## Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee

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

## 681 Florida Street <br> $\$ 33,826,507$ in permanent gap funds $\$ 1,250,000$ in AHP bridge funds For a Total Gap Loan Request of Up to $\$ 35,076,507$

| Evaluation of Request for: | Gap Loan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Committee Date: | August 7,2020 |
| Prepared By: | Sarah Nusser |
| Source of Funds Recommended: | ERAF: $\$ 32,767,632$ <br> 2015 GO Bonds: $\$ 2,308,875$ |
| NOFA/PROGRAM/RFP: | 2070 Bryant RFP - September 2016 |
| Total Previous City Funds Committed: | AHP Inclusionary: $\$ 4,332,000$ (these <br> funds to be swapped out with <br> recommended sources above) |
| Applicant/Sponsor Name: | 681 Florida Housing Associates, L.P. <br> (TNDC/MEDA) |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Sponsor Information:

Project Name:
Project Address (w/ cross
St):

681 Florida Street
681 Florida (@19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$
Street)

Sponsor(s):
Ultimate Borrower
Entity:

TNDC \& MEDA
681 Florida Housing
Associates, L.P.

## Project Summary:

681 Florida Street, formerly known as 2070 Bryant, is a proposed 130-unit affordable housing development for families in the Mission District, including arts-related Production, Design and Repair ("PDR") space. The proposed project was submitted in response to MOHCD's 2070 Bryant RFP issued in September 2016. The site was conveyed to MOHCD in March 2018 by Podell Company, the market rate developer of 2000 Bryant, the adjacent site, who used the land dedication option under Planning Code Section 419.5 to satisfy 2000 Bryant's inclusionary requirements. The project aims to promote the development of permanent affordable housing for moderate-income, low-income, and homeless households in San Francisco that is consistent with the 2015 voter-approved General Obligation Housing Bond Proposition A, as well as the City's Consolidated Plan, the Master Plan Housing Element, and the Department of Homelessness and Housing's Strategic Framework goals for reducing homelessness for families. 681 Florida will include 44 studios, 31 one-bedrooms, 41 two-bedrooms, and 14 three-bedrooms; $30 \%$ of the units will be set aside for families experiencing homelessness, and will be supported by LOSP. The project will serve families between $25 \%$ and $85 \%$ MOHCD AMI. The project also includes approximately 9,250 square feet of artsfocused PDR space, which is required by the City Planning Department and will replace in part previous uses at the site. This space is intended to help retain the artistic and cultural identity of the Mission.

In order to apply for the State's Multi-family Housing Program (MHP) funds, TNDC/MEDA made a request to Loan Committee for preliminary gap financing $(\$ 37,858,510)$ in August 2019. The purpose of this loan evaluation is to conduct a final underwriting of TNDC/MEDA's gap request, which is $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{M}$ lower than what was approved last August. Construction closing is expected to occur in early October 2020.

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | Type I-B | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Stories: | 9 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | .43 acres / 19,000 sf |
| Number of Units: | 130 | Architect: | Mithun Solomon |
| Total Residential Area: | $126,830 \mathrm{sf}$ | General Contractor: | Cahill |
| Total Commercial Area: | $9,250 \mathrm{sf}$ | Property Manager: | TNDC |
| Total Building Area: | 136,080 sf | Supervisor and District: | Sup. Ronen (9) |
| Land Owner: | City/County of San <br> Francisco |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Total Development Cost (TDC): | \$90,337,308 | Total Acquisition Cost: | \$0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TDC/unit: | \$694,902 | TDC less land cost/unit: | N/A |
| Loan Amount Requested: | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 33,826,507 \\ & \$ 35,076,507 \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{AHP} \\ & \text { bridge } \end{aligned}$ | Request Amount / unit: | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 260,204 \\ & \$ 269,819 \text { w/AHP bridge } \end{aligned}$ |
| HOME funds? | No | Parking? | No |
| Proposed MOHCD subsidy/unit | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 260,204 \\ & \$ 269,819 \text { w/AHP bri } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- COVID-19: Beyond the impact to the financial markets (discussed below), the project team is anticipating minimal impacts to the project due to the COVID-19 pandemic. While the tax credit rate has dropped significantly since Shelter in Place in March 2020, the project team was able to reduce Total Development Costs so as not to impact the MOHCD gap. The construction timeline has not been impacted, and the development team feels confident in its General Contractor and subcontractor team. See Sections 6.4.2 and 7.2.
- Lease-Up/Unit Mix: Also exacerbated by COVID-19, the development team is being mindful of its lease-up strategy given potential complications for marketing and leasing up the $85 \%$ AMI units at this project and the economic uncertainty of the years ahead. The lease-up schedule assumes four months to lease up the project ( 1 month longer than typical), and the tax credit investor is requiring a 4.5-month operating reserve ( 1.5 months more than typical). See Sections 6.4.2 and 7.2.
- Commercial Space: In Spring 2019, Carnaval was awarded the right to develop and enter into a lease for the $9,250 \mathrm{sf}$ commercial space at 681 Florida. While many conversations between Carnaval and the development team have taken place since then, little tangible progress has been made in terms of the execution of an LOI and MOU, the refinement of a commercial space development and operations plan or a fundraising plan, or advancing the design of the commercial space. And now that the pandemic is impacting community-based organizations in multiple ways, the way forward is particularly uncertain. MEDA is beginning to re-engage Mission-based arts organizations about the future of this space. MOHCD staff recommends several conditions related to this space in Sections 9.2 and 9.3. Also, see Sections 4.4 and 6.4.1.


## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Predevelopment Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD | $\$ 4,335,000$ | 55 years $@ 3 \% /$ Res Rec | Committed |
| Total | $\$ 4,335,000$ |  |  |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD | $\$ 33,826,507$ | 55 yrs $@ 0 \% /$ Res Rec | Committed |
| Perm Mortgage | $\$ 3,260,000$ | 20 yrs $@ 3.35 \%$ | Committed |
| MHP | $\$ 14,706,000$ | 55 years $@ 3 \% /$ Res Rec | Committed |
| AHP (to be bridged by <br> MOHCD and repaid in '20- <br> '21) | $\$ 1,250,000$ | 15 yrs @ $0 \% /$ Def | Committed |
| Podell | $\$ 961,849$ | Equity | Committed |
| Deferred Developer Fee | $\$ 2,536,566$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | Committed |
| GP Equity | $\$ 100$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | Committed |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 33,796,286$ | $\$ 1.04$ | Committed |
| Total | $\$ 90,337,308$ |  |  |


| Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 69,666,424$ | $\$ 535,896$ | $\$ 512$ |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 15,595,784$ | $\$ 119,968$ | $\$ 115$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 5,075,100$ | $\$ 39,039$ | $\$ 37$ |
| Total | $\$ 90,337,308$ | $\$ 694,902$ | $\$ 664$ |

## 1. BACKGROUND

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

Podell Company's initial plan for a large market-rate development at 2000-2070 Bryant Street, in the heart of the Mission District, generated significant community opposition. That plan would have demolished seven buildings, including Cell Space, a longtime arts and creative PDR space, and constructed a 274 -unit rental building, including 44 belowmarket rate units (in satisfaction of the Planning Code's on-site inclusionary requirement), ground floor retail, and parking. Ten thousand square feet of Production Distribution and Repair (PDR) space would have been eliminated.

In response to community opposition, Podell revised its plan over the course of several years to include the subdivision, creation, and dedication to the City of a 19,000 sf parcel for affordable housing, allowable under the Land Dedication option of the inclusionary housing program, and other community concessions.

The City acquired the affordable site from Podell Company on May 11, 2018. The Purchase and Sale Agreement required Podell to put funds into escrow for necessary
environmental remediation work and to commit tenant improvement funds for a new ground floor PDR space at the affordable project. It also included an easement for the mews that runs between the two properties and a License Agreement granting MEDA/TNDC future access to the mews for construction staging during the construction of the affordable project. The Podell market rate project completed construction in 2019 and is leasing up to renters.

On October 13, 2016, MOHCD released a Request for Proposals (RFP) "for the development of new affordable housing on a vacant lot fronting Bryant Street, at $19^{\text {th }}$ Street, in San Francisco, known as 2070 Bryant Street." TNDC/MEDA was selected to develop the site. The City also entered into a Permit to Enter with 681 Florida Housing Associates, L.P. shortly after acquiring the land to allow TNDC/MEDA to conduct due diligence during the pre-development period.

Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee approved predevelopment funding for TNDC/MEDA in 2017 and 2018. TNDC/MEDA achieved full entitlements for the site in May 2018 and the project's Site Permit was approved in October 2018.

Since then, TNDC/MEDA has completed project design as reflected in its conformed set of construction drawings. The project is fully permitted and bid out, and the development team completed thorough value engineering (described further below) to reduce hard costs. The project was last at Loan Committee in August 2019 to make a preliminary gap loan request in order to apply for MHP funding with a MOHCD commitment letter. That request was based on hard costs generated from $90 \%$ construction drawing cost estimates. The project was awarded MHP funds in December 2019, a tax-exempt bond allocation in April 2020, and an AHP award in June 2020. Through a competitive RFP process, Wells Fargo was selected as the investor and construction lender for the project in May 2020, and CCRC will be the permanent lender. Bond closing calls commenced in June 2020. Upon approval of the gap loan request by Loan Committee, the loan documents (and ground lease) will be presented to the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee in September for approval. The project is expected to close on/around October 1, 2020.
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 681 Florida Housing Associates, L.P. TNDC and MEDA are the managers of the L.P.'s respective co-General Partners.

TNDC has 35 years of experience developing both family and supportive housing in San Francisco. TNDC has developed 33 buildings with 13 more in the pipeline. MEDA has 43 years of experience serving residents and businesses in the Mission District specifically. MEDA has more recently expanded into real estate development, including transforming an obsolete warehouse into a one-stop center of financial, legal, health, childcare and supportive services for low-income and working-class residents and as codeveloper of 400 RAD-funded, former SFHA-owned units in the Mission and the Castro
neighborhoods. MEDA also recently completed their first new construction project, 1296 Shotwell, in partnership with CCDC.

TNDC/MEDA has a four-person project management team assigned to 681 Florida, including Colleen Ma (Project Manager, TNDC), Adrian Napolitano (Assistant Project Manager, TNDC), Daniel Jimenez (Senior Project Manager, MEDA), and Monica Almendral (Assistant Project Manager, MEDA). Additionally, Elaine Yee (Associate Director, MEDA) and Gabe Speyer (Senior Project Manager, TNDC) are supporting the project.

TNDC leads the design, financing, and contractual work, while MEDA leads the community outreach process and PDR space design. TNDC will also ultimately provide asset management and compliance services during project operations, in addition to property management.
2. SITE (See Attachment E for Site map with amenities)

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning: | Urban Mixed-Use (UMU) - 68X Height and <br> Bulk District. Team successfully applied for nine- <br> story affordable housing building and other <br> concessions under SB-35. Planning number: <br> $2017-014088$. |
| Maximum units allowed by <br> current zoning (N/A if rehab): | Project approved for 130 units. |
| Number of units added or removed <br> (rehab only, if applicable): | N/A |
| Seismic (if applicable): | Southern side of the site includes potentially <br> liquefiable layers. |
| Soil type: | According to a Langan Treadwell \& Rollo <br> geotechnical investigation report dated March 28, <br> 2014 and updated August 27, 2015, the site is <br> underlain by 10-24 feet of fill, and the southern <br> side of the site includes potentially liquefiable <br> layers. The report recommended a mat foundation <br> on engineered fill or improved ground. Langan <br> conducted a supplemental report and also <br> encountered groundwater due to the dewatering <br> of Podell's construction site. Langan and the <br> design team have determined that a vapor <br> mitigation system that can also serve as a <br> waterproofing layer for the mat slab foundation is <br> a feasible approach. |
| Environmental Review: | Phase I was conducted by PES Environmental on <br> behalf of Podell Company on June 18, 2013. A <br> Site Mitigation Plan approved by DPH for both |


|  | the market-rate and affordable parcels will require a vapor barrier/ liquid boot as well as excavation and potential off haul of contaminated soils. Phase II subsurface studies of soil and groundwater were conducted by PES Environmental on behalf of Podell Company on July 31, 2013, and April 10, 2014. An additional Asbestos- and Lead Survey Report was conducted by Advantage on March 11, 2017. Langan conducted a supplemental Phase I and Phase II and also submitted a Maher Application to DPH. Elevated levels of TCE were found in the soil and ground water. The design team has refined its proposed soil mitigation plan and vapor systems approaches and design, and the Maher Plan has been accepted by DPH. The proposed design is reflected in the budget. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adjacent uses (North): | 2000 Bryant, 42,250 square foot parcel comprising 191 units of market-rate housing and 3 below market-rate units, approximately 12,000 square feet of below-market and market-rate production/distribution/repair ("PDR") space, parking, and retail. |
| Adjacent uses (South): | 4-unit market-rate condominium; Universal Café; residences that front on Bryant, 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, and Florida |
| Adjacent uses (East): | Across Bryant Street are commercial properties including Left Space (artists work spaces) and Fitzgerald Furniture Company. |
| Adjacent uses (West): | Across Florida Street at 680 Florida is Mosaica, TNDC's mixed use project providing 93 units for seniors and families, $33 \%$ of which are set aside for homeless families, as well as 9,800 square feet of PDR. |
| Neighborhood Amenities within 0.5 miles: | Mission Neighborhood Health Center, John O’Connell Public High School, Franklin Square Public Park, Safeway, Gus' Market, Grocery Outlet Bargain Market, Rainbow Coop, and Foods Co. |
| Public Transportation within 0.5 miles: | $16^{\text {th }}$ Street BART station, Muni lines including \#22 Fillmore, \#55 16th Street, \#12 Folsom, \#9 Potrero, and \#27 Bryant. |
| Article 34: | Not exempt. Project received authorization May 2017. |
| Article 38: | Exempt - not in SF DPH Exposure Zone Map area. |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Accessibility: | Project proposes at least $13(10 \%)$ accessible <br> units and $130(100 \%)$ adaptable units; $4 \%$ of units <br> will have added communication features. |
| Green Building: | Project proposes to meet or exceed Green Point <br> Rated Multifamily Platinum level and Title 24 by <br> $15 \%$ or more. |
| Recycled Water: | Exempt. |
| Storm Water Management: | Plan approved May 2019. Received final <br> Stormwater Control Plan 8/2/19. |

2.1. Zoning. The project is zoned Urban Mixed Use and is governed by the Mission Area Plan, which in turn is within the larger Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The proposed project was granted height and other design concessions via the State Density Bonus Program in May 2018.
2.2. Probable Maximum Loss. N/A as project is new construction.
2.3. Local/Federal Environmental Review. The project received its Eastern Neighborhoods Community Plan Exemption via the market-rate project's CEQA approval in June 2016 and further local/federal environmental review is not required.

### 2.4. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.

- Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results. See above.
- Potential/Known Hazards. See above.
2.5. Adjacent uses and neighborhood amenities. See above.
2.6. Green Building. See above.
2.7. Subdivision. The development team has subdivided the air rights parcels into two separate commercial parcels and one residential parcel as of December 2019. All parcels will be owned by the housing LP during construction, and at permanent conversion the commercial parcels will be transferred to a commercial entity affiliated with the development team members.


## 3. OTHER ENTITLEMENTS ISSUES

3.1 Community Support. The project has had strong community support and was successfully entitled in May 2018. Furthermore, MEDA conducted a yearlong community outreach process to inform its PDR space RFP/RFQ (see Section 4.4). MEDA held two large community meetings in 2017 to discuss goals for the space and reached out to 33 arts and culture organizations in the Mission and in other San Francisco neighborhoods. In early 2018, MEDA conducted a community survey to arts and culture organizations to reach both staff and the organizations' constituents. Since then, community support has remained strong, and the community is eager to see the 681 Florida project break ground.

## 4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

4.1. Site Control. The City owns the land. The City entered into an Option to Ground Lease with the Limited Partnership on August 7, 2019 to document site control for funding applications. A Ground Lease will be entered into at closing. The Ground Lease will be based on the terms in the Option to Ground Lease and will be approved by the Directors of the Real Estate Division and MOHCD, as well as the Board of Supervisors. At permanent conversion, once the commercial parcel is successfully transferred to an affiliated commercial space entity, the Ground Lease will be amended to include just the residential project and parcels, and the owner of the commercial space parcel will enter into a Commercial Ground Lease with MOHCD. The Commercial Ground Lease will be structured per MOHCD's Commercial Space Underwriting Guidelines.

### 4.1.1. Proposed Property Ownership Structure. TNDC and MEDA have formed

 the borrowing Limited Partnership, composed of MEDA 681 Florida LLC and 681 Florida TNDC LLC as co-general partners. The LP will have a leasehold interest in the land and a fee interest in the improvements. The limited partner will be Wells Fargo Affordable Housing Community Development Corporation. The Borrower anticipates setting up an additional entity, during construction, to be the owner of the commercial spaces. Ownership will be transferred to this TNDC/MEDA-controlled commercial space entity at permanent conversion.4.2. Proposed Design. The proposed nine-story building is U-shaped with a network of interior and exterior shared spaces. A Florida Street entry will provide private access to the housing lobby for building residents and a separate, atrium-like portal on Florida will provide access to the Arts/PDR space. The design concept and program address three goals: 1) foster a safe home for families and an inclusive environment; 2) offer resident and community amenities including onsite services; and 3) create an accessible, affordable place for arts-focused production. An additional, overall goal was to include as many units as feasible, while providing multi-functional open space, a unit mix emphasizing larger family sizes, and flexibly designed Arts/PDR space to accommodate a variety of potential uses. The building also incorporates multiple opportunities for public art, which is a requirement of the Arts Commission and funded in the development budget. During construction, there will be murals painted on panels along Bryant Street. The permanent art will include six murals and possibly an ornamental gate at the commercial space entrance. A two-bedroom mobility unit that opens up to the third-floor courtyard will be used for Family Day Care.

| Avg Unit SF by type: | Studio avg 340 sf <br> 1-bdrm avg 520 sf <br> 2-bdrm avg 810 sf <br> 3-bdrm avg $1,150 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Residential SF: | 89,660 sf (units only) |
| Circulation SF: | 20,820 sf (residential circulation, covered exterior - <br> egress, elevator shaft) |


| Common Area SF: | $11,130 \mathrm{sf}$ (community rooms, lobby, offices, laundry <br> room, utility) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Arts/PDR space | $9,250 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Building Total SF: | $136,080 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Open Space | 5,220 at levels 3 and 9 |
| Total SF | 136,080 |

### 4.3. Construction Specialist's Evaluation

This review is based on the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) contract cost estimate and conformed set of drawings. 681 Florida is a Type I-B, steel and concrete building, which will take approximately 22 months to construct. The gross square footage for the building is 136,080 . The building program includes, studio, 1, 2, and 3 Bedroom units, approximately 9,250 SF of PDR/Arts space, a 1,008 SF Community Room facing the mid-block mews space, lounge and reception area at the Florida Street residential entry and adjacent Bike Room space. This program helps to establish flexible and inviting spaces for residents, artists and visitors. Outdoor open space is provided by a 2,810 square foot courtyard on level 3 and a 2,410 square foot roof deck on level 9 .

The foundation system will be a 4' 6" mat slab with spread footings. Level 1 includes PDR space, the community room for the housing development, and "back of house" functions like trash room, fire pump room, and primary switchgear room. Level 2 contains some of the housing units, maintenance space, and staff space including a staff kitchen. The third level incorporates a landscaped courtyard, ringed by residential units. The roof completes the community space amenities with a laundry room, adjacent lounge, and outdoor patio with community gardening opportunities. Levels 4 through 8 have nearly identical housing unit layouts with efficient, stacked, plumbing. Level 9 contains housing units and features a laundry room and an open space roof deck.

Sustainability features have been incorporated to meet the requirements of the Green Point Rated Multifamily Platinum Program. Those features, include the use of non-toxic finishes, rainwater harvesting, and photovoltaic energy production.

The current construction pricing environments is one of the most challenging and strange we've seen in the last few real estate cycles. In early 2019, foreseeing a general slowdown at the end of an approximately 9 -year expansion, MOHCD sought relief for bid escalation to projects. GC's were cautious but agreed to start reducing by about $1 \%$ (down from $6 \%$ to $5 \%$ ). In mid-2019, executive sentiment at nationwide construction firms was still strong but fears of a slowdown in 2020 weighed on their confidence in continued expansion and growth. In the first quarter of 2020 confidence remained high but the COVID -19 outbreak began to
alarm industry executives (Engineering News Record -Markets Still Remain Strong, But Execs Fear 2020 Vision, Gary J. Tulacz:
https://www.enr.com/articles/46627-markets-still-remain-strong-but-execs-fear-2020-vision). At this point, the pandemic is fully blown and with an accompanied economic slowdown, subcontractors are now offering voluntary reductions. As such, some of the general contractors are suspending escalation projections to what seems like at least the $2^{\text {nd }}$ quarter of 2021. MOHCD has been ahead of the curve in requesting reductions to escalation more than a year ago. The current environment has, and should continue to, experience construction pricing trending downward. The fear in the marketplace now is that we will lose subcontractors due to the contraction.

The GMP provided by Cahill Contractors, based on the Conformed Set of drawings, brings the project's hard cost total to $\$ 69,666,424$. This amount includes the full contingencies allowable per the MOHCD underwriting guidelines and translates to $\$ 535,896$ per unit and $\$ 512$ per square foot. On a per unit basis this translates to approximately $15 \%$ lower than the current predevelopment pipeline for Type 1 projects and about $1 \%$ lower than the overall MOHCD portfolio. That's about $19 \%$ lower on a cost per square foot basis than the current predevelopment pipeline and about $1 \%$ lower than the total MOHCD portfolio for Type 1 projects. Both metrics are below the average for recent cost estimates for Type 1 buildings with similar programs. The development team has demonstrated strong cost containment efforts through the value engineering process which identified $\$ 4.4$ million in potential reductions of which approximately $\$ 2.7$ million were accepted by the development team. After being pressed further by MOHCD staff and the project team, subcontractors returned with an additional $\$ 725 \mathrm{k}$ in voluntary subcontractor reductions which are a response to the recent market corrections in construction pricing.

681 Florida is well positioned to begin construction with both the first and second building addenda approved and ready to be picked up at the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) upon loan closing. The project is also ready with its temporary and permanent power designs and contracts in hand. The site has already been demolished with shoring and underpinning work already completed earlier this year (liens have all cleared).
4.4. Commercial Space. As presented the last time this project was at Loan Committee, the development team, in Spring 2019, conducted a multi-step RFP process to select a tenant for the community-based arts-focused commercial space. A third-party, Laurie Jones Neighbors, facilitated the review, interview, and scoring process with the selection panelists. On May 31, 2019, the development team notified Carnaval that it scored the highest of the three applicants based on the scoring criteria of organizational background, community and vision, and organizational readiness. The Carnaval organization has produced the Carnaval parade and festival for the last several decades in San Francisco, in addition to providing arts programming and support for Latinx and Afro-Latinx artists in other ways.

Since making the award, the development team has been working with Carnaval to execute an LOI, to establish basic lease terms, and an MOU, to lay out the milestones and process for developing the commercial space. MEDA also provided funding to Carnaval to create narratives and materials to aid in fundraising for the development of the space. While multiple rounds of conversation have been had about the LOI and MOU, including MOHCD's upfront review, they have not been executed. Carnaval has recently been nonresponsive, in large part due to the stress and strain of responding to COVID-19 and the economic ramifications of Shelter In Place for Mission residents and community-based organizations like Carnaval itself.

Carnaval has a robust vision for the space, which is desperately needed for preserving and supporting the Latinx culture and history of the Mission neighborhood (see Exhibit K for more information). However, it is unclear what Carnaval needs to develop the space and feel prepared to operate such a large space for the long-term. Very recently, MEDA has begun re-engaging arts-based, Latinx organizations in the Mission to possibly re-think the commercial space for this project. With the goal being a successfully developed and utilized space, MOHCD staff recommend conditions to the disbursement of the commercial space developer fee (Section 6.4.1), as well as closing and loan conditions (Section 9.2 and 9.3).

Commercial Space Operating Pro Forma Assumptions: Based on initial negotiations with Carnaval, the development team is currently assuming six months of free rent in Year 1 and $.20 / \mathrm{sf} / \mathrm{mo}$ for the remainder of Year 1 (see Exhibit K). In Year 2 this steps up to $.25 / \mathrm{sf} / \mathrm{mo}$ and is stabilized at $.30 / \mathrm{sf} / \mathrm{mo}$ in Year 3 with a $2.5 \%$ annual increase thereafter. Annual expenses include a commercial management fee to be paid to Ventura Partners (a well-established "community-benefit" commercial space developer who has worked with TNDC in the past), real estate taxes, insurance, and the commercial space's pro rata building share for fire systems, backflow maintenance, and hydrojetting. In Year 3, an annual replacement reserve deposit will begin to be made in the amount of $\$ 9,676$, escalating $3.5 \%$ per year thereafter. From surplus cash, $60 \%$ will be kept by the commercial space owner, and $40 \%$ will be due to MOHCD for repayment of the MOHCD commercial loan.

The commercial space development costs and sources are discussed further in Section 6.4.1
4.5. Service Space. There will be three resident services offices located on the ground floor, one for each of the three services staff (two staff for the LOSP referrals and one staff for the lottery referrals). The three rooms make up 616 sf of services space.
4.6. Target Population. The target population of 681 Florida is families with children earning $35 \%, 40 \%, 50 \% 60 \%$, and $85 \%$ MOHCD AMI, including 39 units ( $30 \%$ ) set aside for homeless families referred by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), which are restricted at $25 \%$ MOHCD AMI.
4.7. Marketing \& Occupancy Preferences TNDC's property supervisor will be the team leader for marketing and outreach at 681 Florida. They will be responsible for planning and organizing informational and application workshops, and will assume the role of liaison with MOHCD and HSH (for LOSP family referrals). TNDC has decades of experience with, and will be responsible for, implementing all required occupancy preferences at lease up and thereafter. Marketing and outreach will particularly use the informational networks of MEDA. The standard MOHCD preferences that are expected to apply to this project, include: 1) Certificate of Preference Holders, 2) Displaced Tenant Housing Preference; 3) Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference; 4) Live or Work in San Francisco Preference.

### 4.8. Relocation. N/A

5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consultant Type | Name | SBE/LBE | Outstanding <br> Procurement <br> Issues |
| Architect | Mithun/Solomon | N | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Landscape Architect | Mithun | N | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| General Contractor | Cahill | N | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Owner's Rep/ <br> Construction <br> Manager | Armando Vasquez | Y | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Financial Consultant | CHPC |  |  |
| Legal | Gubb \& Barshay | N | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

5.1. Outstanding Procurement Issues. The City's Contracting Monitoring Division (CMD) approved TNDC/MEDA's Professional Services Procurement Plan and established a $20 \%$ SBE contracting goal (when federal HOPWA vouchers were still anticipated for the project). The development team achieved $21 \%$ via the procurement of the following sub-consultants to the architect: Lighting, MEP, Structural, Greenpoint Rater, and Civil. CMD also approved a 20\% SBE subcontracting goal for construction; the development team achieved 20.81\%.
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):
$\$ 2,030,000$ in predevelopment financing was approved by Loan Committee on May 19, 2017 and an additional $\$ 2,302,000$ was approved by Loan Committee on December 21, 2018. The total predevelopment loan of $\$ 4,332,000$, has been encumbered for predevelopment expenses.

| Loan Type/ <br> Program | Loan <br> Date | Loan <br> Amount | Interest <br> Rate | Maturity Date | Repayment <br> Terms |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Predevelopment <br> Loan | $1 / 22 / 2019$ | $\$ 4,332,000$ | $3.00 \%$ | The later of 55 years after <br> permanent financing conversion or <br> 57 years after construction closing. | Deferred |

6.2. Disbursement Status. Funds have been drawn down for pre-development activities, and there is $\$ 317,828$ remaining for disbursement.
6.3. Fulfillment of Loan Conditions. Below is the status of the outstanding loan conditions since this project was at Loan Committee for the preliminary gap request in August 2019:

- MOHCD must review the Request for Proposals (RFPs) for equity investors before it is finalized and released for investors. Status: Completed.
- MOHCD must approve all selected investors. Status: Completed.
- MOHCD must review and approve the financial structure of the commercial space, including the commercial space operating budget, Letters of Intent with individual commercial tenants (including lease terms and rent structures), and all reserves. Furthermore, meeting the following milestones are conditions of applying for gap financing:
o August 31, 2019 - Draft LOI and MOU due to MOHCD
- MOU to include timeline for fundraising, design of tenant-paid TIs, and refinement of space operating model
o October 31, 2019 - Executed LOI and MOU between TNDC/MEDA and Carnaval
o January 31, 2020 - Schematic design drawings complete and coordinated with commercial shell design
o Gap loan evaluation (estimated March 2020) - MOHCD approves final commercial sources and uses, operating budget, and commercial space development and operating plan

Status: Not yet completed, per Section 4.4. See closing and loan conditions at end of evaluation.

### 6.4 Proposed Permanent Financing.

### 6.4.1 Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative:

MOHCD gap financing. The total requested amount of MOHCD's contribution is $\$ 35,076,507$ or $\$ 269,819$ / unit. This is an up to amount that will be re-sized closer to closing, and it includes $\$ 1,250,000$ to bridge the AHP award (more on that below). The proposed interest rate on the MOHCD loan is $0 \%$; at greater than $0 \%$, capital accounts are too close to going negative during the tax credit compliance period.

AHP. The project was awarded AHP in June 2020 in the amount of $\$ 1,250,000$. The FHLB takes about six months to close AHP loans, and so the AHP source will close just after construction closing. When that happens, the development team will pay down the MOHCD loan in the amount of $\$ 1,250,000$.
Podell site funding. Per the Remediation and Demolition Funds Agreement and Escrow Instructions, executed by Podell and the City in 2018 as part of the land dedication, Podell put funds into an escrow to pay for remaining demolition and the mitigation of the environmental issues discovered in Podell's initial Phase I and Phase II reports for the site. Per the agreement, Podell placed \$955,267 into escrow (for the estimated costs for the environmental remediation work at the time) and $\$ 51,685$ into escrow (for the estimated costs for the demolition work). TNDC/MEDA have identified demolition costs that exceed the amount placed into escrow, and the environmental remediation costs are less than the amount placed into escrow. The estimated costs in the project budget that this Podell source will be able to pay for amount to $\$ 961,849$. The City will assign this Agreement to 681 Florida Housing Associates, L.P. before closing, so that these funds can be committed and accessed as a project source.

Residential Mortgage. CCRC will provide a $\$ 3,260,000$ permanent mortgage with a 20-year amortization, a 20 -year term, and a $3.35 \%$ interest rate, per the Wells Fargo/CCRC term sheet.

MHP. The project was awarded MHP funds in 2019 in the amount of $\$ 14,706,000$. This funding is structured primarily as a residual receipts loan, with an annual hard debt payment of $\$ 61,765$.

Tax credit equity. Per the Wells Fargo term sheet, $4 \%$ tax credit equity is being contributed at $\$ 1.04$ per credit for a total of $\$ 33,796,286$.

Deferred Developer Fee. Deferred developer fee is a source in the amount of $\$ 2,536,566$. This fee will be paid from $50 \%$ of surplus cash through Year 15. The attached pro forma shows that only $\$ 942,557$ can be paid by the end of the $15^{\text {th }}$ year. The General Partner (TNDC/MEDA) agrees to make a special capital contribution to the Partnership, equal to any unpaid balance of the deferred portion of the developer fees, if such portion has not been fully paid within 15 years from the date of construction completion. This is a similar structure that has been approved on other projects in which Wells Fargo or RBC has been the equity investor.

Commercial Space Cold and Warm Shell Sources. Per MOHCD's commercial underwriting guidelines, MOHCD is funding the build out of the commercial space warm shell for the eventual non-profit tenant. The development budget includes $\$ 2,414,327$ to build the cold shell plus an additional $\$ 337,838$ to build out warm shell restrooms. Because the commercial tenant has not been able to engage on the commercial space design, an allowance for the remaining warm shell build out is included in the budget in the amount of $\$ 310,000$. The total cost/sf for the warm shell space build out comes to $\$ 331 / \mathrm{sf}$, which is comparable to the per sf commercial space build out at 1990 Folsom.

Commercial Space Tenant-Paid Tenant Improvements (outside of development budget): As was negotiated by Mission organizers, Podell will contribute $\$ 500,000$ to the commercial tenant (or TNDC, on behalf of the commercial tenant) to fund tenant-paid tenant improvements (this is not a part of the residential project). An agreement to secure this commitment is being finalized by Podell and TNDC and has been reviewed, and will be acknowledged by, MOHCD.

Construction Loan. The construction loan will be provided by Wells Fargo in the estimated amount of $\$ 45,395,569$. The loan is underwritten at a $3.7 \%$ interest rate (based upon an assumed quoted rate of One Month LIBOR - estimated to be 50 bps, plus 145 bps spread, plus additional underwriting cushion of 175 bps ) and an initial term of 31 months.
6.4.2 Permanent Uses Evaluation:

| Development Budget |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? $(\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N})$ | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit are within standards | Y | $\$ 535,896 /$ unit is below average for projects in predevelopment. |
| Construction Hard Cost Contingency is at least $5 \%$ (new construction) or $15 \%$ (rehab) | Y | Hard Cost Contingency is 5\%. |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees are within standards | Y | A/E fees have been approved by MOHCD. |
| Bid Contingency is at least 5\% of total hard costs | N/A | Project already bid. |
| Escalation amount is commensurate with time period until expected construction start, not to exceed $15 \%$ | N/A | Project already bid. Prices being held through construction closing. |
| Construction Management Fees are within standards | Y | $\$ 132,000$ for 33 months of part-time and full-time predevelopment services and 22 months construction period services. |
| Developer Fee is within standards, see also disbursement chart below | Y | Residential cash-out fee is further restricted by HCD. Wells Fargo does not allow GP equity but allows for a larger deferred developer fee structure per the above. |


| Soft Cost Contingency is either <br> $5 \%$ or $10 \%$ of soft costs. | Y | Soft Cost Contingency is 5\%. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capitalized Operating Reserves <br> are a minimum of 3 months | Y | Capitalized Operating Reserve is <br> equal to $\$ 675,000$, or 4.5 months, an <br> increased requirement of Wells <br> Fargo's due to COVID-19. |

COVID-19 Impacts. The primary impact to the development budget was as a result of the reduced tax credit rate, which reduced equity coming into the project by several million dollars compared to earlier estimates. The development team worked closely with Cahill to reduce project hard costs, per Section 4.3. Additionally, Wells Fargo is requiring a larger operating reserve ( 4.5 months, instead of 3 months) because of COVID and to protect against future COVID or COVID-like risks in the lease up process. These capitalized reserves must permanently stay in the reserves account and can only be used for operating deficits.

The development team has expressed confidence in the subcontractors selected by Cahill in that they do not appear at risk of going under. There are minimal concerns regarding laborers or construction workers not wanting to go to work if the COVID risks become more apparent. The development team believes that because of the location of the job site and its relative isolation, this will not be as relevant an issue as projects in the Tenderloin or SOMA.

| Developer Fee Disbursement Schedule |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Payment Milestone | \% of Project <br> Mgmt, At-Risk, <br> or Commercial <br> Fee | Amount |
| At closing of initial pre- <br> development financing | $18.18 \%$ | $\$ 200,000$ (disbursed) |
| At closing of pre-development <br> loan amendment | $27.27 \%$ | $\$ 300,000$ (disbursed) |
| At construction close | $24.54 \%$ | $\$ 270,000$ |
| During or at end of construction | $20 \%$ | $\$ 220,000$ |
| At project close out | $10 \%$ | $\$ 110,000$ |
| Total Project Management Fee | $100 \%$ | $\$ 1,100,000$ |
| At 95\% lease up and draft cost <br> certification | $20 \%$ | $\$ 252,687$ |
| At permanent conversion | $50 \%$ | $\$ 631,717$ |


| At project close out | $5 \%$ | $\$ 63,172$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Completion (ie. TCO) of tenant- <br> paid tenant improvements | $25 \%$ | $\$ 315,858$ |
| Total At-Risk Fee | $100 \%$ | $\$ 1,263,434$ |
| At construction closing (for <br> subdivision) |  | $\$ 50,000$ |
| At execution of LOI and MOU |  | $\$ 62,500$ |
| At lease signing | $\$ 62,500$ |  |
| Total Commercial Fee | $\$ 175,000$ |  |
| Total Cash Developer Fee | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 8 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |
| Deferred Fee |  | $\$ 2,536,566$ |
| GP Equity |  | $\$ 100$ |
| Total Developer Fee |  | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 0 7 5 , 1 0 0}$ |

This fee schedule is approved by MOHCD staff.
7. PROJECT OPERATIONS (See Attachment I and J for Operating Budget and Proforma)

### 7.1. Annual Operating Budget

### 7.2. Income

681 Florida will serve families at a wide range of income levels, between $25 \%$ MOHCD AMI and $85 \%$ MOHCD AMI. As discussed the last time this project was at Loan Committee, this unit mix is in part structured so as to be competitive for MHP. The tie-breaker for the MHP 2019 round was based on depth of income targeting for all units at or below $60 \%$ AMI CTCAC rents. The range of AMIs also enables the project to meet the needs of many different household incomes, including the documented demand for middle income housing. Families experiencing homelessness will be served by the $25 \%$ MOHCD AMI units and will be subsidized by LOSP. The average MOHCD AMI for all units except for the LOSP units is $60 \%$. The average MOHCD AMI for all units is $49 \%$.

The LOSP subsidy in year 1 is estimated to be $\$ 334,374$, which is just under the amount budgeted by the City for the project. The subsidy funds the LOSP units' proportionate share of expenses after accounting for tenant income. All of the operating expenses are allocated proportionately between LOSP and non-LOSP units except for the non-LOSP services (which must be fully paid for by project income) and the 2.4 FTE front desk coverage (which is allocated 70\% to LOSP units since these units triggered the need for the additional building staff). The staffing pattern allows for near-24-7 staffing coverage of the building and has been reviewed and agreed to by HSH.

COVID-19 Impacts. Even before the pandemic, the development team was aware that it would need to be strategic and intentional about the lease up of the $85 \%$ AMI units, as this is a new income tier for both TNDC and MEDA. TNDC is working with its property management and compliance teams to pull from their collective experience at different companies and properties, and will be looking at the extent that TNDC/MEDA would be willing to (and could afford) incentives for these units, as well as the remaining units as needed. TNDC/MEDA has built four months into the schedule (one month more than typical) to lease up the project. While not completely similar, TNDC plans to derive lessons learn from the leasing process of the projects now under development including market-rate units at 270 Turk, the $74 \%$ MOHCD AMI units at 1990 Folsom, and later the $80 \%$ AMI units at 500 Turk in their own portfolio.

MOHCD income restriction chart:

| Unit Size | No. of <br> Units | Maximum Income Level | LOSP units |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio | 21 | $85 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 1BR | 4 | $85 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 2BR | 8 | $85 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 3BR | 2 | $85 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| Studio | 5 | $60 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 1BR | 3 | $60 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 2BR | 3 | $60 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 3BR | 1 | $60 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| Studio | 4 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 1BR | 1 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 2BR | 3 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 3BR | 2 | $50 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| Studio | 2 | $40 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 1BR | 2 | $40 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 2BR | 5 | $40 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 3BR | 2 | $40 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| Studio | 12 | $35 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 1BR | 2 | $35 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 2BR | 5 | $35 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 3BR | 3 | $35 \%$ of Median Income |  |
| 1BR | 18 | $25 \%$ of Median Income | LOSP |
| 2BR | 17 | $25 \%$ of Median Income | LOSP |
| 3BR | 4 | $25 \%$ of Median Income | LOSP |
| 1BR | 1 | Manager's Unit |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 7.3. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation.

| Operating Proforma |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? $(\mathbf{Y} / \mathbf{N})$ | Notes |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays above 1:1 through Year 17 | Y | DSCR is 1.54 at Year 1 and is 1.46 at Year 17 (and 1.4 at Year 20). As a $30 \%$ LOSP project, the DSCR begins decreasing immediately after Year 1. <br> Both Wells Fargo and CCRC are underwriting the project at a $2 \% / 3 \%$ escalation factor and requiring the DSCR to be 1.1 in Year 20. When adjusting the MOHCD model to be underwritten this way, the DSCR is 1.1 in Year 20. |
| Vacancy meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy is 5\% |
| Annual Income Growth is increased at $2.5 \%$ per year | Y |  |
| Annual Operating Expenses are increased at $3.5 \%$ per year | Y |  |
| Base year operating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | Y | Total Operating Expenses with reserves, ground lease payment, and bond fees are $\$ 11,512$ per unit. |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is \$69 PUPM |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | 1 FTE General Manager, 1 FTE Assistant Manager, 2 FTE Janitor, 2 FTE Maintenance, 2.4 FTE Desk Coverage |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Annual AM Fee is $\$ 20,440 / \mathrm{yr}$ Annual PM Fee is $\$ 19,750 / \mathrm{yr}$ |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or exceed TCAC minimum standards | Y | Replacement Reserves are $\$ 500$ per unit per year. |
| Limited Partnership Asset Management Fee meets standards | N | Wells Fargo is requiring an $\$ 8,500$ investor services fee that escalates $3.5 \%$ per year. |

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

8.1. Services Plan. TNDC will provide 1 FTE Master's level Social Worker/Site Coordinator and 1 FTE Master's level Social Worker to oversee all aspects of services delivery for the LOSP families. This ensures that LOSP households have a 1:25 case management ratio. For the non-LOSP households, TNDC will provide 1 FTE Master's level Social Worker (or a 1:90 service connection ratio). This means that services are slightly over-funded based on MOHCD's standard 1:100 service connection ratio for non-LOSP households. An off-site Family Program Manager (. 21 FTE) will provide supervision to the Social Worker/Site Coordinator and is responsible for the oversight of support services for families in a portfolio of TNDC buildings.

TNDC will complete an intake and assessment for each family at move-in and will offer the following services based on need: case management, culturally inclusive referrals and linkages, crisis intervention and conflict resolution, benefits counseling and advocacy, wellness checks, vocational and educational related services, housing stabilization and eviction prevention, behavioral health counseling, community building, and fostering independence and self-sufficiency, among others. In particular, TNDC services staff will help tenants break the cycle of homelessness and find stability by providing housing retention and eviction prevention services; linking tenants to medical, mental health and substance abuse services; and assisting tenants to increase their income by accessing public benefits and linking them to employment and training programs in the community. TNDC services providers collaborate routinely with property management in order to achieve services-related goals. All residents will have ongoing access to the network of Mission Promise Neighborhood partners as well as MEDA's asset building programs.
8.2. Service Budget. The services for the 39 LOSP families will be funded by HSH at $\$ 240,435$ for 1 FTE Site Coordinator (MSW) and 1 FTE Social Worker, including overhead associated with each staffing position. This will be provided through a separate contract. The non-LOSP services for the 90 lottery referral families are funded by the operating budget and are budgeted at $\$ 113,094$ for 1 FTE Social Worker, including overhead associated with the staff person. TNDC's expenses for 1 FTE Site Coordinator (MSW) are $\$ 134,000$, including overhead, and \$110,000 for 1 FTE Social Worker, including overhead.
8.3. HSH Assessment of Service Plan and Budget.

MOHCD, HSH, and the development team met in September 2018 to discuss the team's proposed front desk coverage, ground floor plan lay-out, and property management staffing model. TNDC presented a property management staffing plan, which allowed for near 24/7 staffing coverage of the building, utilizing 2.4 FTE desk clerk staffing. HSH, MOHCD, and TNDC/MEDA agreed to this plan for staffing the property.

In the last month, HSH has reviewed and approved the updated, detailed Services Plan and Budget, summarized in this Loan Evaluation (above). The final

Services Plan will be presented, reviewed, and approved closer to project leaseup and before TNDC and HSH enter into the services contract.

## 9. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

### 9.1. Proposed Loan/Grant Terms

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | Up to $\$ 35,076,507$ (including a <br> short-term AHP bridge loan of <br> $\$ 1,250,000)$ |
| Loan Term: | The later of 55 years after <br> permanent financing conversion <br> or 57 years after construction <br> closing. |
| Loan Maturity Date: | The later of 55 years after <br> permanent financing conversion <br> or 57 years after construction <br> closing. |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Residual Receipts |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $0 \%$ |

### 9.2 Recommended closing conditions:

- Should TNDC/MEDA not execute the commercial space LOI and MOU by construction loan closing, TNDC/MEDA must begin the process of finding an alternative commercial space tenant or tenants.
9.3 Recommended loan conditions:
- TNDC/MEDA may not draw down on the $\$ 310,000$ commercial space warm shell allowance until a lease has been executed with a commercial space tenant.
- TNDC/MEDA must meet with MOHCD every three months during construction to provide an update on the commercial space development.


## 10. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

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

From: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 12:07 PM
To: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Cc: Gotthelf, Felicia (MYR) [felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org](mailto:felicia.gotthelf@sfgov.org)
Subject: Loan Committee Approvals from 8-7-2020
Hello Eric,
When you have a moment, if you could please provide your approvals on 681 Florida St (Request for Permanent Financing) and 1950 Mission (Request for LOSP Contract) as discussed at Loan Committee on 8/7/2020.

Thank you,
Rosie Chavez

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


#### Abstract

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


䨟
## 681 Floridam

Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org)
Mon 8/10/2020 3:46 PM
To: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Cc: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org)
Rosanna,
My apologies for the delay sending my approval for the 681 Florida project.
I approve.
Salvador


## Salvador Menjivar

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Rosie Chavez

Due to public health orders I'm currently working remotely.
I can be reached via call or text to 415-640-8071, but e-mail is the best way to reach me.

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



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

Date: $\qquad$
Eric Shaw, Director
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.
Date: $\qquad$
Nadia Sesay, Executive Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

## [ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Date: $\qquad$
Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.
Date: $\qquad$
Anna Van Degna, Director
Controller's Office of Public Finance

Attachments: A. Project Milestones/Schedule
B. Borrower Org Chart
C. Developer Resumes
D. Asset Management Analysis of Sponsor
E. Site Map with amenities
F. Elevations and Floor Plans
G. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments
H. Permanent Development Budget
I. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget
J. 20-year Operating Pro Forma
K. Commercial Operating Budget and Vision for Space

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

See attached.

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

| No. | Performance Milestone | Estimated or Actual Date | Contractual Deadline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) | June 2017 | Complete |
| 1 | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | May 2017 | Complete |
| 2. | Site Acquisition by City | Summer 2017 | Complete |
| 3. | Development Team Selection |  |  |
| a. | Architect | Complete | Complete |
| b. | General Contractor | July 2017 | Complete |
| c. | Owner's Representative | July 2017 | Complete |
| d. | Property Manager | Complete | Complete |
| e. | Service Provider | Complete | Complete |
| 4. | Design |  |  |
| a. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Estimate | July 2017 | Complete |
| b. | Submittal of Design Development \& Cost Estimate | December 2017 | Complete |
| c. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | $\begin{gathered} \text { October } 2018 \\ (70 \% \mathrm{CD}) \end{gathered}$ | Complete |
| d. | Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate (75\%-80\% CDs) | $\frac{\text { January } 2019}{(90 \% \mathrm{CD})}$ | Complete |
| 5. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | CEQA Environ Review Submission | N/A | N/A |
| b. | NEPA Environ Review Submission | March 2019 | Complete |
| c. | Affordable Housing Bonus Program Submission | July 2017 | Complete |
| 6. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | March 2018 | Complete |
| b. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | November 2018 | Complete |
| c. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | January 2019 | Complete |
| 7. | Request for Bids Issued | December 2018 | Complete |
| 8. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | Complete | Complete |
| b. | Interim | December 2018 | Complete |


| c. | Update | May 2020 | Complete |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. | Additional City Financing |  |  |
| a. | Predevelopment Financing Application \#2 | December 2018 | Complete |
| b. | Gap Financing Application | August 2020 |  |
| 10. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | MHP Application | Awarded August 2019 |  |
| b. | Construction Financing RFP | Completed | Completed |
| c. | AHP Application | Awarded June 2020 |  |
| d. | CDLAC Application | Awarded April 2020 |  |
| e. | TCAC Application | Awarded April 2020 |  |
| 11. | Closing |  |  |
| a. | Construction Closing | October 2020 |  |
| b. | Permanent Financing Closing | May 2023 |  |
| 12. | Construction |  |  |
| a. | Notice to Proceed | October 2020 |  |
| b. | Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Cert of Substantial Completion | August 2022 |  |
| 13. | Marketing/Rent-up |  |  |
| a. | Marketing Plan Submission | March 2022 |  |
| b. | Commence Marketing | May 2022 |  |
| c. | 95\% Occupancy | December 2022 |  |
| 14. | Cost Certification/8609 | December 2023 |  |
| 15. | Close Out MOH/OCII Loan(s) | December 2023 |  |

## Attachment B: Borrower Org Chart

See attached.
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Organizational Structure
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## Attachment C: Developer Resume

Gabriel Speyer is a Senior Project Manager with TNDC Housing Development. In his four years with TNDC, Gabe has managed two "RAD" rehabilitation projects and two new-construction projects. While relatively new to project management, prior to coming to TNDC, Gabe spent 10 years as a Relationship Manager with Bank of America Merrill Lynch Community Development Banking. In that role, Gabe helped to finance over 1,000 units of affordable and supportive housing through LIHTC equity finance and construction \& permanent loans. His clients included Mercy Housing, Eden Housing, Low Income Investment Fund, and TNDC. Gabe is a Marshall Memorial Fellow and former Ironman triathlete. He holds an MBA from Columbia University and a Bachelor's in Economics from the University of California, San Diego.

Dan Jimenez is a Senior Project Manager with MEDA Community Real Estate. An engineer and general contractor, he joined MEDA in 2020 but began his affordable-housing career at a twoperson Nevada nonprofit with great vision, but no assets. Within 24 months, the upstart nonprofit had been awarded $\$ 60$ million in projects; it is now the largest affordable-housing developer in Nevada, with over 4,000 units. Dan spent the next two decades involved in several dozen transactions - involving tax credits, bonds, 202s, and USDA and Bureau Indian Affairs deals across the United States, from Hawaii to Puerto Rico. Dan holds a Juris Doctorate from the University of San Diego and a Bachelor's in Economics from Harvard University. In his spare time, Dan enjoys biking and swapping fun stories about travel to remote countries.

Colleen Ma is a Project Manager with TNDC Housing Development. She joined TNDC in 2017 and has helped to manage acquisition, new construction, and rehabilitation projects in various phases of development, lease up, and close out. Prior to her time at TNDC, Colleen worked at Mercy Housing Lakefront in Chicago to analyze portfolio performance, delivery of social services, and conduct research on housing outcomes. She previously worked in social services as a case manager and housing coordinator in San Francisco, as well as in community organizing with public housing tenants and the unhoused in Los Angeles. Colleen holds a Master's in Urban Planning and Policy from the University of Illinois at Chicago and a Bachelor's in Geography/Environmental Studies from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Monica Almendral is an Assistant Project Manager with MEDA Community Real Estate. Monica joined MEDA in 2017, where she began her work in affordable housing in asset management before moving into project management on $4 \%$ projects and the San Francisco Small Sites Program. She has helped the MEDA Community Real Estate team to grow their portfolio to over 1,000 preserved/produced affordable units in San Francisco. Monica holds a Bachelor's in Mathematics from Spelman College.

Adrian Napolitano is an Assistant Project Manager with TNDC Housing Development. Having joined the team in 2020, he was previously a Financial Analyst at Wells Fargo, where he primarily provided support to the Community Lending \& Investment Debt team and worked on affordable housing, homebuilder, office, and mixed-use projects. Adrian grew up in the Bay Area and appreciates the opportunity to work on affordable, transit-oriented projects that provide stable, well-maintained homes and contribute to the racial and economic diversity of San Francisco's neighborhoods. Adrian holds a Bachelor's in Urban Studies from UC Berkeley's College of Environmental Design. In his free time, Adrian enjoys biking and running around San Francisco, singing, and eating burritos in the Mission.

## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

TNDC has 42 projects in its portfolio, with an additional 17 projects in the pipeline including recapitalization. The average units per project ranges from 75-120.

There are three full-time employees. The department is headed by the Director of Asset Management, with two Asset Managers reporting to the Senior Asset Manager, who reports to the CFO. Each of the three employees in the Asset Management Department have a set number of projects in the portfolio. Each is responsible for developing asset management plans for each property, as well as managing the needs and requests of the partner and/or lender in each of the properties, examining opportunities related to the rental structure/operating subsidies, and developing, when necessary, partner exit strategies and/or resyndication and refinancing strategies for those projects that are approaching Year 15.

Members of the Asset Management Department work closely with other TNDC departments. Each project in development in the Housing Development Department has a multidisciplinary "interdepartmental team" to help inform rehab or new construction scopes in which one or more members of asset management participates. Additionally, TNDC has a Recapitalizaion Workgroup, in which all members of the Asset Management Department attend in order to update senior staff members and the Housing Development Department about asset management plans, partner exit strategies and other asset management related activities, challenges and opportunities.

## Attachment E: Site Map with amenities

## See attached.

## 681 Florida TCAC and CDLAC Amenity Map - 2017 Regulations

## Amenities

681 Florida St- Public Park: Franklin Square

9 Public Park: Alioto Park

- Public Park: 17th \& Folsom 9
Transit: 16 th \& Mission BART


## 0

Transit: Potrero Ave \& 18th St

- Elementary: Marshall
- Middle School: Everett $\theta$
High School: John O' Connell Technical
0
Library: Mission Branch Library

9 Grocery Store: Safeway 9
Grocery: Duc Loi Supermarket 9
Medical: Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital $\bullet$
Medical: Homeless Prenatal Program


## Attachment F: Elevations and Floor Plans

See attached.

## 681 FLORIDA STREET FAMILY HOUSING
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## MITHŪN
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SUMMARY OF SHORING SCOPE AND EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR DEMOLITION


Project Parameters:

- No Property Intrusion
- Neighbor-friendly
- No vibrations

Coordinate with future architecture

- coordinate with foundations
- cost effective
- maximum 24" Face of Building to Property Line





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

See attached.

| Affordable Multifamily Housing New Construction Cost Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Updated 7/31/2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Dev. Cost w/oland | Notes on Financing | Comments |
| PROJECTS COMPLETED |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  | Total Dev. Costw/land | Local Sussidy 5 |  |  |  |
| Project Name | Address | Lot sq.ft | Compl Date | Units | \# of $\mathrm{BR}^{1}$ | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | on-Res. | Total | Aca. Cost3 | Constr. Cost4 | Soft Cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95 Laguna Senior | 95 Lagnua | 14.300 | May-19 | 79 | 82 | 59,75 | 7.316 | 67,101 | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ 5 5 , 12 2,000 | \% 32,596,088 | s 11,343,750 | ${ }_{48,952,588}^{58}$ | s 21,234,000 | 43,94,558 | 9\% LIHTC | 7 Story - 5 stories T ype Ill ver 2 stories 7 |
| Mission Family Housing | ${ }^{1036 \text { Mission }}$ | ${ }^{15,200}$ | Oct-18 | ${ }_{\substack{88 \\ 113}}^{\text {13 }}$ | ${ }^{134}$ | $\frac{92,462}{10840}$ | ${ }^{6,9,955}$ | ${ }^{\text {9,9,417 }}$ | ¢¢ | ¢ $41,066,162$ <br> 56678.225  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | s ${ }_{\text {s }}^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 2 HCOL Loans (M+P \& TOO) |  |
| Completed Projects: | Average: | 17,281 |  | 93 | 142 | 86,896 | 11,786 | 98,681 | ¢ 6,621,010 | s 43,447,065 | s 10,921,554 | s 60,989,629 s | s 20,375,279 | S $54,368,619$ |  |  |
| PROJECTS UND | Construction |  |  |  |  | Building | Square F | tage |  | tal Project Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name | Address | q.ft | pl Date | \# of Units | \# of ER' | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Res. | Total | Acc. Cost3 | tr. Cos | cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Dev. Cost } \\ & \text { w/land } \end{aligned}$ | Local Subsidy 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Dev. Cost w/o } \\ \text { land } \end{gathered}$ | Notes on Financ | Comme |
| 40 South 2 Ness | 490 S. Van Ness Avenue | ${ }^{14,250}$ | Sep-20 | ${ }^{81}$ | ${ }^{121}$ | 51.639 | ${ }^{28.985}$ | ${ }^{800.624}$ | S 18,500.000 |  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{7,5441,804}$ S | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ \% $28.892,030$ | 57,041,804 |  |  |
| $\frac{2060 \text { Filsom Street }}{1950 \text { Mision Steet }}$ | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{20650 \text { Folsom }}$ | ${ }_{\text {29,075 }}^{3650}$ | $\frac{\text { Dec-20 }}{\text { Nor-20 }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{157 \\ 157}}^{\text {127 }}$ | ${ }_{222}^{262}$ | (155,648 | ${ }_{\text {12,810 }}^{18,12}$ | -167,458 |  | s $71,655,60$ <br> 856485  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | $31,697,110$ 44945740 4 | 91,755.832 | HCD AHSC Lan HCD AHSC Loan | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Story Type AB- TAY, Chilicara, Commu |
| 500 Turk Street (555 Larkin) | 500 Turk Street | 18,906 | Dec-21 | 108 | 186 | 82,805 | 26.586 | 109,391 | S $\quad 1.855 .895$ | s 54,251,461 | s 29.815 .020 S | ¢ 85,920,376 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | S 32,40,000 | s 84,066,481 | HCD AHSC Loan | Type 18 stories on on onstraind site |
| Under Construction: | Average: | ${ }^{24,705}$ |  | 118 | 205 | 100,881 | 28,881 | 129,762 | $7,565,957$ | 63,799,992 | 19,620,125 | 90,986,073 | 34,483,720 | ${ }^{83,420,117}$ |  |  |


| PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  |  | Total Dev. Cost |  | Local Subsidy5 |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Total Dev. Cost w/o } \\ \text { Land }}}{\text { and }}$ |  | No | en |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Address | Lot sq.ft | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start Date } \\ \text { (anticipated) } \end{gathered}$ | \# of Units | \# of BR' | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Res. | Total | Acq. Cost3 |  | nstr. Cost4 | Soft Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Misision Bay S. Bi. PA (Homeowner) | 350 China Basin Stre | ${ }^{29,939}$ | Feb-22 | 140 | 280 | 136,165 | 50.611 | 186,776 | s | ${ }^{5}$ | 110,040,000 | ${ }^{22,053,737}$ | s | 132,093,737 | s | 79,20,000 | 5 | 132,093,737 | Not LITTC eligible: Homeowners | Type 1 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {BPOY }}$ | 2330 San Jose Ave | 30.699 | Nor-21 | ${ }^{131}$ | ${ }^{217}$ | ${ }^{164,636}$ | 10.741 | 175.377 |  | ${ }_{5}$ | ${ }^{90,772,748}$ |  |  | -17,304,622 | s | $30,493,722$ <br> 1.629817 <br> 1 | s | 117,394,562 | 4\% Credits HCDCDIG \& AHSC | Type 18 | ent to BART. EEar |
| Parcalu | 260 Hintieet | ${ }_{5.583}^{5.400}$ | ${ }_{\text {Juan-21 }}$ | ${ }_{63}$ | ${ }_{63}$ | ${ }^{60.537} 4$ |  | ${ }_{4}^{62,7,076}$ | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{\text {4,9,1,44, } 683}$ | 17,94, 17.957 | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{60,9315,5303}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | s | ${ }^{60,52,29,060} 5$ | $4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Typee }}$ Type | Ihasementit const |
| 6007 7t Street (fmly 8018 Branan) | 6007 th Street | 37,800 | Apr-22 | ${ }^{200}$ | 290 | ${ }^{147,857}$ | 5.000 | 152,857 | 10,00 | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{90,567,791}$ | $58,478,670$ | ${ }^{5}$ | 149,056,461 | s | $44,55,243$ | s | ${ }^{149,046,461}$ | Fed S St Credisis HCD IIS | Typel, |  |
| 1800 Onesestreet | ${ }^{180 \text { Jones Street }}$ | 4,453 | ${ }_{\text {Sepe-21 }}$ | ${ }^{72}$ | ${ }^{72}$ | ${ }_{\text {20,800 }}^{23871}$ | $\xrightarrow{3,700}$ | ${ }^{33,500}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | ${ }^{34,109,177}{ }^{11,093210}$ | - $13.689,695$ | s | 477748,866 | ${ }^{5}$ | $\xrightarrow{13,950,000}$ | s | ${ }^{471778,866}$ | ${ }^{4 \% \% L H T C+M H P}$ | Typea | Iver tight site est |
| I21 Howard | ${ }^{921}$ Howard Street ${ }_{\text {Ave }}$ | ${ }_{20,881}^{20,83}$ | Dec-20 | ${ }_{126} 12$ | ${ }_{192}$ | ${ }_{126.716}$ | ${ }_{10,993}$ | $\stackrel{23,680}{127,709}$ | ${ }^{1,2755,249}$ | - | ${ }_{744,787,117}$ | ${ }^{36,089,122}$ | s | ${ }_{\text {100,693,932 }}^{103,013,627}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 30,000,000 | 5 | ${ }_{\text {101, }}$ 1776,407 | Califa MP/ $4 \%$ LHTC | IA | 9 spaces \& ${ }^{\text {re }}$ |




| PROJECTS COMPLETED |  | Acquisition by Unit/Bed/SF |  |  | Construction by Unit/Bed/SF |  |  | Soft Costs By Unit/Bed/SF |  |  | Total Development Cost (Incl. Land) |  |  | Subsidy |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Compl. Date | Acqunit | Acq/Br | Acqlot sq.ft | Constunit | ConstisR | Constsq.ft ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | Softunit | Softibr | Sottsp.ft6 | Gross TDC/unit | Gross TDCCIBR | Gross TDC/sq.ft6 | Sussidy / unit | Leveraging ${ }^{7}$ |  |
| 95Laguna Senior | May-19 | 63,43 | 61,122 | 350 | 412,618 | 3 39,522 | ${ }^{486}$ | 144,592 | 138,338 | ¢ 169 | 619,653 | 596,982 | ${ }_{7} 7$ | 268,785 | 56.6\% |  |
|  | $\frac{0}{\text { Ott-18 }}$ | 6, 6 6,800 | $\frac{41,426}{407}$ | 365 | ${ }_{\text {460,661 }}^{40.157}$ | ${ }^{3068,464}$ | ${ }_{4}^{438}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | s <br> ${ }_{5}$ | ${ }_{604.553} 715$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{503}$ | 201,186 | 66.7\% |  |
| Coay \& Payor family Cousing | ${ }_{\text {Jun-19 }}^{\text {Average: }}$ | 6,6,608 | 44,874 | 377 | $\stackrel{560,285}{4}$ | $\stackrel{268,61}{324,201}$ | ${ }_{445}^{445}$ | ${ }_{1}^{116,570}$ | ${ }_{\text {8, }}^{\text {8,929 }}$ | ${ }^{117}$ | ${ }_{645,463}$ | ${ }_{4}^{\text {359,005 }}$ | ${ }_{6}^{620}$ | ${ }^{1296,399}$ |  | ${ }^{65 \%}$ |


| PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION |  | Acquisition |  |  | Construction |  |  | Soft Costs |  |  | Total Development Cost (Incl. Land) |  |  |  | Subsidy |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Compl. Date | Acqunit | Acq/ER | Acqlot sq.ft | Constunit | Constigr | Constst.f.t ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Softunit | sotubr | Sotts.t.t6 | Soss TDC/unit | oss TDC/IRR |  |  |  | dy / unit | Leveraging ${ }^{7}$ |  |
| 400 Sout Van Ness | Sep-20 | 228,395 | 152,893 | 1,228 | 538.864 | 360,727 | 541 | 166,356 | \$110,693 | 166 | 932,615 | \$ 624,312 | s | 937 | s | 356.692 | 61.8\% |  |
| 2066 Folsom Street | Dec-20 | 1.062 | ${ }^{535}$ | - ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{564,218}$ | 284,388 | ${ }_{5}^{428}$ | ${ }^{158,269}$ | ${ }_{\text {S }}^{5997763}$ | 120 | ${ }^{723,549}$ | ${ }^{364,646}$ | s | ${ }_{5}^{549}$ | s | ${ }_{\text {249,584 }}^{28629}$ | - $6.5 .5 \%$ |  |
| ${ }^{1950}$ Mission Street | $\stackrel{\text { Noo-20 }}{\text { Dec-21 }}$ |  | ${ }^{37,099} 9$ | ${ }_{98}^{267}$ | ${ }_{\text {545,599 }}^{5023}$ |  | 496 |  | ${ }_{\text {sf7,966 }}^{\text {si60,26 }}$ | ${ }_{24}^{97}$ | s 704,403 <br> s 795,59 |  | $\frac{5}{5}$ | ${ }_{7}^{684}$ | $\frac{5}{5}$ | 266,279 300000 | $\frac{59.4 \%}{62.3 \%}$ |  |
| Under Construction: | Average | 77,221 | 50,176 | 417 | 537,730 | 315,910 | 499 | 174,081 | 102,164 | 163 | 789,032 | 468,250 |  | 739 |  | 298,138 |  | ${ }_{62 \%}$ |


| PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT |  | Acquisition |  |  | Construction |  |  | Soft Costs |  |  |  | Total Development Cost (Incl. Land) |  |  | Subsidy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Start Date (anticipated) | Acq/unit | Acq/ER | sa.tt | Constunit | BR | enstsp.f.t ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Softunit | Softibr |  | Sottsq.f6 | Gross TDC/unit | ss Toc | Gross TDC//s.ff6 | ubsidy / unit | Leveraging ${ }^{7}$ |
| Mission Bay S. Block 9A (ownership) | Feb-22 |  |  |  | ${ }^{786,000}$ | ${ }^{393,000}$ |  | ${ }^{157,527}$ | 78,763 | s |  | ${ }^{943,527}$ | ${ }^{471,763}$ | 707 | ${ }_{565,714}$ | 40.0\% |
| $\frac{\text { BPUY }}{44 \mathrm{hand} \text { Folsom }}$ | $\frac{\mathrm{Noor} 21}{\text { Dec-21 }}$ | 1.901 | 1.344 | 16 | ${ }^{\frac{670,306}{} 74,032}$ | 400,388 <br> 504871 | ${ }_{503}^{505}$ | 153,824 <br> 199,192 | $\xrightarrow{94,163}{ }_{10,843}$ | ${ }_{5}$ | ${ }_{225}^{115}$ | $\xrightarrow{8824,131}$ 91, 32 | ${ }_{6}^{5044,491}$ | $\frac{618}{1,027}$ | ${ }_{\text {2 } 24,952}^{293}$ | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{\text {69.7. }} 7.5$ |
| Parcelu | ${ }_{\text {Jun-21 }}$ | ${ }_{391}$ | ${ }^{39}$ |  | ${ }_{525,5771}$ | ${ }_{5}^{525,471}$ | 694 | ${ }_{\text {27, } 27,793}$ | ${ }^{272,793}$ | s | ${ }_{360}$ | ${ }_{798,566}$ | ${ }_{7}^{\text {798,656 }}$ | $\stackrel{1}{1,055}$ | ${ }_{353,797}^{20,29}$ | ${ }_{\text {55.7\% }}$ |
| 6007 7t Street | Apr-22 | 50 | ${ }^{34}$ | 0 |  | 312,303 | ${ }_{5}^{593}$ | ${ }^{292,393}$ | ${ }^{201,651}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{383}$ | ${ }^{745,282}$ | ${ }_{5}^{513,988}$ | S | ${ }_{\text {222,751 }}$ | 70.1\% |
| $\frac{1800 \text { Jones Street }}{\text { 921 Howard }}$ | $\frac{\text { Sep-21 }}{\text { Dec-20 }}$ | ${ }^{43,148}$ | 27,118 | 303 |  | ${ }^{4735,788}$ | +1.018 | ${ }^{189,4040}{ }^{182,274}$ | ${ }^{1899440}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{407}$ | s 663,19 <br> s 791,596 | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{6639,179}$ | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{198,7750}$ | $\xrightarrow{70.8 \%}$ 81.3\% |
| In Predevelopment | Average: | ${ }^{11,373}$ | 5,778 | 81 | 598,366 | 425,077 | 670 | 206,778 | 156,030 |  | 252 | 811,099 | 584,850 | 927 | 279,576 | 66\% |

[^2]
## Attachment H: Permanent Development Budget

See attached.


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

See attached.


OPERATNG EXPENSES
Management


| Ground Lease Base Rent | 4,500 | 10,500 | 15,000 | Sround lease with MOHCD ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (15000 annualy, alocated to rest and comm' |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond Monitoring Fee | ${ }^{0}$ | 0 |  |  |  |  | Alternative LoSP Split |
| Replacement Reserve Deposit | 19,500 | 45,500 | 65,000 |  |  |  | Replacement Resereve Deposit |
| Operating Resere Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  | Operating Reserve Deposit |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit | 0 | 9,475 | 9,475 | suer |  |  | Other Required Resenve 1 Deposit |
| Required Reserve Depositts, Commmercial |  |  |  | Links from ' Commercial Op. | dget Worksheet |  |  |
| Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees | 24,000 | 65.475 | 89,475 | PUPA: 688 | Min DSCR: | 1.09 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Itgage Rate: | 5.00\% |  |
| Fees) | 443,539 | 1,052,995 | 1,496,534 | PUPA: 11,512 | Term (Years): | 30 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Supportable 1st Mortgage Pmt: |  |  |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES) | 27,005 | 413,661 | 440,666 | PUPA: 3,390 | Supportable 1st Mortgage Amt: Proposed 1st Mortgage Amt: | \$6,275,836 \$3,260,000 |  |
| dEBT SERVICEIMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amorized loans) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Alternative LoSP Spli |
| Hard Debt - First Lender | 0 | 223,877 | 223,877 | Perm Loan | Provide additional comments here, if needed. |  | Hard Debt-First Lender |
| Hard Debt- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lende | 18,530 | 43,236 | 61,765 | MHP | Provide additional comments here, if needed. |  | Hard Det- - Second Lender (HCD Program 0.4 |
| Hard Debt- Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Provide additional comments here, if freedd.d. |  | Hard Dett- - Third Lender (Other HCD Program |
| Hard Debt - Fourth Lender | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Provide additional comments here, if needed. |  | Hard Dett-Fourth Lender |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service |  |  |  | Links from 'Commercial Op. | dget Worksheet |  |  |
| TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE | 18,530 | 267,113 | 285,642 | PUPA: | 2,197 |  |  |
| CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) | 8,475 | 146,549 | 155,024 |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Only Cash Fow |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (r | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVALLABLE CASH FLOW | 8,475 | 146,549 | 155,024 |  |  |  |  |
| USES Of CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) |  |  | 1.54 |  |  |  |  |
| USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 5.925 | 13,825 | 19,750 | Asset and Partnership manag | ment fee, 2nd |  |  |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) | 2,550 | 5,950 | 8,500 | 1 1st |  |  | Alternative Losp Split |
| Other Payments | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | Other Payments |
| Noon-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 (select lender in comments field) | 0 | 0 |  |  | Provide additional comments here, if needed. |  | Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt-Lender 1 (select ts |
| Non-amoritiing Loan Pmmt - Lender 2 (select lender in comments field) |  | 0 |  |  | Provide additional comments here, if if eeded. |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt $<=$ Max Fee from cell 1130 ) |  | 68,586 | 68,586 | Def. Develop. Fee split 54\% | Provide additional comments here, if needed. |  | Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt < = Max Fed |



Residual Receipts Calculation
Does Project have a MOHCDResidual Receipt Obligation?
Will Proiect Defereveveloper Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Max Deferred Developer FeelBorrower \% of Residual Receipts in $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{r}} 1$ :
$\%$ of Residual Receipts available for distritution to soft debt lenders in $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{r}}$

| Soft Debt Lenders with Residual Receipts Obligations | (Select lender namelprogram from drop dow | 1 Principal A | Distrib. of Soft Debt Loans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD/OCII - Soft Debt Loans | All MOHCD/OCII Loans payable from res. rects | \$35,076,507 | 70.46\% |
| MOHCDIOCII- Ground Lease Value or Land Acq Cost | Acquisition Cost | \$14.706,000 | ${ }^{0.00 \%}$ |
| HCD (soft debt loan) - Lender 3 | MHP | \$14,706,000 | 29.54\% |
| Other Soft Debt Lender - Lender 4 |  |  | ${ }^{0.000 \%}$ |


$\begin{array}{llll}\begin{array}{lll}\text { Yes } \\ \text { Yes }\end{array} & \text { Project has MOHCD ground lease? } & \text { Yes } & \\ 50 \% & \text { Max Deferred Developer Fee Amt (Use for data entry above. Do not link.): } & \text { 63,387 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sum of DD F from LOSP and non-LOSP: } \\ \text { Ratio of Sum of DDF and calculated } 50 \%\end{array} \\ 50 \%\end{array}$ | Distrib. of Soff |
| :---: |
| Debt Loans |
| $0.46 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ |
| $2.54 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ |

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due | 40,999 | 50\% of residual receipits, multiplied by $70.46 \%$-- MOHCD's pro rata share of all soff debt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Reeeipts Amount to Loan Repayment | 40,999 | 40,999 Enterloveride amount of residual receipts proposed for loan repayment. |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Lease | 0 | 0 If applicable, MOHCD residual receipts amt due LESS amt proposed for loan repymt. |

REMANING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT
SERVICE
NoN-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVIC



| Application Date: | $5 / 20 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total \# Units: | 130 |

Total \# Units:
First Year of operations (provide data assuming that Year
1 is a full year,, i.e. 12 2 montins of operations):

| Residential - Tenant Rents |  |  | non-Losp |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) |  | 0.00\% | non-Losp | 100.00\% | Approver by (requ) |
| Residential - LoSP Tenant Assistance Payments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Space |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | LosP |  | non-LOSP |  | Approved By (read) |
| Supportive Services Income |  | 30.00\% |  | 70.00\% |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | Losp |  | non-LOSP |  | Ionly acepepable it |
| Tenant Charges |  |  |  |  | at entry level in the popref |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | LosP |  | non-Losp |  | Approved By (read) |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) <br> Gross Potential Income |  | .00\% |  | 70.00\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents Gross Potentiat hicome |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Commerial |  |  |  |  |  |


| Management | Losp |  | non-Losp |  | Approved By (read) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management Fee |  | 30.00\% |  | 70.00\% |  |
| Asset Management Fee |  | 30.00\% |  | 70.00\% |  |
| Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries/Benefits | Losp | 30.00\% | non-Losp | 70.00\% | Approved By (read) |
| Manager's Salary |  | 30.00\% |  | 70.00\% |  |
| Heatth Insurance and Other Benefits |  | 30.00\% |  | 70.00\% |  |
| Other Salaries/Benefits |  | 70.00\% |  | 30.0\% |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit |  | 30.00\% |  | 70.00\% |  |


$\frac{\text { Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits }}{\text { Sub-total Taxes and Licenses }}$

Reserves/Ground Lease Base RentitBond Fees

$\underset{\text { Fees) }}{\text { TOTAL }}$
et operating income (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES)


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

| Commercial Only Cash Flow |
| :--- |
| Allocotio of Commercial Surplus to LoPS/non-LOSP (residual income) $\square$ |

AVAIIABLE CASH FLLOW
USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)
USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVIICE N WATERFALL

| tnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) | Losp | non-LOSP | Approved By (read) |
| Other Payments | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmmt - Lender 1 (select lender in comments fild) | nder in comments field) |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 (select lender in comments field) | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |  |

TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD
RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS PRECEDING
Residual Receipts Calculation
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
Max Doferred Developer FeelBorrower \% of Residual Receipts in Yr 1:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { wax Deferred Developer FeelBorrower \% of Residual Recipts in } \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{r}} 1: & 6 \\ \text { \% of Residual Receipts available for distritution to soft debt lenders in } \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{r}} & 0.586 \\ 0.92419410\end{array}$

| Soft Debt Lenders with Residual Receipts Obligatio |
| :---: |
| MOHCD/OCCII - Soft Debt Loans |
| MOHCDIOCII- - Ground Lease Value |
| HCD (soft debt laan) - Lender 3 |
| Other Soft Debt Lender - Lender 4 |
| Other Soff Debt Lender - Lender 5 |
| MOHCD RESIIUUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE |
| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipits Amount to Loan Repayment |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Lease |
| REMAINING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE |
| NON-MOHCD RESIIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE |
| HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |
| Lender 4 Residual Receipits Due |
| Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |
| Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service |
| REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below) |
| Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee |
| DistributionsUses |
|  |

Wner Distributions/lncentive Management Fee
final Balance (should be zero)

## Attachment J: 20-year Operating Proforma

See attached.

| $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Losp } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ | Non-LOISP <br> Units <br> 91 <br> $70.00 \%$ <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 39 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 1 } \\ 2023 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 2 } \\ & 2024 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 3 } \\ & 2025 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { \% annual } \\ \text { inc LOSP } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% annual } \\ \text { increase } \end{gathered}$ | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non- } \\ & \text { Losp } \end{aligned}$ | Total | LOSP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non- } \\ & \text { LOSP } \end{aligned}$ | Total | LosP |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 140,400 | 1,536,996 |  | 143,910 | 1,57,421 | 1,799,331 | 147,508 | 1,614,806 | 1,762,314 | 151,195 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 334.374 |  | ${ }^{334,374}$ | 345.950 |  | ${ }^{345,950}$ | ${ }^{357,966}$ |  | ${ }^{357,966}$ | 70.43 |
| Commericial Space | $\frac{\text { n/a }}{25}$ | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Pakking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supporive Services Income | ${ }_{\text {2.5\% }}^{2.5}$ | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {2.5\% }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 2,340 | 5,460 | 7.800 | 2,398 | ${ }_{5}^{5.596}$ | 7,995 | 2.458 | 5,736 | 3,195 | 2.52 |
| Tenant Charges | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ | 2.5\% |  | 450 | 1,050 | 1,500 | 461 | ${ }^{1.076}$ | ${ }^{1.538}$ | 473 | 1.103 | ${ }_{1.576}$ | 485 |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) n/a n/a <br> Gross Potential Income   |  |  | Link from R applicable |  | 1.543.506 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,021,070 | 492,720 | 1,582,094 | 2,074,814 | 508,405 | 1,621,646 | 2,130,051 | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{524,637}$ |
| Vacancy Loss - Resisidential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manually per relevant MOHpolicy, annual incrementing usually notappropriate | (7,020) | (76,850) | (83,870) | (7,196) | (78,771) | (85,967) | ${ }^{(7,355)}$ | (88,740) |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments | ${ }_{\text {n/a }}^{\text {n/a }}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { n/a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFFECTIVE GR |  |  |  | 54 | ${ }^{1,466,656}$ | 1,937,200 | 485,524 | 1,50 | 8,847 | 501,02 | 1,540,906 | 2,041,935 | ${ }_{517,077}$ |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee <br> Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD <br> schedule. <br> per MOHCD policy | 32,292 | 75,348 | 107,640 | 33,422 | 77,985 | 111,407 | 34.592 | 80,715 | 115,307 | 35,803 |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | $\frac{6,632}{38,242}$ | 14,38889,656 | ${ }^{20,440} 120$ | 6,347 | 14,80992,794 | ${ }_{1}^{21,12,55}$ | 6.569 | 15,327 | 21,896 | 6,799 |
| Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{39,769}$ |  |  | ${ }^{41,161}$ | 96,042 | 137,202 | 42,601 |
| (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salan | $35^{\circ}$ | 3.5\% |  | 30,30 | 70700 | 2,000 | ${ }^{31,361}$ | 73175 | 10.4535 | ${ }^{32} 258$ |  | ${ }_{1}^{24,4069}$ |  |
| Heatht Insurance and Other Benefits | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | 30,908 | 72,119 | 103,027 | 31,990 | 74,643 | 106,633 | ${ }_{\text {32,436 }}^{33,10}$ | ${ }_{7}^{77,256}$ | 110,366 | ${ }_{34,269}^{3,59}$ |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 54.862 | 23,512 | 78,374 | 56,782 | 24,335 | 81,118 | 58,770 | 25,187 | ${ }^{83,957}$ | ${ }_{60,827}$ |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {125,088 }}^{2,160}$ | 18,7,372 | 7,200 | 2,236 | 5.216 | ${ }_{\text {32, }}^{\text {\% } 2396}$ | 2,314 | 5,399 | ${ }_{7}^{7,713}$ | 2,395 |
|  |  |  |  | 312,460 |  | 129,466 | 193,930 | 133,977 |  | 200,718 | 334,715 | 138,687 |  |
| Administation <br> Adverising and Marketing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 10,280 | 23,986 | ${ }^{34,265}$ | 10,639 | ${ }^{24,825}$ | ${ }^{35,464}$ | ${ }_{11,012}$ | ${ }^{25,694}$ | ${ }^{36,706}$ | 11,397 |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,569 | 3,661 | 5,230 | 1,624 | 3,789 | 5.413 | 1,681 | 3,922 | 5,603 | 1.740 |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,346 | 3,140 | 4.486 | ${ }_{1,393}$ | ${ }^{3,250}$ | 4.643 | 1,442 | 3,364 | 4.806 | 1.492 |
| Audit Expense | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 3,977 | 9,280 | 13,257 | ${ }_{4}^{4.116}$ | 9,605 | ${ }^{13,721}$ | 4,260 | 9,941 | 14,201 | 4,409 |
| BookkeepingAccounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4,446 | 10,374 | 14,820 | 4,602 | 10,737 | 15,339 | 4,763 | ${ }_{11,113}$ | 15,876 | 4,929 |
| Bad Debls | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,800 | 4,200 | 6,000 | 1,863 | 4,347 | ${ }_{6,210}$ | 1,928 | 4,499 | 6,427 | ${ }^{1,996}$ |
| Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | 3.854 | 8.992 | 12.846 | 3,989 |  | 13,295 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{27,892}$ | ${ }_{65,081}$ | ${ }^{92,973}$ | 28,868 | 67,359 | ${ }^{96,227}$ | ${ }^{29,878}$ | ${ }_{69,716}$ | ${ }^{99,595}$ | ${ }^{30,224}$ |
| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 18,274 | 42.640 | ${ }^{60,915}$ | 18,994 | 44,133 | ${ }^{63,047}$ | ${ }^{19,576}$ | 45.677 | 65,253 | 20,261 |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 49,956 | 116,565 | ${ }^{166.521}$ | 51.705 | 120.645 | ${ }_{172,350}$ | ${ }^{53,515}$ | ${ }_{124,867}$ | 178,382 |  |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 17,051 | 39,785 | 56,836 | 17,647 | 41,177 | 58,825 | 18,265 | 42,619 | 60.884 | 18,904 |
| Sub-total Ulilities |  |  |  |  | 198,900 |  |  |  | 294,221 | ${ }_{91,356}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{85,281}$ |  | 284,272 | ${ }^{88,266}$ | ${ }^{205,955}$ |  |  | 213,163 | ${ }^{304,519}$ | 94,55 |
| (e) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1.500 | 3.500 | 5,000 | 1,553 | ${ }_{3.623}$ | 5,175 | 1,607 | 3,749 | 5,356 | 1.663 |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 9,759 | ${ }^{22,770}$ | ${ }^{22,529}$ | 10,100 | 23,567 | ${ }^{33,667}$ | 10.454 | ${ }^{24,392}$ | ${ }_{3,}, 846$ | 10.820 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 613 | 1.431 | 2.044 |  | 1.481 | 2.115 | 657 | ${ }^{1.533}$ | 2.189 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 11,872 | ${ }^{17,701}$ | ${ }^{20,543}$ | ${ }^{12,237}$ | ${ }^{18,6870}$ | ${ }^{20,958}$ | ${ }^{12,717}$ | 29,674 | 42,391 | 13,162 |
| Insurance |  |  |  | ${ }^{14,556}$ | 33,963 | 48,519 |  | 35,152 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  | 15,065 |  | 50,217 | 15,592 | 36,382 | ${ }^{51,975}$ | 16,138 |  |
| Fijdility Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 10,843 | 25,300 | 36,143 | 11,222 | 26,186 | ${ }^{37,408}$ | 11,615 | 27,102 | 38,718 | 12,022 |  |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability lisurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 25,399 | 59,264 | ${ }^{84,662}$ | 26,288 | 61,338 | ${ }^{87,625}$ | 27,2 | 63, | ${ }^{90,692}$ | ${ }^{28,160}$ |  |
| Maintenance \& Repair Sub-total lisurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 49,920 | 116,480 | 166,400 | 51,667 | 120,557 | 172,224 | ${ }_{53,476}$ | 124.776 | 178,252 | ${ }_{55,347}$ |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1.868 | 4,358 |  | 1.933 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{31,7,43}$ |  | - $\begin{array}{r}105,876 \\ 58,077\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32,875 \\ & 18,033 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 76,77 \\ \hline 42,077 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 109,582 \\ \hline 60,109 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34,025 \\ & \hline 18,664 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79,392 \\ & \hline 43,549 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | - $6,2,213$ | $\begin{array}{r}35,216 \\ 19,37 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | 40,654 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sele | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.793 | 6.517 | 9.311 | 2.891 | ${ }^{6.745}$ | ${ }^{9.636}$ | 2,992 | 6.982 | 9.974 | 3.097 |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | ${ }^{125}$ |  |  |  | 184 |  | ${ }^{134}$ |  |  |  |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses <br> Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{\text {10,5884 }}$ | +4,155 | ${ }_{351,1,46}$ | ${ }_{10,9279}$ | ${ }_{254,985}$ |  | 1,8899 | 4,408263,910 | ${ }_{3,7,297}^{67,014}$ | ${ }_{\text {117,965 }}^{1}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 113,104 |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Services Commercial Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | - | 113,094 | 113,094 | - | 117,052 | 117,052 | - | ${ }^{122,149}$ | ${ }^{121,149}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total operating expenses <br> PUPA (wo Reserves/GL Base RentBond Fees) |  |  |  | 419,539 | 987,520 | $\begin{gathered} 1,407,059 \\ 0,824 \end{gathered}$ | 434,223 | 1,022,083 | 1,456,306 | 449,421 | 1,057,856 | 1,507,277 | 465,15. |  |
| Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rentibond Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vote: Hidden co | are in b | total coll | To updater | values ir |  |
| Ground Lease Base Rent |  |  |  | 4.500 | 10.500 | 15,000 | 4.500 | 10.500 | 15,000 | 4,500 | 10,500 | 15,000 | 4,500 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 19,500 | 45.500 | 65,000 | 19.500 | 45.500 | 65.000 | 19.500 | 45,500 | 65,000 | 19,500 |  |
| Operating Resene Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Resenve 1 Deposit |  |  |  |  | 9.475 | 9,475 |  | 9.475 | 9,47 |  | 9.475 | 9.475 |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rentibond Fees |  |  |  | 24,000 | ${ }^{6,475}$ | ${ }^{89,475}$ | 24,000 | 65,475 | ${ }^{89,475}$ | 24,000 | ${ }^{6,475}$ | ${ }^{8,475}$ | 24,000 |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond PUPA (w/ Reserves/GL Base RentBond Fees) |  |  |  | 44,539 | 1,052,995 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,496,534 \\ & 11,512 \end{aligned}$ | 48,223 | 1,087,558 | 1,545,781 | 473,421 | 1,23,331 | 1,596,752 | 489,151 |  |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES) |  |  |  | 27,005 | 13,661 | 400,666 | 27,301 | 415,7 | 43,06 | 27,6 | 417,575 | 445,183 | 27,92 |  |
| DEBT SERVICEIMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vote: Hideden co | umsarein | en total oll | S. To updat | elete valuestin |  |
| Hard Debt- - First Lender |  |  | Enerecommenis e: annual incease, etc. |  | ${ }^{223,877}$ | ${ }^{23,8,877}$ |  | ${ }^{23,877}$ | 233.877 |  | ${ }^{223,877}$ | ${ }^{223,877}$ |  |  |
| Hara Deet- Second Lender (HCD Program $0.42 \%$ pymt, orother 2nd Lend |  |  | Enter commenis rea anualinceasese etc. | 18,530 | 43,236 | ${ }^{61,765}$ | 18,530 | ${ }^{43,236}$ | ${ }^{61,765}$ | 18,530 | 43,236 | 61,765 | 18,530 |  |
| Hard Deit- - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) |  |  | Enter commenis e: annual incease, etic. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Enter commenisis e: annual increase, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Hard Debt Senice TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE |  |  |  | 18.530 | 267,113 | 285,642 | 18.530 | 267,113 | ${ }^{285,642}$ | 18,530 | 267,113 | 285,642 | 18,530 |  |
| CASH FLOw (NOI minus Debt service) |  |  |  | ${ }^{8,475}$ | 146,549 | 155,024 | 8,772 | 148,652 | 157,423 | 9,079 | 150,462 | 159,541 | 9,396 |  |
| Commercial Only Cash Fow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) AVAILABLE CASH FLOW |  |  |  |  | 116.59 |  |  |  |  | 1079 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Note: Hididen $\frac{1.50}{}$ | ums are in | total coll | To update | ete vales in |  |
| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | Peer Motcl popicy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partherstip Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCO policy | ${ }_{5}^{5,925}$ | 13,825 | 19,750 | ${ }^{6,132}$ | ${ }^{14,309}$ | ${ }^{20.441}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6,347}$ | ${ }_{\text {14,810 }}$ | ${ }^{21,1575}$ | ${ }^{6.569}$ |  |
| Investor Serice Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Feee") (seee policy for inimits) |  |  | Per MOHCCD policy no anvual increase | 2.550 | 5,950 | 8.500 | 2.639 | 6.158 | ${ }^{8.798}$ | 2,732 | 6.374 | 9,105 | 2.827 |  |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Non-amorizing Loan Pmmt - Lender } 1}{\text { Non-amorizing Loan Pmmt-Lender } 2}$ |  |  | Enter commenis ee a anual incease.e etc. |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | - | 68,586 | 68.586 | - | 64,092 | 64,092 | . | 64,639 | 64,639 | - |  |
| Total Payments Preceding mohcd |  |  |  | 8.475 | 88,361 | 96,836 | 8,772 | 84,559 | 93,331 | 9,079 | 85,822 | 94,901 | 9,396 |  |
| RESIIUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLow minus PAYMENTS PRECEDING | онс |  |  |  | 58,188 | 58,188 |  | 64,093 | 64,093 | ${ }^{(0)}$ | 64,639 | 64,639 | (0) |  |




## MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE



| REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below) |
| :--- |
| Owner DistributionsIncentive Management Fee |

Other DistributionsSUSes
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE

Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to $C N A$ )
Replacement Reserve Interest
RR Running Balance


| Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance |
| :--- |
| Other Reseve 1 Deposits |
| Other Reseve 1 Withiwals |
| Other Reserve 1 interest |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |

OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE




| Total 4 Units: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-Lospp } \\ & \text { Unitsp } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{39}$ | ${ }_{700006}^{95}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 8 \\ & 2030 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Year } 9 \\ 2031 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 10$ $2032$ |  |
| Income |  | \% \% anual |  | Total | Losp | Losp | Total | Losp | non-LOSP | Total |  | SP |  |
| Residenilal- Tenan Rents | 25\% |  |  | ${ }_{\text {1,945265 }}$ | ${ }^{168689}$ | ${ }^{1.827 .005}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,9093897}$ | ${ }^{177.064}$ | ${ }_{1.827260}$ | ${ }_{20,93744}$ |  | 1.99,497 | ${ }_{2049}$ |
|  | ${ }^{\text {na }}$ | ${ }^{\text {na }}$ |  | 41075 | $\underline{42520}$ |  | ${ }^{425220}$ | 44023 |  | 40.23 | , 812 |  | 455.812 |
| Cosmerali Soare | ${ }_{\substack{\text { na } \\ \text { na }}}^{\text {ata }}$ | ${ }_{\text {cha }}$ |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residenili Paxing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {2,5\% }}^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intest Socone Privect oee |  |  |  | 9.04 | 278 | ${ }_{6,40}$ | 9272 | 2851 | ${ }_{6}^{6.652}$ | ${ }_{9,504}$ | 2922 | 6.89 | ${ }^{7} 71$ |
|  | ${ }^{2.56 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{25 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{1,74}$ | 535 | ${ }_{12,48}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,783}$ | 568 | 1279 | 1,828 | ${ }_{562}$ | ${ }_{1}, 311$ | ${ }_{1.873}$ |
| Oner commecrail hoome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) <br> Gross Potential Income | na | na |  | ${ }_{2,366,03}$ | ${ }_{595,28}$ | 1,83,744 | ${ }_{\text {2,40, } 172}$ | ${ }_{614,96}$ | 1.880,612 | ${ }^{2.495 .088}$ | ${ }_{63,686}$ | ${ }_{1,287,627}$ | ${ }^{2.562264}$ |
|  | ${ }^{\text {Na }}$ | ${ }^{\text {na }}$ | Etane | (972, 283 | (8,365) | (91,350] | [99,656] |  | (93,634] | (102, 187) | (8,767) | (959.975 | (1097,742) |
|  | $\stackrel{n}{n a}$ | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| operating expenses Effective gross income |  |  |  | ${ }^{2,26,590}$ | ${ }^{587,083}$ | 1,773,393 | 2,330,47 | ${ }^{\text {60, } 123}$ | ${ }^{1,786,978}$ | ${ }^{2,33,121}$ | ${ }^{625,89}$ | ${ }_{1,831,653}$ | ${ }^{2,45,552}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Management }}$ Feem | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | Sols | $\frac{132,317}{25,126}$ |  | 9,9,886 <br> 18.204 |  | ${ }_{\substack{42522 \\ 8.075}}$ | \|i929 | ${ }_{\substack{417.74 \\ 20.916}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{44,011 \\ 8.357}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{102,692 \\ 19.500}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{46,702 \\ 27,585}}$ |
| Suriesfenefts Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{4,8,86}$ | 14,0,67 | 122,954 | 50,977 | 118,060 |  | 2368 | ${ }^{122,192}$ |  |
| Ofictesalises | ${ }^{3.5}$ | 5\% |  | ${ }^{28.0988}$ | , | 20.35 | ${ }^{20,0}$ | 9,090 | 21,000 | ${ }^{30,100}$ | ${ }_{9} 9.36$ | I, 8.8 | 31,153 |
| Managers salay |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{38.550 \\ 30.524}}$ | ${ }_{\text {82,959 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {128,500 }}^{120}$ | 39.899 | ${ }^{\text {93,098 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {132989 }}^{13,}$ | ${ }_{412266}^{42}$ | ${ }_{96,3}$ |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Hemememen }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {dit, }}^{20,5}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {ata }}^{30}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Administraive Rentif fee Unit | ${ }^{\text {c. }}$ 3.6\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {29,424 }}^{29.4}$ |  | ${ }^{12,283}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{103,294}$ |  |  | , |
| Administration Sub-toal Salariesisienenfits |  |  |  | ${ }^{384,03}$ | ${ }^{159,277}$ | 238,30 | ${ }^{397,536}$ | 106,717 | ${ }^{246,733}$ | 411,40 | 170,482 | 255,369 |  |
| Aaterising and Mareting | ${ }_{\text {3 }}^{3}{ }^{35 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{2.542}$ | ${ }^{789}$ | ${ }^{1.847}$ | ${ }_{2631}^{26,59}$ | ${ }^{817}$ | ${ }^{1.906}$ | ${ }^{2.724}$ | ${ }_{846}$ | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{1.973}$ | 2819 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense- Propenty | ${ }^{3,55^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }_{1}^{1,712}$ | ${ }^{3,966}$ | ${ }_{5,70}$ | ${ }_{1,772}^{2072}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4,12}$ | 088 | ${ }_{1,384}$ |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{16,29}$ | 5060 | ${ }^{11,300}$ | ${ }_{16,98}$ | ${ }_{523}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| BookreopngAccounting Senves |  | ${ }_{\text {chem }}^{3.5 \%}$ |  | (18,28 | 年, | ${ }_{\substack{13,994 \\ 5.34}}^{\text {a }}$ |  | 㐌, ${ }_{2,35}$ | ${ }_{\substack{13,61 \\ 5651}}^{\text {5 }}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{6,095 \\ 2.45}}^{\text {c, }}$ | 14.394 |  |
| Scelanous | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | 15.780 | 4.093 | ${ }^{11.490}$ | ${ }^{16,343}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5075}$ | 1184 | ${ }_{10,915}^{12,}$ | ${ }_{5}^{525}$ |  |  |
| b-otal Administration Expenses |  |  |  | 114,287 | ${ }^{35,486}$ | ${ }^{828801}$ | 118,27 | ${ }^{36,73}$ | ${ }^{8,599}$ | ${ }^{122,42}$ | ${ }^{38,014}$ | ${ }^{88,699}$ | 126,7 |
| Eleaticily | ${ }^{3.5}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{74,488}$ | ${ }^{23,250}$ | ${ }^{54425}$ | ${ }^{71,50}$ | ${ }^{24,06}$ | ${ }_{56,1}$ | ${ }^{80,273}$ | ${ }^{24.906}$ | ${ }_{58,144}$ | ${ }^{83,2020}$ |
| Gaser |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {20, }}^{69965}$ | ${ }^{6,3,598}$ | ${ }_{\text {L }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{211,82 \\ 12,31}}$ | ${ }^{6.52483}$ | 52389 |  | ${ }_{\text {ceise }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {20,4,61 }}$ |
| Seener Sub-totalutulties | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 3494.42 | 10.50 | ${ }^{253,717}$ | 3616 | ${ }^{112298}$ | ${ }_{262032}$ | 374,331 | ${ }^{116,230}$ | ${ }^{271203}$ | ${ }^{387833}$ |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real Estate Taxes Payroll Taxes | ${ }_{\substack{3.5 \% \\ 3.5 \%}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | $\left.\right\|_{\substack{3.5 \% \\ 3.5 \%}}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{6.361 \\ 4.368}}^{\text {4, }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1.975 \\ 12.850}}$ |  | ci.fest |  |  |  |
| Misclaneosis Taxes, Licenses and Pemmis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.86 |
| Subtotal Tax |  |  |  | 4,96 | ${ }^{15,104}$ | ${ }^{35,23}$ | 50,38 | ${ }^{15,63}$ | 36,47 | 52,10 | 16,130 | 37,754 | ${ }_{\text {s, }}$,94 |
| Prepery nad Labilil hes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 59.642 | 18.5 | 432 | 61,70 | 19.16 | 44.723 | 63.90 | 19.83 | 46.28 | 66.126 |
| Wookers Compensation |  |  |  | 44.429 | 13.75 | ${ }_{32189}$ | ${ }_{4}^{45,94}$ | 14278 | ${ }^{3,3,36}$ | ${ }^{47.594}$ | 14.78 | ${ }^{34,482}$ | 49,260 |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1040,072}$ | ${ }_{32,314}$ | ${ }^{75,400}$ | 107.714 | ${ }_{33} / 45$ | ${ }^{78.039}$ | ${ }^{111,8,84}$ | ${ }_{3,4666}$ | ${ }^{\text {s0,70 }}$ | 115,366 |
| Maintenance \& Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Paproll }}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{204,5488}$ | ${ }^{6.3527}$ | ${ }^{1488,955}$ | ${ }^{211,707}$ | ${ }_{65,735}$ |  | ${ }^{29.9 .17}$ |  | ${ }^{158,7500}$ | ${ }^{228.7868}$ |
| Suples |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{40.411}$ | \% ${ }^{\text {54,293 }}$ |  | ${ }_{41,826}$ | 97,593 |  |  |  |  |
| Coraga and rash Removal | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3}, 5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  | 71.39 | 22167 | ${ }_{51172}$ | ${ }^{73} 389$ | 22943 | ${ }_{53,53}$ | 76.476 | 23.76 | 55407 | ${ }^{79,15}$ |
| HVaC Reparis and Maininenance | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 1.445 | ${ }_{3}, 55$ | 8292 | 11.846 | 3.78 | 8.592 | 12280 | 3807 | 8883 | 12.689 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \% \%}}$ |  | ${ }^{219} 7$ | ${ }^{\frac{68}{284}}$ | ${ }^{1595}$ | ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{\text {27,49 }}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2022}$ |  | ${ }^{23}$ | ${ }_{\text {2, }}^{2.404}$ | ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{5008}$ |  |
| Sub-toal Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }_{432632}$ | ${ }^{134,332}$ | 313,422 | 447,74 | ${ }^{13,034}$ | ${ }^{324,412}$ | 43,46 | ${ }^{13,3,90}$ | ${ }^{33,767}$ | ${ }_{47,67}$ |
| Supporive Serives | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 139,021 |  | ${ }^{143,887}$ | ${ }^{138,887}$ |  | ${ }^{148,923}$ | ${ }^{148,923}$ |  | ${ }^{154,136}$ | ${ }^{154,136}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES <br> PUPA (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rentibond Fees) |  |  |  | 1,729,635 | 63,71 | 1,256,001 | 1,790,172 | ${ }_{\text {s52,433 }}$ | 2,30,375 | , 182,82 | 57,789 | 1,35, 538 | 1,971,678 |
| ReseevesG/round Lasese ase Rentiond Fees |  |  |  | 15.000 |  | 10.500 | ${ }_{15,000}$ | 4.500 | 10.50 | 15.000 | 4.500 | 10.500 | 15.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Repacement Reseeve opeosi |  |  |  | 65.00 | 19,500 | 45550 | 65000 | 19.500 | 45.500 | 65.00 | 19.500 | ${ }_{45,50}$ | 65.000 |
| Other Requirese Reseseos 1 Deposit |  |  |  | 9.475 |  | 9,473 | 9,475 |  | 9.47 | 9.475 |  | 9,475 | 9,475 |
| Other Reauref Resere 2 Deeposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-toal Reservestiground Lease Ease Rentivond fees |  |  |  | ${ }^{89,475}$ | 24,000 | ${ }_{65,475}$ | ${ }_{89,475}$ | 24,00 | $\stackrel{\text { c,7\% }}{ }$ | ${ }_{89,45}$ | 24,00 | ${ }^{65475}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{9,75}$ |
|  |  |  |  | 1,899,10 | 557,71 | 2, 8,8 | 187,647 | 453 | 1,36,580 | 9292304 | 59,789 | 21,363 | 2.07,153 |
|  |  |  |  | 450,430 | 20,312 | 42,517 | 450,229 |  | ${ }_{42,128}$ | 450.817 | 30,80 | 420,289 | 450,369 |
| DEBTSERYVCEMUSST PAY PArMENTS Chard deert'lamorized loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard Debt - Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd Lend |  |  |  | ${ }^{\frac{23,877}{6,765}}$ | ${ }_{18,50}$ | ${ }^{238376}$ | ${ }^{23,7,765}$ | ${ }_{18,50}$ | ${ }^{\frac{233877}{4326}}$ | ${ }^{\frac{23,87765}{665}}$ | 18.50 | ${ }_{\frac{238376}{4326}}$ | ${ }^{\frac{23,877}{665}}$ |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) <br> Hard Debt - Fourth Lender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial larat Denis Senice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total hard debt service |  |  |  | ${ }^{2856,62}$ | ${ }^{18,530}$ | 267,133 | ${ }^{285,642}$ | ${ }^{18,530}$ | ${ }^{267,13}$ | ${ }^{295642}$ | ${ }^{18,530}$ | ${ }^{267,13}$ | ${ }^{2856,62}$ |
| CASH F Low ( NO I minus DEBT SERVICE) |  |  |  | ${ }^{164,788}$ | 10,783 | ${ }^{154,098}$ | 165, 187 | 11,60 | 154,015 | 165 | 11,51 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| AVallable cash flow |  |  |  |  | 10,783 | 154,044 |  | ${ }^{11,160}$ | 154,0,5 |  | 11,551 | ${ }^{153,177}$ | ${ }^{164,727}$ |
| USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL |  |  | oscre: | 1.58 |  |  | 1.58 |  |  | 1.58 |  |  | 1.58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {24, }}^{\frac{2488}{10.49}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{17,599 \\ 7.50}}$ | $\underbrace{\text { a }}_{\substack{25.128 \\ 10.84}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{182055 \\ 78.85}}$ | ${ }_{\text {260,07 }}^{11,193}$ | ${ }_{\frac{8075}{3475}}$ | (18892 |  |
|  |  |  | Enere ommenstre amual incease.ect |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Siecommenses ammaincease otc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{665031}$ |  | ${ }^{64.63}$ | ${ }^{64,623}$ |  | ${ }^{63.988}$ | ${ }^{63.988}$ |  | ${ }^{63,13}$ | ${ }^{63,13}$ |
|  | ( монсо) |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {10,733 }}^{\text {(0) }}$ | $\frac{897782}{66,622}$ | ${ }_{\text {100, } 656}^{6,622}$ | ${ }^{11.150}$ (0) | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 90,288 } \\ 6387}}$ | $\frac{1001888}{6,3897}$ | 11.551 | ${ }_{\text {90, }}^{\text {9064 }}$ 63,12 | ${ }_{\text {20,615 }}^{63,12}$ |
| Does Prioet have a MOHCO Residial Receipit Oiligation? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 ld Resisual Receipls Spilt - Lenteromer | red develop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mohco resilual recelits debt service |  | Deet | laive Deferred Doveloper Fee Eamed | 457,005 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{52,428}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {568,416 }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{69,929}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCCD Residual Peceipis Amount Due |  | 0.46\% |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{4.5532 \\ 4.582}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{450,085 \\ 45.055}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{4.469 \\ 4.469}}$ |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Lease |  |  | Premen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hov-MHCD RESIUMA RECEEPTS DEET SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due <br> Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,090 |  |  | ${ }^{18,502}$ |  |  |  |
| Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipis Debt Service |  |  |  | 19,210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee <br> Other Distributions/Uses |  |  | - |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
| Final Balance ( (sould be zero) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REPLACEMENT RESERVE- - UUNNNG BALANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Starting <br> Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢5, |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATING Reserve -runnng balance |  |  | RR Eaaneount | 535000 |  |  | st,00 |  |  | 34,500 |  |  | s5,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Withtrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operaing Reseeve Interest or Runing Ealance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| other require reserve 1 - RuNNING BaLance |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.088 |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{66,325}^{6,25}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (esene Thiesest Other Requited Reseseve 1 Running Balance |  |  |  | ${ }_{66,255}$ |  |  | 7,500 |  |  | ${ }_{85}{ }^{275}$ |  |  | 94,750 |
| OTHER RESERVE 2 - Runnnvg balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| s |  |  |  |  |  |  | : |  |  | : |  |  | : |
| Other Reserve 2 Withdrawals Other Reserve 2 Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total \＃Units： | Losp <br> Units | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-LOSP } \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 130 | 30．00\％ | ${ }_{70.008}^{90}$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 11$ $2033$ |  |  | ${ }_{2034}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Year } 13}$ |  |  |
| ncome | \％oremal | \％annual |  | Losp | on－LOSP | Total | Losp | n－LosP |  |  | non－LOSP | Total |  |
| Residenial．－Tenant Rents | 2．5\％ | 25\％ |  | ${ }^{179,92}$ | ${ }^{1.987,485}$ | ${ }^{2,447209}$ | ${ }_{108427}$ | 20.106 .672 | ${ }^{2} 200888$ | ${ }_{108}^{18,82}$ | 2007，089 | 2225.911 | ${ }_{10,565}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\text {na }}^{\text {na }}$ | $\substack { \text { na } \\ \begin{subarray}{c}{\text { na }{ \text { na } \\ \begin{subarray} { c } { \text { na } } } \\{\hline} \end{subarray}^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }_{471.97}^{47}$ |  | 471.97 | 488751 |  | ${ }_{488751}$ | ${ }_{506,155}$ |  | 506,155 | 2422 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{25 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{2}^{2.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{255 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive sesioses inomeme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lemate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 隹 | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  | 576 | ${ }_{1}^{1,344}$ | 1.920 | 590 | ${ }_{1.378}$ | 1.968 | ${ }^{605}$ | 1.412 | 2017 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With hrawal from Capitalized Reserve（deposit to operating account） Gross Potential Income | n／a | na |  | ${ }_{655,272}$ | 1．975，988 | 2.681 .090 | 67，628 | 2.025214 | 27，01，842 | 698，730 | 2075,84 | ${ }^{2,74,5,54}$ | 22， 0,02 |
| Vacancy Loss－Residential－Tenant Rents Vacancy Loss－Residential－Tenant Assistance Payments | ${ }_{\text {na }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Na }}$ |  | （8，986） | （09，374） |  | （12210） |  |  | （9，445］ | （103，354］ | （1127．96］ |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {Na }}^{\text {na }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Na }}^{\text {na }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| operating expenses Efrective gross income |  |  |  | ${ }^{666,286}$ | 1，87，449 | ${ }^{2,53,730}$ | ${ }^{667,488}$ | ${ }^{1,2424,300}$ | 2，59，788 | ${ }^{689289}$ | 1，972，490 | ${ }^{2,661,778}$ | ${ }^{21,925}$ |
| Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee Asset Management Fee | ${ }^{3}{ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ 3．5\％ | hedule． MOHCD policy | $\begin{array}{r} 4,5,51 \\ \hline, 650 \\ \hline, 650 \end{array}$ | ${ }^{1068268}$ | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { a }}}_{\substack{51,837 \\ 20.83}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{47.45 \\ 8.953}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{157,51 \\ 20.929}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{48,75 \\ 9.266}}$ |  | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { a }}}_{\substack{122.55 \\ 30.886}}$ | （5．503） |
| －toal Mana |  |  |  | 54,201 | ${ }^{126,469}$ | ${ }^{180,669}$ | 56,098 | ${ }^{130,895}$ | ${ }^{186,993}$ | ${ }_{58,61}$ | ${ }^{135476}$ | ${ }^{193,588}$ | ${ }^{60,093}$ |
| Solitessenefis | 3，5\％ | 3．5\％ |  | 9.673 | ${ }^{22,570}$ | ${ }^{32243}$ | 10．012 | ${ }^{23380}$ | ${ }_{33,322}$ | ${ }^{10.3522}$ | ${ }^{24,478}$ | ${ }^{3,5490}$ | ${ }^{10.725}$ |
| Menagers saial |  |  |  | ${ }_{42,741}^{420}$ | ${ }^{99.729}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {177，457 }}$ | ${ }_{45,785}$ | ${ }_{\text {106 }}^{1083}$ | ${ }_{152661}^{10}$ |  |
| Sabaisis Benefits | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.56 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{77388}$ | ${ }_{33266}$ | ${ }^{10.555}$ | 80，097 | ${ }_{34327}$ | ${ }^{114,424}$ | 82800 | ${ }_{35,529}$ | ${ }^{118,429}$ |  |
| Administrativ Rentifee Unit | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  | 3047 | 7， | ${ }^{10.156}$ | ． 3.54 | ${ }^{7} 7.358$ |  | ${ }^{3.2894}$ |  | 10．880 | 3．378 |
| Administration Sub－otal Salaresibenefits |  |  |  | ${ }^{176,49}$ | ${ }^{264,307}$ | 40.75 |  | ${ }^{27,588}$ |  | 130，0 | ${ }^{23,32}$ |  |  |
| Aaterising and Maketing | ${ }_{3}^{3.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{14.505}$ | ${ }_{\substack{2,022 \\ 3083}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{2.983 \\ 48.34}}^{\text {2，}}$ | ${ }_{\text {15008 }}$ | ${ }_{35018}^{214}$ | ${ }_{\substack{3.020 \\ 50.028}}$ |  |  | $\underset{\substack{3.125 \\ 51.77}}{ }$ |  |
| Oficice Rent | ${ }_{\text {3，5，}}^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{\frac{3}{35 \% \%}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5.145}$ | $\substack{7.378 \\ 6.38}_{\substack{\text { c，}}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{2,291 \\ 105}}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5.595}$ | ci．6． | ${ }_{2,331}^{2034}$ |  |  |  |
| Leagat kenesse－Property |  |  |  |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| epingacounting Senices |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{6,49}$ |  |  | ${ }_{6}^{6,718}$ |  | ${ }^{22394}$ |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Bat }}$ Debs | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{2}^{25939}$ | 5.925 | ${ }^{8.464}$ | 2.288 | ${ }_{6}^{6.322}$ | ${ }^{8,780}$ | 2272 | 6.346 | 9.066 |  |
| Sub－total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{39,34}$ | ${ }^{\text {20，0，03 }}$ | ${ }^{131,47}$ | 40.72 | ${ }_{\text {9，5，0 }}$ | ${ }^{135,37}$ | ${ }^{42,246}$ | ${ }^{\text {O，} 3,32}$ | ${ }^{10,4888}$ | ${ }^{43,622}$ |
| Unitios | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3．5\％ |  | ${ }^{25} 77$ | ${ }^{60,148}$ | ${ }_{8,926}$ | 26，800 | ${ }^{62253}$ | ${ }^{88,933}$ | 27.64 | ${ }_{64,422}$ | ${ }^{92046}$ | ${ }^{22.580}$ |
| Water | 5\％ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {70，468 }}$ | ${ }_{1044}^{120}$ |  |  | ${ }^{170,19}$ |  | ${ }^{75,488}$ | ${ }^{176,138}$ |  |  |
| Ses | ${ }^{\frac{3.5 \% \%}{3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{\substack{3.5 \% \\ 3.5 \%}}$ |  | ${ }^{24,0,2}$ | ${ }^{56,121}$ | ${ }^{80,172}$ | ${ }^{24883}$ | 5809 | ${ }^{82998}$ | ${ }_{25,96}^{25}$ | 60.18 | 85.6 |  |
| sub－otala Unilites |  |  |  | ${ }^{120,298}$ | ${ }^{28,095}$ | 40,993 | ${ }^{124,508}$ | 20,519 | 415,28 | ${ }^{128,866}$ | ${ }^{300.688}$ | ${ }^{42,595}$ | ${ }^{133,36}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {daxes and ciches }}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3．5\％ |  | ${ }^{2,116}$ | ${ }^{4.937}$ | ${ }^{7}, 0.58$ | ${ }^{2,19}$ | ${ }_{5.12}$ |  | ${ }^{2} 287$ | 5.229 |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | 32200 | ${ }_{4}^{45885}$ | ${ }_{\text {14，2 }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {4，7，99 }}$ | ${ }_{14,76}$ | 38.402 |  | 15，262 |
|  | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }^{16,746}$ | ${ }_{\substack{2,088 \\ 39,075}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ |  | 17，322 | ${ }_{\substack{20898 \\ 00.42}}^{2}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 2，944 } \\ 5,775}}$ | 17，939 | ${ }^{4,4,888}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Propary anclubill h hurance | ${ }_{\substack{3.5 \% \\ 3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }_{\text {chem }}^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{20.532}$ | 47.909 | 68.441 | 21.251 | 49.95 | ${ }^{20.836}$ | 22.995 | ${ }_{51,31}$ | ${ }^{73,36}$ | ${ }^{22,764}$ |
| Wookers Compensation | 5，5\％ | ${ }^{3.5 \% \%}$ |  | 15.295 | ${ }^{35689}$ | ${ }_{50,984}$ | 15，830 | 36,98 | ${ }_{52786}$ | 16.384 | 38.23 | 54.69 | ${ }_{16,958}$ |
|  | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  | ${ }^{3,587}$ |  | ${ }^{19,924}$ | ${ }^{37,081}$ | ${ }_{86,52}$ | ${ }^{123,604}$ | ${ }^{38,39}$ | ${ }_{89,55}$ | ${ }_{122,390}$ | ${ }_{39,722}$ |
| intenace 8 Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payoll | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 70．47］ | 1648307 | ${ }^{234,724}$ | ${ }^{72,882}$ | 170．05 | ${ }^{242989}$ | ${ }^{75,4}$ | 176.0 | ${ }^{251.442}$ | ${ }^{78.075}$ |
| Suphes |  | ${ }^{\text {c．j．5\％}}$ |  | ${ }_{4}^{2.8055}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {2，}}^{4.373}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {195，}}^{15096}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {1，9096 }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { a } \\ 4.97676}}^{\text {a }}$ |
| trage and Trash Removal | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{24557}$ | 57.36 | 8.1923 | ${ }^{2543}$ | 5933 | 84780 | ${ }^{26,37}$ | 61,31 | ${ }^{87,788}$ | 2720 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {3，5\％}}^{3.50}$ |  | ${ }^{3.950}$ |  |  | ${ }_{48}^{4.48}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{4.21}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { c．488 } \\ 188}}^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{14,096}$ | ${ }_{4.884}^{84}$ |
| Miscollaneous operatig and Maninearce Expenses S | 3．5\％ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{2}^{24.888}$ | 5.805 | ${ }_{\text {ene }}^{8.829}$ | ${ }_{2}^{25755}$ | \％，0．0 | ${ }^{8,582}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2.659}$ | ${ }^{6,2288}$ | ${ }_{\text {8，883 }}^{8.80}$ | 2788 |
| Sub－toal Maintenance \＆Repair Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{128,937}$ | ${ }_{37,519}$ | ${ }_{496,455}$ | 155，29 | ${ }^{359,62}$ | ${ }^{51,3,31}$ | ${ }^{159,955}$ | ${ }_{372271}$ | ${ }_{\text {53，} 1,15}$ | ${ }_{165,129}$ |
| Supporive Serices | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  |  | ${ }^{159.509}$ | ${ }^{159,530}$ |  | ${ }^{165,514}$ | ${ }^{165,14}$ |  | ${ }^{170,933}$ | ${ }^{170,093}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | 59， 002 | 998 | 84，796 | ${ }_{612,515}$ | 1，441，79 | 2，054，264 | ${ }^{63,93}$ | 1，992211 | 2，126，63 | ${ }_{65,141}$ |
| PUPA（w／o Reserves／GL Base Rent／Bond Fees） Reserves／Ground Lease Base Rent／Bond Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ground Lease Base Rent |  |  |  | 4.500 | 10．500 | 15.000 | 4.50 | 10.500 | 15.000 | 4.500 | 10.50 | 15.000 | 4.500 |
|  |  |  |  | 19.500 | 45.500 | 65000 | 19.500 | 45.500 | ${ }^{65} 5000$ | 19.50 | 45.50 | 65.00 | ${ }^{10.5}$ |
| Opeating Resere eopesst |  |  |  |  | 9，475 | 9，475 |  | 9，475 | 9.475 |  | 9，475 | ${ }_{9,475}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub |  |  |  | 2，000 | ${ }^{6,9775}$ | ${ }^{39,475}$ | 24.000 | ${ }_{65475}$ | ${ }^{89,475}$ | 24,000 | ${ }_{6,5775}$ | ${ }^{8,475}$ | 24.000 |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{615,02}$ | 1，458，469 | 2074，271 | 5，515 | 1．507，24 | 2，143，739 | ${ }_{657,93}$ | 1，557，686 | 2215,6 | 680，41 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME（INCOME minus op expences |  |  |  | 5，884 | 18，974 | 49,459 | 30，03 | 417，156 | 488.59 | 31，36 | 21，804 | 446,140 | 31，784 |
| DEBTSERYICEMUSTT PAY PAYMENTS＂hard debrt／amotized loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{18,580}$ | $\frac{23887}{43826}$ | ${ }_{\frac{223877}{6,1765}}^{\substack{\text { che }}}$ | 18.50 | $\frac{223877}{43236}$ | $\frac{223877}{\substack{\text { 6，765 }}}$ | ${ }_{18,50}$ | $\frac{223875}{43365}$ | $\frac{238,87}{\substack { \text { ci，} \\ \begin{subarray}{c}{\text { che }{ \text { ci，} \\ \begin{subarray} { c } { \text { che } } }}$ | ${ }^{18,580}$ |
|  |  |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total hard debt service |  |  |  | 18，530 | ${ }^{267,13}$ | 235，642 | 18，530 | 267，13 | ${ }^{285,692}$ | 18，530 | 267，133 | ${ }^{285,642}$ | ${ }^{18,530}$ |
| CASH FLOw（NOI minus DEBT SERVICE） |  |  |  | 12，955 | 25，${ }^{\text {，62 } 2}$ | ${ }^{163,817}$ | 12，373 | 150，033 | 162416 | 12，806 | 127，691 | ${ }^{160,988}$ | ${ }^{13,255}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVALIABLE CASH FLLow ${ }^{\text {a }}$（ |  |  |  | 11，955 | 151，862 | 16,817 | ${ }_{12,373}$ | 150，093 | 162416 | ${ }^{12,806}$ | 127，991 | 160,988 | ${ }^{13,255}$ |
| USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW（This row also shows DSCR．） USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL |  |  | ${ }^{\text {oscre }}$ |  |  | 1.57 |  |  | 1.57 |  |  | 1.56 |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ | 隹 |  |  | ${ }^{27,89}$ | 8.580 | 20.88 | ${ }^{28,84}$ | 8.95 | 20.89 | 2284 | ${ }^{9266}$ |
|  |  |  |  | 3，997 | ${ }_{8}^{8,39}$ | ${ }^{11.990}$ | 3，723 |  | ${ }^{12410}$ | ${ }_{3}$ | 8.99 | ${ }^{12844}$ | ${ }^{\text {3．988 }}$ |
| Nor－momozizn Loan Pmut－Lender 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{6}^{61984}$ | 61,94 |  | 60.56 | 6.586 |  | 58.05 | 58，95 |  |
| Total Payments preceling mohco |  |  |  | 12.955 | ${ }^{88,879}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {89，4，47 }}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{13,255}$ |
| RESIUUAL RECEIPTS CAASH FLow minus Payments Preceing | м ${ }^{\text {OHCO）}}$ |  |  | － | ${ }^{81,983}$ | ${ }_{61,98}$ | （0） | ${ }^{60.566}$ | ${ }^{60.566}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {s8．095 }}$ | ${ }^{58,005}$ | （0） |
| Does Priject have MoHCo Residual Recoip Oiligation？ |  |  | $\sqrt{\text { rear } 15 \text { s sear indesees beowe }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1st Residual Receipts Split－Lender／Deferred Developer Fee 2nd Residual Receipts Split－Lender／Owner |  |  | 2nd Residual Receipts Split Begins： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max defer | Deven |  | Lese |  |  | ${ }^{61,984}$ |  |  | ${ }^{80.586}$ |  |  | 58.95 |  |
| mohco resival recelips debt service |  | dist sot |  |  |  | ${ }^{71,513}$ |  |  | ${ }^{722,99}$ |  |  | ${ }^{831,04}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morco |  |  | and Mocco restatar reasis poley |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{43673 \\ 43,63}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{42689 \\ 42689}}$ |  |  | ${ }^{41,54} 4$ |  |
| Propese MOHCO Ressiual Receips Ammuntlo Resitual Ground |  |  | （eamen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non－MOHCD RESIUUAL R RCEEPTS DEET SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due <br> Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  | $\because$ |  |
| Total Non－MOHCO Resitual Receipts Deth Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{17,897}$ |  |  | 17，401 |  |
| REMANDER（Shoulu b beror unless hhere are distributions beow） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner Distributions／Incentive Management Fee Other Distributions／Uses |  |  | 㖪 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final Balance（should be zero） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Starting Balance |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits <br> Replacement Reserve Withdrawals（ideally tied to CN <br> Replacement Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{65,000}$ |  |  | 65.00 |  |
| Replacement Reserve Interest <br> RR Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\substack{715000}}{\substack{\text { csico }}}$ |  |  | ciso．00 |  |  |  |  |
| operating reserve－running balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance <br> Operating Reserve Deposits |  |  | － |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | $\because$ |  |
| Operating Reserve Withdrawals <br> Operating Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OR Running Ealance |  | OR Baane | Spra Y Y OP Exps + Doets Sencee |  |  |  |  |  | 0．0\％ |  |  | 0．0\％ |  |
| OTHER R RQuirem Reserve 1 －RUUNNM BALANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance |  |  |  |  |  | ¢， |  |  | $\underset{\substack{10,425 \\ 9.455}}{ }$ |  |  | （13，700 |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals <br> Other Reserve 1 Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  | ． |  |  | － |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Deposits Other Reserve 2 Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Interest <br> Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## Attachment K: Commercial Operating Budget and Vision for Space

See attached.

| Commercial Operating ProForma |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stabilized | Y1 | Y2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rental Rate / sf / month | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Square Feet | 9,250 | 9,250 | 9,250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy - Year 1 | 20\% | 50\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserves | 9,676 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Trend | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expense Trend | 3.50\% | 3.50\% | 3.50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Total Annual Underlying Rents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Rent |  | 11,100 | 27,750 | 33,300 | 34,133 | 34,986 | 35,860 | 36,757 | 37,676 | 38,618 | 39,583 | 40,573 | 41,587 | 42,627 |
| Total annual CAM |  | 68,893 | 71,305 | 83,815 | 86,748 | 89,784 | 92,927 | 96,179 | 99,546 | 103,030 | 106,636 | 110,368 | 114,231 | 118,229 |
| Vacancy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EGI |  | 79,993 | 99,055 | 117,115 | 120,881 | 124,770 | 128,787 | 132,936 | 137,222 | 141,648 | 146,219 | 150,941 | 155,818 | 160,856 |
| Less: Operating Expenses and reserves |  | $(68,893)$ | (71,305) | $(83,815)$ | $(86,748)$ | $(89,784)$ | $(92,927)$ | $(96,179)$ | $(99,546)$ | $(103,030)$ | $(106,636)$ | $(110,368)$ | $(114,231)$ | $(118,229)$ |
| Net Operating Income |  | 11,100 | 27,750 | 33,300 | 34,133 | 34,986 | 35,860 | 36,757 | 37,676 | 38,618 | 39,583 | 40,573 | 41,587 | 42,627 |
| Ground Lease |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Annual Issuer Fee |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Operating Reserve |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted NOI |  | 11,100 | 27,750 | 33,300 | 34,133 | 34,986 | 35,860 | 36,757 | 37,676 | 38,618 | 39,583 | 40,573 | 41,587 | 42,627 |
| Debt Service Perm Loan |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Debt Service: AHSC |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Debt Service: Other |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Debt Service: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DCR - First Debt |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cash Flow |  | 11,100 | 27,750 | 33,300 | 34,133 | 34,986 | 35,860 | 36,757 | 37,676 | 38,618 | 39,583 | 40,573 | 41,587 | 42,627 |
| Investor Services Fee |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
| Deferred Developer Fee Asset and Partnership Mat. Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset and Partnership Mgt. Fee |  | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Flow |  | 11,100 | 27,750 | 33,300 | 34,133 | 34,986 | 35,860 | 36,757 | 37,676 | 38,618 | 39,583 | 40,573 | 41,587 | 42,627 |
| NCF Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP | 60\% | 6,660 | 16,650 | 19,980 | 20,480 | 20,991 | 21,516 | 22,054 | 22,606 | 23,171 | 23,750 | 24,344 | 24,952 | 25,576 |
| MOHCD Loan Repayment | 40\% | 4,440 | 11,100 | 13,320 | 13,653 | 13,994 | 14,344 | 14,703 | 15,070 | 15,447 | 15,833 | 16,229 | 16,635 | 17,051 |


| 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 43,692 \\ 122,367 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44,785 \\ 126,650 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 45,904 \\ 131,083 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47,052 \\ 135,670 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48,228 \\ 140,419 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 49,434 \\ 145,334 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50,670 \\ 150,420 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 51,937 \\ 155,685 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 53,235 \\ 161,134 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54,566 \\ 166,774 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 55,930 \\ 172,611 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 57,328 \\ 178,652 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58,762 \\ 184,905 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60,231 \\ 191,377 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 61,736 \\ 198,075 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 63,280 \\ 205,007 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 64,862 \\ 212,183 \end{array}$ |
| 166,059 | 171,435 | 176,987 | 182,722 | 188,647 | 194,768 | 201,090 | 207,622 | 214,369 | 221,340 | 228,541 | 235,980 | 243,666 | 251,607 | 259,811 | 268,287 | 277,044 |
| $(122,367)$ | $(126,650)$ | $(131,083)$ | $(135,670)$ | $(140,419)$ | $(145,334)$ | $(150,420)$ | $(155,685)$ | $(161,134)$ | $(166,774)$ | $(172,611)$ | $(178,652)$ | $(184,905)$ | $(191,377)$ | $(198,075)$ | $(205,007)$ | (212,183) |
| 43,692 | 44,785 | 45,904 | 47,052 | 48,228 | 49,434 | 50,670 | 51,937 | 53,235 | 54,566 | 55,930 | 57,328 | 58,762 | 60,231 | 61,736 | 63,280 | 64,862 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| 43,692 | 44,785 | 45,904 | 47,052 | 48,228 | 49,434 | 50,670 | 51,937 | 53,235 | 54,566 | 55,930 | 57,328 | 58,762 | 60,231 | 61,736 | 63,280 | 64,862 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 43,692 | 44,785 | 45,904 | 47,052 | 48,228 | 49,434 | 50,670 | 51,937 | 53,235 | 54,566 | 55,930 | 57,328 | 58,762 | 60,231 | 61,736 | 63,280 | 64,862 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 43,692 | 44,785 | 45,904 | 47,052 | 48,228 | 49,434 | 50,670 | 51,937 | 53,235 | 54,566 | 55,930 | 57,328 | 58,762 | 60,231 | 61,736 | 63,280 | 64,862 |
| 26,215 | 26,871 | 27,543 | 28,231 | 28,937 | 29,660 | 30,402 | 31,162 | 31,941 | 32,740 | 33,558 | 34,397 | 35,257 | 36,138 | 37,042 | 37,968 | 38,917 |
| 17,477 | 17,914 | 18,362 | 18,821 | 19,291 | 19,774 | 20,268 | 20,775 | 21,294 | 21,826 | 22,372 | 22,931 | 23,505 | 24,092 | 24,695 | 25,312 | 25,945 |

## Cultura Y Arte Nativa De Las Americas (CANA) AND 681 FLORIDA

Roberto Barragan
AQUARIA FUNDING SOLUTIONS

## 681 Florida St., Mission District

Cultura Y Arte Nativa De Las Americas (CANA) dba Carnaval San Francisco has proposed to use the ground floor of 681 Florida St. in San Francisco as a year-round performance and visual arts facility for its Carnaval contingents, former CELLspace tenants, Mission District artists and residents and other arts organizations. As requested, Aquaria Funding Solutions has prepared this programmatic narrative in order to discuss and examine the year round educational and arts activities that CANA dba Carnaval San Francisco will hold at 681 Florida St. as well as the economic impact of Carnaval San Francisco, and associated events and activities, to the Mission District community. The purpose of this narrative is to establish the value CANA will bring to the neighborhood, its residents and to the wider arts community.

This investment being made by the Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA) in the arts space of 681 Florida St. and by virtue of entrusting this space to CANA will be an investment in the students and residents of the greater Mission community, in the citywide cultural experience of Carnaval, in the lives of thousands of artists and dancers, and in numerous community groups and small businesses. CANA dba Carnaval has been the driving and nurturing force behind maintaining the Latin culture and history of the Mission for decades.

The Mission District will benefit enormously, through the provision of desperately needed CANA managed arts space, and through the delivery of arts education and services to local residents and local students. Local small businesses will benefit as money spent in the Mission will have a multiplier effect of hundreds of thousands of dollars supporting local and neighborhood businesses and jobs. The total economic impact to the City of San Francisco is estimated at approximately $\mathbf{\$ 4 0}$ million per year in direct event expenditures. (SF Tourism Bureau and "economicImpact" calculator)

## Background

For decades, CANA dba Carnaval San Francisco has served the diverse residents from the greater Mission District, a neighborhood rich in people of color, artists, and art space. However, since 2005, 10,000 low and moderate income families and artists have been displaced from the neighborhood to other parts of the City of San Francisco and the Bay Area, leaving a cultural void and a lack of available and affordable arts space. Within San Francisco, Carnaval contingents from various Latinx and African-American communities struggle to find arts education and performance space in the Tenderloin, Excelsior, Bernal Heights, Visitacion Valley, and Bayview Hunters Point. Due to gentrification and rising rents in San Francisco, artists have also moved to other places in the Bay Area. Over the last ten years, artists and Carnaval participants have reached out to perform and practice in neighborhoods in cities such as Oakland, Berkeley, Stockton, and San Jose. But since our target community is still concentrated
in and around the Mission, Carnaval continues to seek to build equity and opportunity for people of color and artists to be educated and practice their craft in the heart of San Francisco, the Mission.

CELLspace previously occupied 681 Florida St. CELLspace was home to Carnaval from 1999 to 2009. CELLspace served the Mission District community by providing affordable arts space for cultural producers, local artists, nonprofit organizations, and professionals. Their mission was to "provide a safe and supportive public environment for the exploration of art, education, performance and community building. Through cooperative relationships and multidisciplinary programs, CELLspace encourages the celebration of intergenerational, cross-cultural collaborations and the promotion of social justice." Carnaval utilized CELLspace for rehearsals, costume and float-making workshops, and as storage for props and costumes for over 10 years. The space was perfect for CANA's year-round operations.

When CELLspace announced its closure, CANA galvanized musicians and dancers to protest against the owner who wanted to sell the property to a developer. Our members participated in a grass-roots community campaign to secure space for the arts and community-based organizations. Thanks to the pressure from the community, the City of San Francisco required that the new development would have a community-based arts space. Carnaval sees the projected arts space as an opportunity to return "home."

CANA's plan for this permanent facility will include office, archival, rehearsal, storage, and costume-making space. Acquisition of a permanent home in what was previously rehearsal and classroom space at CELLspace will ensure the long-term viability and alleviate the operational challenges for CANA, artists and various contingents, as well as exponentially increase the economic benefits of artistic expression to the Mission District community.

## Schools

As an organization, CANA values its interconnectedness with the Mission community through the arts and the family and they bring it to fruition with their Carnaval Cultural Arts and Health Education Program. Since 2002, the program has promoted culturally relevant education in underperforming schools in the San Francisco public school system as a way to incentivize student learning and parent participation. The Carnaval Cultural Arts \& Health Education Program serves approximately 240 students in nine public schools every year. Classes and workshops are presented over a 16-week period and culminate in student participation in the Carnaval Grand Parade.

The program was inaugurated as a pilot program at Leonard Flynn Elementary School in the Mission District in 2002. Flynn's demographics included 68\% Latinxs (many being English Language Learners) and $16 \%$ African Americans. Working with Ms. Nancy Obregón, a $5^{\text {th }}$ grade teacher, Carnaval offered drumming and dance classes at Flynn, seeking to increase student involvement in the arts and to prepare students to participate in the 2002 Carnaval Parade. The
program offered opportunities for individuals to work together for a common goal and engaged teachers, students, parents, interns and volunteers in activities that affect problem solving and team building, self-esteem and self-validation, cultural enrichment, discipline, physical fitness, and collaborative skills. In recognition of the results achieved at Flynn, a partnership was created between Carnaval and the San Francisco Unified School District for the collaborative development and implementation of this program in numerous schools, which continues to this day.

Since its inception, Carnaval has presented the program classes in 13 schools, serving over 9,000 students and their parents. Carnaval believes in the power of culturally-appropriate education. These schools include:

Buena Vista Horace Mann K-8
Marshall Elementary School
Sherman Elementary School
Thurgood Marshall High School,
Fiesta Gardens International School
Willie Brown Jr. Middle School
John O'Connell High School
Mission High School
June Jordan School for Equity
CANA's most important cultural and arts equity work occurs at the beginning of each year, 5 months prior to the Memorial Day weekend when Carnaval collaborates with SFUSD Visual and Performing Arts school site coordinators and provides a teaching artist to work with students in developing music and dance routines during PE, music, art or history class for their parade participation. Our in-school program provides physical exercise as well as develops music and dance competence among the participants who are often the most underserved, at-risk school populations within SFUSD.

In May, the Carnaval SF Parade provides parade spaces for cultural participation by multigenerational contingents, performing artists, and elementary, middle and high school students offering an opportunity for families to introduce and reinforce their heritages to their children and youth. The parade consists of 70 contingents, with over 2,400 participants, and spans across 17 blocks in the Mission District.

## Carnaval SF's Arts \& Culture Program in SF Unified School System in 2019:

\# Student Participants: 30 in each school x $8=240$ total participants
Ages 6-11 = 75

Ages 12-18= 165
Race/Ethnicity (estimate)= 54\% Latinx, 19\% black, 17\% white, 10\% Asian
Gender: $42 \%$ male, $58 \%$ female
Role in Program: dancer, musician, costume maker
\# of staff/teacher participants: 40
Ages 23-65: 40
Race/Ethnicity (no data)
Gender: $32 \%$ male, $68 \%$ female
Role in Program: dancer, musician, costume maker, float builder, seamstress/tailor
\# of parent participants: 120
Ages 23-65: 120
Race/Ethnicity: 54\% Latinx, 19\% black, $17 \%$ white, $10 \%$ Asian
Gender: $21 \%$ male, $79 \%$ female
Role in Program: costume maker, float builder, seamstress/tailor

## Impact

Carnaval San Francisco cultivates and celebrates the diverse Latin American, Caribbean, and African roots of the Mission District and the San Francisco Bay Area. They accomplish their mission through dance, music, visual arts, and by creating spaces for community learning, school-based education, and arts advocacy. But for Carnaval, these students, the majority of which are of color and low and moderate income, would never receive this arts instruction. Most schools, because of funding cutbacks, have eliminated most arts programming. Carnaval has been that arts experience, as well as sanctuary, for the community.

## Events

Over the past forty years, CANA has preserved Latinx cultural traditions, while advocating for racial and artistic equity, by reclaiming public spaces in the name of art, community and political resistance. Carnaval reclaims spaces, temporary as well as permanent, while creating year-round access to art for underserved people of
color, through the February Mardi Gras Fat Tuesday celebration, the April Royalty Competition, the May Grand Parade, and the two-day Festival. Every year during Memorial Day weekend, the streets of the Mission District boast vibrant art, music, and dance that reflect the cultures and histories of the Latinx, Caribbean, and African communities.

Our special events, including October's Day of the Dead festivity, serve as platforms where historically underserved artist communities can express their Latinx, Caribbean, and African heritages. Mardi Gras Fat Tuesday Celebration connects over 20 merchants with over 250 artists to perform while promoting classes for Carnaval. The event brings over 20,000 people to the Mission District Neighborhood on one day. The Royalty Competition creates a platform where children, youth, and adults demonstrate their dance talents in a friendly and competitive space. The competition showcases over 25 contestants, with an attendance rate of over 1,000 people. The Day of the Dead celebration brings together families and artists from the neighborhood to build altars, while they celebrate their loved ones with music, dance, and traditional foods.

Our two-day Carnaval festival is a free and open space for community learning. Students perform on stage with local artists and headliners. The Dance Pavilion teaches people to dance, the Drum Pavilion teaches you the beat, the Health and Wellness pavilion is a partnership with the SF Department of Public Health, which provides a wide variety of free services; diabetes education, blood pressure screenings, nutrition, aids testing, dental check-up and several other health services. Carnaval is committed to educating and empowering community members through health and wellness education and offering culturally affirming services.

Carnaval San Francisco's festival fosters entrepreneurship in our neighborhood by giving opportunities to local merchants from La Cocina, the Mission Small Business Association, and independent entrepreneurs to participate in a festival of great magnitude. The Carnaval Festival Director makes it a priority to facilitate the application process for food vendors and exhibitors-many of which primarily only speak Spanish--by helping them with their permits, licenses, and food service requirements. The Festival also provides exposure and fundraising opportunities for other community-based nonprofit organizations: Mission Neighborhood Centers Inc., Horizons Unlimited, Roadmap to Peace, Instituto Familia de la Raza, and La Casa de las Madres. For forty years, our festival has served as a business incubator for Mission District entrepreneurs, merchants, and nonprofit organizations.

Carnaval believes in the power of volunteers. Every year, Carnaval engages over 500 volunteers in the two-day Festival and Grand Parade. The volunteers are residents, high school and college students, and corporate employees. The festival is also a safe space for court-ordered individuals and people who are in substance-abuse programs to give back to the neighborhood through community service hours.

## Mardi Gras Fat Tuesday

\# Businesses participating: 20
Latinx Owned: 7 total or 35\% of participating businesses
\# of dance groups participating: 22
\# of artists total: 271
Ages 6-17: 109
Ages 18-65: 162
Role in Program: dancer, musician

## Royalty Competition

\# of dancer participating: 26
Ages 6-17: 8
Ages 18-65: 18
\# of attendees: 700
Role in Program: Dancer, musician

## Festival

\# Businesses participating: 200
\# of bands/groups: 90
\# or artists: 1,080
\# of Festival attendees: 200,000-400,000
Race/Ethnicity (estimate) $=51 \%$ Latinx, $23 \%$ white, $17 \%$ black, $9 \%$ Asian
Role in Program: dancer, musician

## Impact

After 40 years, and a series of iterations, Carnaval exists as a prime example of arts and economic development interacting with community and neighborhood. From the parade that winds down its traditional route of $24^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. to Mission St, to 16th St., the Harrison St. festival held among industrial buildings and old San Francisco homes, the benefits go beyond two days. People from across the Bay Area, across California and the nation and even internationally are exposed to the " 4 th Tourist

Neighborhood "of San Francisco, after Fisherman's Wharf, Chinatown and Little Italy. Carnaval has put the Mission on the map to tourists, day visitors, restaurant goers, and those searching out that perfect burrito. All while spending millions of dollars along the way.

With an average attendance of 400,000 for the parade, two-day festival and lead up events, Carnaval generates over $\mathbf{\$ 2 1}$ million in direct local economic impact.
(eventImpacts: Economic Impact Calculator) In addition, BART has reported a $64 \%$ increase in ridership during the two-day festival.

## Contingents

The parade consists of 70 contingents, with over 2,400 participants, and spans across 17 blocks in the Mission District. Dance and music instructors provide classes year-round in preparation for the Carnaval parade at the Mission Cultural Center, Dance Mission, Brava Theater, ABADACapoeira, ODC, Malonga Casquelourd Center, BrasArte, American Indian Cultural Center of San Francisco, Club Puertorriqueño de San Francisco, Samoan Community Development Center, Mission Neighborhood Centers Inc., SF Day Labor Program \& Women's Collective, and Hip Hop for Change, Inc.

Parade Contingents:

ABADÁ-Capoeira San Francisco<br>Aquarela Brazilian Dance Ensemble<br>Asiya Shriners of San Mateo<br>Asociación Cultural Kanchis<br>Batalá San Francisco<br>Bead Squad<br>Buena Vista Horace Mann<br>Caravana de la Alegría Representando El Salvador<br>Club Puertorriqueño de San Francisco<br>Comparsa Colombiana Vive Mi Tierra<br>Comparsa Orichá Oya Nike \& Grupo Reunião da Velha Guarda<br>Comunidad Anqari<br>Comunidad Yucateca<br>Conjunto Folklórico Panamá América<br>CubaCaribe Carnaval<br>Danza de los Diablos de Juxtlahuaca<br>Diaspora Masquerade Band<br>El Show de Pepe<br>Esplendor Azteca Xipe Totec*

Feline Finesse Dance Company
Fiesta Gardens International School
Flavaz of D' Caribbean
Fogo Na Roupa Grupo Carnavalesco Cultural
Gente Da Cidade
Ginga Brasil
Grupo Folklórico Guatemalteco Xelaju
Grupo Samba Rio
Grupo Tania Santiago
Hip Hop for Change, Inc
Hot Pink Feathers
Institución Hijos de Santa Rosa de Lima
Instituto de Cultura Raíces del Perú
Kantuta Ballet Folklórico de Bolivia
Karibbean Vibrationz
La Cumbiamba Colombiana
Latin Dance Grooves and AcroSports
Loco Bloco Jamestown
Maracatu Pacífico
Mas Makers Massive
Mission Cultural Center for Latinx Arts
Mission Neighborhood Centers, Inc.
Mixtiso Latinx Indio-Afro-Mexican Salvadoreño Urbano Hip Hop
Morenada Para el Mundo $100 \%$ es Boliviana
Muito Quente! Samba Performers
Nicaragua Danza, Hijos de Maíz
Paixão Dance Ensemble
Parceros Salseros
Recology
Renacer Folklórico Bolivia
Rueda Con Ritmo
SambaFunk Funkquarians w/ King Theo
Samba Queen Maisa Duke \& Energia do Samba
Samoan Community Development Center
San Francisco Lowrider Council
San Francisco Muni Railway Cable Cars
SF Art Car w/ Wardell Walters
SF Day Labor Program \& Women's Collective
Sherman Elementary
Sistas-Wit-Style

# Super Sonic Samba School 

Telemundo 48 and Xfinity Comcast
The Church of 8 Wheels
Tradición Peruana Cultural Center
Trash Mash-Up at Ruth's Table
United Rhythms SF
Viva La Diva
Willie Brown Middle School Steel Pan Ensemble
Xiuhcoatl Danza Azteca
Zorro \& Zorro Jr

## Grand Parade:

\# or contingents: 70
\# of artists, dancers: 2,400
\# of parade attendees: 75,000
Race/Ethnicity (estimate) $=51 \%$ Latinx, $23 \%$ white, $17 \%$ black, $9 \%$ Asian
Roles in Program: dancer, musician, costume maker, float builder, seamstress/tailor.

## Impact

Throughout the year, people from all walks of life, all economics, all ethnicities, all age groups prepare themselves for an event that is common in Latin America, but occurs nowhere else in the United States but San Francisco. Dancers learn complicated samba movements by night while holding down non-arts jobs during the day. Musicians practice incessantly to play that Caribbean tune just right. And floats are designed and built in old warehouses in preparation for that unveiling. Twelve months of dreams, practicing and planning go into 6 hours of musical challenge and achievement. Over 2 thousand people perform for 75,000 parade goers and another million viewers at home, with their feet and hands and bodies and heart.

The economic impact from the industry created by thousands of dancers and performers taking lessons and purchasing costumes and decorations is estimated at over \$4 million in direct expenditures. (Arts \&Economic Prosperity Calculator, 2012)

## Community businesses and groups

The local economy in the Mission District benefits from the wave of hundreds of thousands of tourists who come to the neighborhood. Tourists purchase artisanal merchandise, savor Latin and Caribbean foods, while enjoying world music at our Festival. CANA supports the local artisanal businesses in the Mission District by collaborating with over 200 businesses every year. CANA strongly espouses the belief that cultural life and economic well-being are deeply intertwined in communities of color.

The Grand Parade and the Festival are all vital to the economic well-being of local artists. The year-round activities become an opportunity for people to take classes in dance, music, visual arts, costume-making, and float building. Carnaval serves as a platform for artists to make a living teaching their culture to community residents. The high cost of living in the Bay Area is unaffordable for many artists, and the steady income from teaching classes helps to ameliorate their situation.

CANA sees itself as a vehicle that brings awareness and engages community residents in advocacy. CANA dba Carnaval has generated themes that have made social and political statements throughout the years. In 2015 Carnaval sought environmental awareness about the California drought with its theme, "Sacred Water." Carnaval engaged students and families in the Mission into finding ways to conserve water to combat the environmental crisis at the time. In 2016 the theme was "Long Live Mother Earth," and it was dedicated to the deforestation of the jungles and maltreatment of the earth. CANA received a grant in order to make official Carnaval tote bags to hand out to underserved families of color as an incentive not to buy plastic or paper bags, and to learn about alternative, more traditional ways of carrying groceries home.

The Carnaval theme for 2019 was "La Cultura Cura / Culture Heals," and it serves as a social and moral statement that helps counter the polarized political environment in the US, and sought to heal our communities of color with culturally relevant art, music, dance and dialogue. Having the Grammy-winning group, Los Tigres del Norte, as the headliner brought a bold message to Carnaval attendees and the local community about the power and resilience of the Latinx and immigrant community.

During a time when immigrant children were being caged on the border between Mexico and the United States, Carnaval and Calle 24 ( the business association) decided to take a stand and support the Latinx and immigrant community through their messaging, marketing efforts, and merchant partnerships. Carnaval partnered with Calle 24 in September of 2019 to promote local businesses through a Los Tigres del Norte custom-themed merchant passport. The passport highlighted over 60 merchants during the two-day event to help patronize their businesses. The partnership in 2019 built a cross-promotional campaign that demonstrated the unity between the two organizations for a common cause.

Small Business

Merchant Associations:
Calle 24 Latinx Cultural District
Mission Merchants Association
Mission Small Business Association
Valencia Street Merchants Association
Mission Creek Merchants Association
Gateway Management
San Francisco Hispanic Chambers of Commerce

## Cultural Institution \& Nonprofit Partnerships:

Mission Cultural Center for Latinx Arts
Dance Mission Theatre
Brava! For Women in the Arts Theater
ABADA-Capoeira San Francisco
ODC
Malonga Casquelourd Center
World Arts West - Ethnic Dance Festival
BrasArte Cultural Center
American Indian Cultural Center of San Francisco
Club Puertorriqueño de San Francisco
Samoan Community Development Center
Acción Latina
Pacific Felt Factory
Mission Neighborhood Centers Inc.
SF Day Labor Program \& Women's Collective
Hip Hop for Change, Inc.

## Impact

It is estimated that the above businesses and community groups generated another $\mathbf{\$ 1 0} \mathbf{~ m i l l i o n ~ i n ~}$ sales during the festival and associated events. (San Francisco Tourism Board)

## THE BUILDING

The 681 Florida St. arts center will further CANA's mission of creating spaces for cultural arts by acting as a community gathering space with arts events, classes, and educational activities. There are essentially four main users of the spaces, to be detailed below, (1) students, (2) events, (3) contingents, and (4) community groups.

CANA has stated that it will provide $25 \%$ of the programming at 681 which will include the school programming during after school and during the summer. CANA will partner on some programming with the Mission Educational Project as well as expand a puppet making partnership. The existing Arts Program Manager and the Event and Media Coordinator positions will go from part time to full time when the building becomes available. The Carnaval contingents, previous CELLspace users (Loco Bloco, Project Tango, Roller Disco, Earwig Studios, and Studio 17), and homeless artists and art groups (evicted from elsewhere) will provide the remainder of the programming.

The Studio/Office Rental Manager (new position) will be responsible for managing the center and its use by Carnaval contingents, previous CELLspace users and homeless artists and arts groups. The Rental \& Building Manager will make sure that the facilities are utilized within the specified time(s) and date(s) within the contracts. S/he will also be in charge of building maintenance. S/he reports directly to the Executive Director and works closely with the Event and Media Coordinator and the Arts Program Manager.

## Students

The 681 Florida St. arts/community center will serve the neighborhood in different capacities and at affordable rates. It will have a space for local, music, dance and artists instructors to teach. The Arts Program Manager will manage student activities.

## Recording Studio:

The Recording Studio will be managed by a collaboration between CANA and a private recording company, who will teach and train within the construct of an academy. We will have a music and media training program for underserved students in the neighborhood as well as the children and youth residents from 681 Florida. The recording studio will be open to the public for an affordable rate. Children \& Youth Training Programs will enjoy free use of the space while local artists and bands, Community-Based Organizations, local businesses, government entities and corporate entities will pay on a sliding scale.

## Music Lessons:

Music lessons will be provided by outside vendors, and managed by the Arts Program Manager and the Building Manager. This approach was decided through a focus group of 86 local musicians and music teachers. Neighborhood teachers, including Dr. John Calloway (flute and piano), Anthony Blair (violin), Arturo Carillo (conga), Tony Pride
(timbales), and Suzanna Cortez (bass), have all indicated a desire to provide music lessons at 681 .

Music teachers will give lessons in the recording studio. The music lessons that they will offer for children, youth, and/or adults will consist of individual or group music lessons in a variety of Latin, Caribbean, Jazz, songwriting, singing, and world styles. The studio will be available for lessons every day from 10am to 7pm. We will have Spanish/English bilingual teachers giving classes, to make it inclusive to all learners.

Because we don't want to compete with neighborhood centers already offering music classes, we can either collaborate with Mission Cultural Center, Brava! For Women in the Arts, or the Community Music Center and others to offer some of their music classes in our space, or leave it to them, if preferred.

## Proposed Music Lessons:

- Percussion
- Mariachi
- Conga Drumming
- Piano
- Singing
- Classical Guitar


## Types of Instruments:

Percussion, samba drums, Aztec drums, string instruments such as guitar, upright bass and violin played acoustically or with amplification, wind instruments, piano with minimal or no amplification.

## Events

The center will be a revenue generator for artists and a local economic engine to support the community. CANA seeks to use the shared space for art - concerts, performances, dance events as an economic development tool to create financial and entrepreneurship opportunities festivals and events - for local vendors and artists, as well as promote the Latinx culture of the Mission District. We envision 681 Florida becoming a multicultural hub, a safe place for the community, and a tourist attraction for art-enthusiasts from around the region, country and world.

The performances that will be shown in our large multipurpose studio will range from live bands, to dance shows, to literary festivals. Musically, we will primarily showcase Latin, Caribbean, Hip-Hop, and Afro-Funk music. Examples of musical styles that we are likely to
include are salsa, samba, cumbia, soca, mariachi, afrobeat, dancehall, tango, folkloric, and banda. The space will have all the necessary elements to host performances: sound equipment, seating, stage, and lighting.

## Contingents: Dance Rehearsals / Performances:

Sixteen of our Carnaval SF parade contingents have lost rehearsal spaces due to the shortage of adequate spaces and the high fees being charged. These contingents have had to resort to rehearsing on the streets, backyards, and nightclubs. This arrangement is impractical and not healthy or viable for long-term sustainability, for both the Carnaval SF year-around production and the contingents. Obtaining a permanent home for Carnaval SF ensures permanent rehearsal spaces for a score of local organizations.

Dance rehearsal space will be available in the large multipurpose studio and the smaller studio. The style and types of rehearsals will vary from each dance group. Examples of dance groups to rehearse include samba drumming and dancing rehearsals, tango lessons, traditional Aztec Dance classes, folkloric Peruvian rehearsals, ballet, children and youth hip-hop lessons, to name a few. The type of sound amplification will depend on the group, given that some require speakers to play their rehearsal music while others rehearse with live instruments.

The number of performers will depend on the group, which can range from a 10-piece band to a samba ensemble of 20 drummers and 50 dancers.

## Community Groups

The multi-purpose rehearsal studio will also serve as a venue for community organizations and community-members to hold fundraisers and celebratory events. CANA will use the center for our annual Día de los Muertos, Christmas posadas, Cinco de Mayo, Mardi Gras festivities, and the Grand Parade and Festival. The community center will have a makerspace with different stations: One station will be for costume designers to utilize for costume-making projects, another one for screen-printing workshops, and another for arts and crafts. There will be a sizable space designated for offices that will be shared between community organizations throughout the year.

## Makerspace Studio:

The new community art space will have a shared makerspace studio for the production team and artists to utilize year-round. The studio will have commercial sewing machines for costumes, and power tools for creating props and float decorations, as well as a station to learn how to screen
print. It is not lost on us that ACT prop shop was a former occupant of this space and were evicted. It is our hope to restore the arts, and arts production activities, on the site. CANA's Rental and Building Manager will manage the Makerspace.

Community events and celebrations such as fundraisers, birthdays, quinceañeras, weddings, and community celebrations will take place in the large multipurpose studio. Pricing will depend on the type of entity (community-based nonprofit, school, local business, corporation) that will rent the space. We will have a system of different tiers for the rental of the space.

The conference room will be used by several community organizations and individuals. It will be a meeting space available for cultural events and institutions such as Dia de los Muertos, Cesar Chavez Festival and Parade, The San Francisco Lowrider Council, and Calle 24 Latinx Cultural District. Carnaval SF will conduct their weekly production meetings and their bi-monthly parade contingent reunions. We intend to share the office with other community organizations that have been displaced or who need a space from which to work. The Rental and Building Manager will have a working calendar to coordinate the rental and usage of the space.

## CANA, 681 Florida St. and the Mission District

The investment being made into the arts space of 681 Florida St., and by virtue of entrusting this space to CANA, will be an investment into the students of the greater Mission community, into the citywide cultural experience of Carnaval, into the lives of thousands of artists and dancers and into numerous community groups and small businesses. It will be the reincarnation of CELLspace and the physical embodiment of a Mission cultural tradition, Carnaval. It is a long time in coming, and by entrusting this space to CANA, real value is achieved in the amount of educational activities, the variety of events produced during the year, and the large quantity of artists and dancers that will utilize the space and the number of community and business groups that will benefit.

The Mission District will benefit as well through the provision of desperately needed arts space, and through the delivery of arts education to local residents and local students. Local small businesses will benefit as 681 Florida St. will be a destination activity that attracts students, artists and meeting and event goers. Money spent in the Mission will have a multiplier effect supporting local and neighborhood businesses and jobs. Carnaval and the Mission are incredibly intertwined, historically, culturally, and economically. And finally, CANA and its Carnaval experience reminds everyone that the Mission is the "Corazon of San Francisco."


[^0]:    681 Florida Housing Associates, L.P., a California limited partnership. EIN: 82-1438453
    681 Florida TNDC LLC, a California limited liability company. EIN: 94-3403318 (sole member's EIN)
    MEDA 681 Florida LLC , a California limited liability company. EIN: 51-0187791
    Mission Economic Development Agency, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. EIN: 51-0187791
    Turk Street, Inc., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. EIN: 94-3297381
    Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. EIN: 94-2761808
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