total }}{377,978}$ | Losp 381.757 |  | ${ }_{\text {Total }}^{381,757}$ | Losp |  | ${ }_{\text {Total }}^{355.575}$ |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 1,704,331 |  | 1,704,331 | 1,771,192 |  | 1,771,192 | 1,840,483 |  | 1,840,483 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Services Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | n/a | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential lincome ma |  |  | 2,082,309 |  |  | 2,082,309 | 2,152,949 |  | 2,152,949 | 2,226,058 |  | 2,226,058 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manually per relevant MO policy; annual incrementing usually not appropriate | (18,899) |  | (18,899) | (19,088) |  | (19,088) | (19,279) |  | (19,279) |
|  | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 2.063, |  | 2,063,411 | 2,133,862 |  | 2,133,862 | 2,206,779 |  | ${ }^{2,206,779}$ |


| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1 1st Year to be set according to HUD schedule. | 136,233 |  | 136,233 | 141,001 |  | 141,001 | 145,936 |  | 145,936 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 31,974 |  | 31,974 | 33,093 |  | 33,093 | 34,251 |  | 34,251 |
| Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  | 168,206 |  | 168,206 | 174,093 |  | 174,093 | 180,187 |  | 188,187 |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 169,356 |  | 169,356 | 175,284 |  | 175,284 | 181,419 |  | 181.419 |
| Heath Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 132,627 |  | 132,627 | 137,269 |  | 137,269 | 142,074 |  | 142,074 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.55\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

## DEBT SERVICEMUSTT PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"lamortized loans)



Hard Debt- Fourth Lender
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL

(Enter amt <= Max Fee from row 131)
TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD

|  | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2.500 | - | 2.500 | 2.500 | - | 2.500 | 2,500 |  | 2,500 |
|  | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 |  | 48,000 |
|  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | - |  |
|  | - | - | . | - | - | . | - | - |  |
|  | 50,501 |  | 50,501 | 50,501 | - | 50,501 | 50,501 |  | 50,501 |
|  | 2,063,410 | - | 2,063,410 | 2,133,862 | - | 2,133,862 | 2,206,779 | - | 2,206,79 |



ING MOHCD
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receits split for all years.

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
Lease
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipis Amount Due
Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
$\frac{\text { Lender } 5 \text { Residual Receipts Due }}{\text { Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service }}$


REMANDER (Sh
below)
Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee
Other Distributions USes
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANCE
Replacement Reserve Starting Balance
Replacement Reserve Deposits
operating reserve - running balance


OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANC
Other Reserve 1 Statring Balanc

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

Other Reserve 1 Interest
Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance
other reserve 2 - RUNNing balanc

$\square$


OR Balance as a \% of Prior Yr op Exps + Debt Servic





| Total \# Units: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { L.osp } \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 100.009 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 13 \\ & 2035 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 14 \\ & 2036 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 15 \\ & 2037 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | inc <br> inc <br> Losp | \% annual | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-Losp | Total | LOSP | non-Losp | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | ${ }_{\text {Losp }}$ | ${ }^{2}$ |  | L ${ }_{389,431}$ |  | 3 389,431 | ${ }_{\text {L993,325 }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{397}$ L258 |  | ${ }_{3} 397.258$ |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 1,912, 290 |  | 1,912,290 | 1,986,701 |  | 1.986,701 | 2,063,810 |  | 2.06, 8810 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Sevices Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  | 2,301,720 |  |  | 2,301,720 | 2,380,026 |  | 2,380,026 | 2,461,068 |  | 2,461,068 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manually per relevant MOH policy; annual incrementing usually not appropriate | (19,472) |  | (19,472) | (19,666) | - | (19,666) | (19,863) | . | (19,863) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residentital - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss - Commercial | $\xrightarrow{\text { n/a }}$ | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 2,282,249 |  | 2,88,249 | 2,360,360 |  | 2,360,360 | 2,441,205 |  | 2,411,205 |


| Manageaement Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1 strear to be set according to HUD | 151.044 |  | 151.044 | 156,330 |  | 156,330 | 161.802 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 35,450 |  | 35,450 | 36,690 |  | 36,690 | 37,975 |  | 37,975 |
| Salaries/Benefits 3 Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 187,769 |  | 187,769 | 194,340 |  | 194,340 | 201,142 | - | 201,142 |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 147,046 |  | 147,046 | 152,193 |  | 152,193 | 157,519 |  | 157,519 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  | 334,815 |  | 334,815 | 346,533 |  | 346,533 | 358,662 |  | 358,620 |



| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 120.016 |  | ${ }^{120,016}$ | ${ }^{124.217}$ |  | ${ }^{124.217}$ | 128.565 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 61.109 | . | ${ }^{61,109}$ | ${ }^{63,248}$ |  | ${ }^{63,248}$ | 65.462 |  | ${ }_{65,462}$ |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 95,874 | - | 95.874 | 99,229 | . | 99,229 | 102,702 |  | 102,702 |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 276,999 | - | 276,999 | 286,694 | - | 286,694 | 296,729 |  | 296,729 |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{6}^{20,127}$ | - | ${ }_{6}^{20,127}$ | 64,301 |  | ${ }_{64}^{2,301}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6,5,522}$ |  | 6,6,522 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 7.668 |  | 7.668 | 7.936 |  | 7.936 | 8.214 |  | 8,21 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 90,733 |  | ${ }^{90,733}$ | 93,908 |  | ${ }^{93,908}$ | 97,195 |  |  |




TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)

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



Hard Debt- Fourth Lender
CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)

(Enter amt <= Max Fee from row 131)
TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD

|  | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |  | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2.500 |  | 2.500 | 2.500 |  | 2.500 | 2.500 |  | 2.500 |
|  | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 |
|  |  | . |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
|  | . | $\cdots$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | . | - | - | . | . | $\square$ | $\cdots$ | - |  |
| 50,501 |  | - | 50,501 | 5,501 | - | 50,501 | 50,501 |  | 50,501 |
|  | 2,882,249 | - | 2,882,249 | 2,360,360 | - | 2,360,360 | 2,441,205 | - | 2,441,205 |



ING MOHCD
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receits split for all years.

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
Lease
NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipis Amount Due
Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
$\frac{\text { Lender } 5 \text { Residual Receipts Due }}{\text { Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service }}$

remander (shor ber
below)
Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee
Other Distributions Uses
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANCE
Replacement Reserve Starting Balance
Replacement Reserve Deposits
operating reserve - running balance


OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANC
Other Reserve 1 Statring Balanc

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

Other Reserve 1 Interest
Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance
other reserve 2 - RUNNing balance

$\square$


OR Balance as a \% of Prior Yr op Exps + Debt Service





| Total \# Units: | Losp | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-LOSP } \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ \text { 100.000 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.00 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 16 \\ & 2038 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 17 \\ & 2039 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 18$ $2040$ |  |
| INCOME | inc | \% annual | $\underset{\text { Comments }}{\text { (reated to annual inc assumptions) }}$ | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  | 400,231 |  | 401,231 | 405,243 |  | 405,243 | 409,296 |  | 400,296 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LoSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 2,143,710 |  | 2.143,710 | 2,22,502 |  | 2,226.502 | 2,312,287 |  | 2,312, 287 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
| Supporive Services Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitaized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  | 2,544,941 | - | 2,544,941 | 2,631,745 | - | 2,631,745 | 2,721,582 |  | 2,721,582 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Ener formuas manuall per relevant MOH | (20,062) |  | (20,062) | (20,262) |  | (20,262) | (20,465) |  | (20,465) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss - Commercia | $\xrightarrow{\text { n/a }}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { n/a }}$ | policy; annual incrementing usually not appropriate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GRoss InCOME |  |  |  | 2,524,880 |  | 2,524,880 | 2,611,483 |  | 2,611,483 | 2,70, 117 |  | 2,701,117 |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD schedule. | 167,465 |  | 167,465 | 173,326 |  | 173,326 | 179,392 |  | 179,392 |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 39,304 | - | 39,304 | 40,679 | - | 40,679 | 42,103 |  | 42,103 |
| Salaries/Benefits Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  | 206,768 |  | 206,788 | 214,005 |  | 214,005 | 221,496 |  | 221,496 |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 208,182 |  | 208,182 | 215,469 |  | 215,469 | 223,010 |  | 223,010 |
| Heath Insurance and Other Benefitis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 163,033 |  | 163,033 | 168,739 |  | 168,739 | 174,645 |  | 174,645 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | - |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |


| Adverising and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 116,862 |  | 116,862 | 120,952 |  | 120,952 | 125,186 |  | 186 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 21.536 |  | 21.536 | 22,290 |  | 22,290 | 23,070 |  | 23,070 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 34,244 |  | 34,244 | 35,443 |  | 35.443 | ${ }_{36,683}$ |  | ${ }^{36,683}$ |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 39,298 |  | 39,298 | 40,673 |  | 40,673 | 42,097 |  | 42,097 |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 21,186 | , | 21.186 | 21,927 |  | 21.927 | 22,695 |  | 22,695 |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 18,431 |  | 18,431 | 19,076 |  | 19,076 | 19,744 |  | 19,744 |
| Utilies Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | 251,557 | . | 251,557 | 260,362 | - | 260,362 | 269,474 |  | 269,474 |
| Electricity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electricily | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | 133,064 |  | 133,064 | 137,722 |  | 137,722 | 142,542 |  | 142.542 |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 67,753 |  | 67,753 | 70,124 |  | 70,124 | 72,578 |  | 72,578 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 106,297 | . | 106,297 | 110.017 | . | 110.017 | 113.868 |  | 113,868 |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 307,114 |  | 307,114 | 317,863 |  | 317,863 | 328,988 |  | 328,988 |
| Taxes and License |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 23,214 |  | 23,214 | ${ }^{24,027}$ | - | 24,027 | 24,868 |  | 24,868 |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 68,881 |  | 68,881 | 71,292 | - | 71,292 | ${ }^{73,787}$ |  | ${ }^{73,787}$ |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 8.501 | - | 8.501 | 8,799 | - | 8,799 | 9,107 |  | 9,107 |


| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 263,369 |  | 263,369 | 272, 587 |  | 272.587 | 282,127 |  | 282,127 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 33,585 |  | 33.585 | 34,760 |  | 34,760 | 35,977 |  | 35,977 |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Insurance |  |  |  | 296,953 | - | 296,953 | 307,347 | - | 307,37 | 318,104 | - | 318,104 |
| Maintenance \& Repair | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 331907 | . | 331907 | 342.524 | , | 343524 | 355.547 |  |  |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 25.754 | - | 25,754 | 26.655 | - | 26,655 | 27.588 |  | ${ }^{27,588}$ |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 130,922 | . | 130,922 | 135,504 | - | 135.504 | 140,246 |  | 140,246 |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 91,385 |  | 91,385 | 94,583 | - | 94,583 | 97,894 |  | 97,894 |
| Security Payrollc ontract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 351,62 |  | 351.682 | 363,991 |  | 363,991 | 376,730 |  | 376,730 |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 449 |  | 449 | 464 |  | 464 | 481 |  | 481 |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{8,076}$ | - | 8.076 | 8,359 | - | 8,359 | 8,651 |  | 8,651 |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  |  | 940,174 | - | 940,174 | 973,080 | - | 973,080 | 1,007,138 | - | 1,007,138 |
| Supportive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | - | . |  | - |  |  |  | - |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total operating expenses |  |  |  | 2,474,379 |  | 2,474,379 | 2,560,982 | . | 2,560,982 | 2,650,616 |  | 2,650,61 |



TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)
DEBT SERVICEMMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans)

| Hard Debt- - First Lender |
| :--- |
| Hard Det (HCond - Second Lender (HCD Program $0.42 \%$ pymt, or other 2nd Lender) |
| Hard Debt- - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Harrald Debt- Fourth Lender } \\ \text { Hal } \\ \text { Commercial Hard Debt Service } \\ \end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |

CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
AVAILABL CASH FLOW
USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE W WTER

| "Below-the-line"Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for linits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy no anual increase | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enter comments re: anual increase, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmit - Lender 2 |  |  | Enter comments re: anual increase, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt $<=$ Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |  | | Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |
| :--- |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 |

TOTAL $\operatorname{PAYMENTS}$ PRECEDING MOHCD



Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receits split for all years

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment

NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
$\frac{\text { Lender } 5 \text { Residual Receipts Due }}{\text { Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service }}$


REMAIDER (St
below)
Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE - RUNNING BALANC
Replacement Reserve Starting

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

operating reserve - running balance


OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Reserve 1 Statring Balanc

| Other Reserveve 1 Depositis |
| :--- | :--- |
| Other Resenve 1 Withrawals |

Other Reserve 1 Interest
Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance
other reserve 2 - RUNNing balance


other reserve 2 - RUNNing balance


[^0]:    Anna Van Degna, Director
    Controller’s Office of Public Finance

