# Citywide HOPE SF Affordable Housing Loan Committee 

San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Controller’s Office of Public Finance Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: AUGUST 21, 2020
TO: CITYWIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING LOAN COMMITTEE
FROM: CINDY HEAVENS, SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER
RE: HUNTERS VIEW PHASE III - REVISED and UPDATED MHP COMMITMENT LETTER FOR SEPTEMBER 15, 2020 APPLICATION

## THIS REQUEST

Certificates of Participation:
\$ 9,740,000 includes AHP bridge loan of \$1,170,000
PREVIOUS COMMITMENTS
Certificates of Participation: \$ 7,304,973
EXISTING PREDEVELOPMENT LOAN
Certificates of Participation: \$ 6,455,027
LMIHAF - Predevelopment: \$ 1,500,000
TOTAL MHP COMMITMENT
LETTER REQUEST: $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$

## Summary of Request

Hunters View Associates, LP (the "Partnership"), a California limited partnership formed by the John Stewart Company ("JSCo"), an affiliate of Ridge Point Non-Profit Housing Corporation, and Devine and Gong, Inc. ("DGI"), requests a preliminary gap loan commitment to support their application for California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") Multifamily Housing Program ("MHP") funds for Hunters View Phase III (the "Project" or "HV3"). This preliminary gap request is for a total City contribution of up to $\$ 25,000,000$, including a construction period-only bridge loan of $\$ 1,170,000$, and includes a portion of the infrastructure costs that are directly associated with the vertical development. JSCo, DGI, and Ridge Point Non-Profit Housing Corporation (the "Sponsors") received a preliminary gap loan approval from the HOPE SF Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee ("Committee") on February 21, 2020 in the amount of $\$ 16,760,000$ for an MHP application due in March 2020. The February 23, 2020 MHP Commitment Letter loan evaluation is attached to this memo for reference.
The loan evaluation memo contains the following information:

- An update on Project status, including the proposed development budget based on $100 \%$ design development drawings ("DD");
- An increase to the City gap contribution assumed for the vertical construction in the approved February 21, 2020 Loan Evaluation;
- An increase to the maximum income/rents for 20 units to exceed 50\% Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development's area median income ("MOHCD AMI"); and,
- A revision to the developer fee for vertical construction and master planning.

If awarded MHP in October 2020, staff and Sponsors will make a final gap request loan for horizontal/infrastructure not associated with an affordable housing development along with preliminary gap request update for vertical construction in order to begin infrastructure construction in January 2021. Also, since the Sponsors plan to submit a California Debt Limit Allocation Committee ("CDLAC") Application in January 2021, they will also see a CDLAC gap commitment letter in October 2020. The final vertical gap request will be presented to this Committee in Spring 2021 prior to the residential construction and bond closing.

## HCD-MHP

The Sponsors applied for $\$ 20,000,000$ in MHP under the previous Notice of Funding Availability in published January 2020 for Round 2. While the Project was competitive, the Project's affordability, which is a key to winning the tiebreaker, was not as restrictive as other awarded developments. Approximately $\$ 310.4 \mathrm{MM}$ was awarded under the January 2020 MHP NOFA, of which $\$ 112.85 \mathrm{MM}$ (or $36 \%$ ) went towards projects in the Northern California region. Many of the developments awarded MHP were $100 \%$ supportive housing developments or had more than $20 \%$ of the units designated for supportive housing out of the MHP assisted units. While HV3, as a HOPE SF development, is a family development and has 20 units designed for homeless or formerly homeless families, the project had a point score of 116.0 and a tiebreaker score of 0.3440 that did not result in an award.

On July 20, 2020, HCD released a new MHP NOFA (Round 3). The July 2020 NOFA has approximately \$175MM available to award. MHP applications under Round 3 are due September 15, 2020. HCD's MHP provides permanent financing for affordable new construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing for households with incomes at or below the state’s 60\% Tax Credit Allocation Committee’s Area Median Income ("TCAC AMI"). The July 2020 MHP NOFA outlines a maximum point scoring criteria of 116 points and requires a minimum point score of 90 points for a project to be considered for a funding award. The program will be highly competitive, and the tiebreaker for awarding funds is solely based on a project's average TCAC AMI of MHP assisted units. This funding round prioritizes extremely low-income housing in its design and seeks to award a higher level of funding to High Resource areas. Of the \$175MM available in the 2020 MHP NOFA, \$52.5MM (or 20\%) is available for projects in Northern California.

The Sponsors plan to re-submit HV3 in Round 3 with a more competitive tiebreaker (lower percentage score than was submitted in Round 2) by limiting the total number of units that will be MHP supported to 97 units (out of 118 total Project units). HV3 will remain a large family development with 20 units ( $21 \%$ of the MHP assisted units) set aside for homeless or formerly homeless families. HV3 meets all requirements of large family eligibility category and will achieve the maximum score of 116 points, with a tiebreaker score of 0.3118 , suggesting the application will be competitive. The Sponsors are requesting $\$ 20,000,000$ in September, the same amount requested in March 2020. HV3 is one of two San Francisco projects applying for MHP this round; the other project is 180 Jones. As a $100 \%$ supportive housing development 180 Jones has a self-score of 116 points and a tiebreaker score of 0.2042 .

## Update on Project Status

## 1. BACKGROUND

Hunters View was the first of four HOPE SF developments to begin revitalization on a San Francisco public housing site. However, HOPE SF implementation has been ongoing since August 2005. Hunters

View Phase I completed infrastructure improvements, including Promontory Park, in April 2013 and its one affordable development contained on 3 blocks has been in operations since April 2013. Two additional affordable housing sites -- Phase IIA - Blocks $7 \& 11$, and Phase IIB - Block 10 -- as well as Phase II infrastructure that included Ironwood Park, were completed in 2017. With the completion of Phase IIA, all former public housing residents that lived on site or had a known offsite relocation at the start of the revitalization of Hunters View have successfully relocated to Hunters View's new on-site units.

In early 2018, the Sponsors demolished the last dilapidated 18 public housing buildings to their foundations to address public safety concerns of the former public housing residents and new residents living in newly completed Phase I, Phase IIA, and Phase IIB. The other predevelopment activities the Sponsors have completed to-date include:

- Defined the Phase III plans; Sponsors' architect is currently working on $35 \%$ construction development drawings;
- Increased the number of units from 100 to 118;
- Increased the size of the privately owned public open space, Bayview Park, while eliminating a small park that was identified on the master site plan and located on steep terrain that is too difficult to develop;
- Received City Planning Commissions approval to extend the sitewide entitlements in February 2020;
- Received HOPE SF approval in February 2020 to include 20 permanently supportive housing units for homeless and formerly homeless families into the development in order to meet threshold requirements of an MHP application;
- Increased podium parking from 43 spaces or 1: 0.36 parking ratio excluding the staff unit to 56 spaces or 1: 0.48 parking ratio excluding the staff unit in response to District Supervisor concerns; and,
- Hired a traffic consultant to study parking and transportation for the entire site.

When complete, Hunters View Phase III will total 118 units contained in two buildings on Blocks 14 and 17 of Hunters View. The current unit mix is 49 one-bedrooms, 13 two-bedrooms, 16 three-bedrooms, 34 four-bedrooms, 5 five-bedrooms and 1 two-bedroom onsite staff unit. The Project's proposed unit mix and income restrictions enable the Project to be significantly more competitive for MHP. The units and income restriction in this request are shown in the chart below. (Please note that in the chart PHR PBV means public housing replacement units supported by project-based vouchers ("PBVs")).

| UNIT SIZE |  | MAXIMUM INCOME LEVEL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NON-LOTTERY | No. of Units | MOHCD | TCAC | MHP |
| 1 BD - LOSP | 15 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |
| 2 BD - LOSP | 3 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |
| 3 BD - LOSP | 2 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |
| LOSP Sub-Total | 20 |  |  |  |
| 2 BD - PHR PBV | 3 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |
| 3 BD - PHR PBV | 11 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |
| 4 BD - PHR PBV | 34 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |
| 5 BD - PHR PBV | 5 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 25\% TCAC AMI |


| PHR PBV Sub-Total | 53 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOTTERY |  |  |  |  |
| 1 BR | 19 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI |
| 2 BR | 2 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI |
| 3-BR | 3 | 50\% MOHCD AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI | 50\% TCAC AMI |
| 50\% MOHCD AMI | 24 |  |  |  |
| 1 BR | 15 | 80\% MOHCD AMI | 70\% TCAC AMI | 70\% TCAC AMI |
| 2-BR | 5 | 80\% MOHCD AMI | 70\% TCAC AMI | 70\% TCAC AMI |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 80\% MOHCD AMI } \\ \text { Sub-Total } \end{array}$ | 20 |  |  |  |
| MANAGER UNIT |  |  |  |  |
| 2-BR | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| TOTAL | 118 |  |  |  |

It should be noted that based on the May 2020 MOHCD and TCAC maximum income charts the MOHCD AMI to TCAC AMI is as follows:

- $33 \%$ MOHCD AMI is approximately $25 \%$ TCAC AMI and in the chart above $25 \%$ TCAC AMI will be the most restricted AMI for the permanent supportive housing units supported with LOSP and the public housing replacement units supported with PBVs;
- $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI is approximately $37 \%$ TCAC AMI and in the chart above $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI will be the most restricted AMI on the tax credit and MHP supported units in the lottery
- $80 \%$ MOHCD AMI is approximately $59 \%$ TCAC AMI and in the chart above $80 \%$ MOHCD will be the most restrictive AMI on the tax credit units without MHP financing in the lottery

Also, FHLB AHP will require $60 \%$ of the units ( 71 units) to be at or below $50 \%$ TCAC AMI. Since the Project has $82 \%$ ( 97 units) at or below 50\% TCAC AMI, the AHP affordability restrictions are not shown in the chart above. Also, please note that the families in LOSP supported units will pay $30 \%$ of the household monthly incomes as rent, estimated at $\$ 300$ / month.

## 2. PRIOR MOHCD/OCII FUNDING FOR CURRENT REQUEST

## Existing Loans

Predevelopment loan for $\$ 9,455,027$ was executed in June 2017, of which $\$ 3 M M$ was designated for infrastructure and demolition. Of the \$3MM only $\$ 1.5 \mathrm{MM}$ was expended for infrastructure and demolition, and with this request the remaining $\$ 1.5 \mathrm{MM}$ will be applied to vertical construction. As of August 2020, $\$ 4,835,817$ of the $\$ 9,455,027$ has been drawn with $\$ 4,619,210$ remaining.

## Prior Funding Commitments

On February 21, 2020, for an MHP application submitted in March 2020, the Committee recommended an additional $\$ 7,304,973$ for the Project.

Fulfillment of Conditions Prior to Financing from Previous Loan Evaluations: Please See Section 7 Staff Recommendations for conditions related to this request and those included in previous loan evaluations.

## 3. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Site
Other than the Environmental Review sitewide entitlements, no other aspects of the site have changed since the February 21, 2020 Loan Evaluation. The sitewide entitlements were approved on February 20, 2020, and the Recreation and Parks Commission and Planning Commission approved the height increase from 45 to 65 feet. Also, since the initial Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") did not contemplate Hunters View Phase III and the existing EIR had expired, an EIR Addendum to extend the date of the entitlements and include HV3 was approved on February 20, 2020. A sitewide National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") evaluation was completed in 2008, and NEPA clearance will be required for the public housing replacement units supported by PBV rental subsidy.

## Proposed Design

Other than small changes in square footages, the proposed design remains as described in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation.

Construction Supervisor/Construction Specialist's Evaluation.
In March 2020, HV Phase IIIA Blocks 14 \& 17 Vertical Construction currently estimates $\$ 92,297,116$ GMP. This estimate was based on the $50 \%$ DD plans informed by the $100 \%$ DD drawings and did not include value engineering ("VE"). In April 2020, the Sponsors identified \$5.5MM in potential VE, was only able to claim $\$ 3.4 \mathrm{MM}$ bringing the GMP estimate to $\$ 88,897,116$. However, the $50 \%$ DD plans informed by the $100 \%$ DD drawings did not include the cost for the 14 spaces additional parking spaces that in February 2020 was quickly estimated at $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{MM}$ and this equivalent amount has been added back into the project making the total GMP reflected on the permanent budget with this request $\$ 91,173,956$ including VE, Sponsor's contingency, and bid and hard cost escalations. When the infrastructure allocation of $\$ 15,194,607$ is added to the GMP reflected on the permanent budget the total development hard cost is $\$ 106,368,563$. (For a discussion about infrastructure allocation please see Section 4 Financing, Tax Credits).

David Baker Architects released a 35\% CD includes the \$2.2MM VE items in the design and other design developments on $7 / 2 / 2020$, but this pricing is not in this request. Nibbi/Cahill, the general contractor, expects to have updated pricing based on the $35 \%$ CDss by mid-August. The largest single line item in the $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{MM}$ VE exercise came from enclosing what had previously been open-air exterior corridors in each building. While this adds a small amount of cost for mechanical ventilation, it is more than offset by reducing the number of exterior walls, which are far more expensive to build than interior walls. The other large design change was the elimination of reclaimed "purple pipe" water due to an exemption from San Francisco Code that was granted to the project due to it being 100\% affordable. The Owner-Architect-Construction ("OAC") team continues to look for further VE opportunities, and is cautiously optimistic that the impacts of the current COVID-related recession might provide more favorable bidding.

It should be noted that to compare construction costs, the infrastructure allocated to HV3 vertical development was removed from the construction cost comparison chart. As shown on the cost comparison chart, the total current projection for construction cost per unit excluding infrastructure associated with the vertical development is $\$ 772,661$, well above the average for comparable MOHCD projects, while the cost per bedroom $(\$ 318,790)$ is the second lowest of project in predevelopment. The per square foot cost (\$516) is also slightly below the average. In all cases, the costs warrant more explanation, due to additional cost escalators including the sloped site and the standard HOPE SF related
design features (in-building car parking, in-unit laundry in two-bedroom and larger units, much larger bedroom type counts than typical) that typically drive up the construction costs on HOPE SF buildings. Once these items are factored in, the costs for this project are well in line with comparable projects in MOHCD's pipeline. Also, it should be noted that HV3 will only have washer/dryer hook-ups in its 3 bedroom or larger units for the following reasons:

- As the first HOPE SF development to begin construction, Hunters View did not have the requirement of in-unit laundry in two-bedroom and larger units.
- The HV3 public housing replacement units will have a preference for the existing families living in older units at Sunnydale-Velasco and Potrero and Potrero Annex, two of the three other HOPE SF sites, which follow the policy of providing laundry in three-bedroom units and larger.
- The tenants who lived at Hunters View before revitalization of Phase I began were not provided in-unit washer/dryers and only some of the larger units, mostly the accessible units, have washer/dryer hook-ups only. MOHCD staff and the Sponsors have determined that in order to be equitable to the legacy families and create a unified community for all Hunters View affordable housing sites, washer/dryer hook ups only will be provided for the 3bedroom and larger units.


## 4. FINANCING PLAN

## Updated Sources and Uses Summary

| Predevelopment Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD Loan inclusive <br> of vertical and <br> infrastructure expenses | $\$ 9,455,027$ | 55 yrs. @ 0.25\% Def / RR | Awarded |
| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| MOHCD Vertical Loan, <br> inclusive of infrastructure <br> related to vertical <br> construction | $\$ 23,830,000$ | 55 yrs. @ 0.25\% Def / RR | This Request |
| Permanent Bank Loan | $\$ 34,000,000$ |  |  |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 49,107,958$ | \$0.95 per credit | Not Committed |
| HCD MHP Loan | $\$ 20,000,000$ | 55 yrs. @ 3.00\% / RR, |  |
| $0.42 \%$ annual fee | Not Committed |  |  |
| AHP Loan | $\$ 1,170,000$ |  | Not Committed |
| GP Equity Contribution | $\$ 6,380,000$ |  | Not Committed |
| Def Dev Fee | $\$ 1,300,000$ |  | Not Committed |
| Total | $\$ \mathbf{1 3 5 , 7 8 7 , 9 5 8}$ |  |  |


| Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per GSF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hard Costs, excluding infrastructure associated with the vertical development | \$91,173,961 | \$772,661 | \$516 |
| Infrastructure Costs, associated with the vertical development | \$15,194,607 | \$128,768 | \$ 86 |
| Soft Costs | \$19,739,391 | \$180,747 | \$112 |
| Developer Fee | \$9,680,000 | \$82,034 | \$ 55 |
| Total | \$135,787,959 | \$1,150,745 | \$796 |
| Uses Excluding Infrastructure | Amount | Per Unit | Per GSF |
| Hard Costs, excluding infrastructure associated with the vertical development | \$91,173,961 | \$772,661 | \$516 |
| Soft Costs | \$19,739,391 | \$180,747 | \$112 |
| Developer Fee | \$9,680,000 | \$82,034 | \$ 55 |
| Total | \$120,593,352 | \$1,021,978 | \$683 |

Per unit total development costs ("TDC") without infrastructure is over \$1MM. In addition to design elements contributing to the high per unit TDC, the Project, as required by MHP, has \$2MM in a transition reserve for the public housing replacement units supported by PBVs. The Sponsors in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation committed to working with HCD to eliminate and/or reduce prior to final gap closing for the HV3 affordable housing development. Also, to bring the per unit TDC without infrastructure below $\$ 1 \mathrm{MM}$, a minimum of $\$ 2.6 \mathrm{MM}$ has to be eliminated from the Project in hard or soft cost. However, as discussions around equitable design and operations are ongoing for HV3 and other HOPE SF developments, staff recommends that Sponsors continue to seek additional cost reductions. Please note: cost reductions and targets are not provided with this preliminary gap request for an MHP Commitment Letter.

## Potential/Proposed Permanent Financing.

The Sponsors propose to use the combination of the following permanent sources for the vertical Phase IIIA development:

MOHCD ( $\$ 23,830,000$ ): For the MHP preliminary gap application commitment letter, the Sponsors request $\$ 23.8 \mathrm{MM}$ in total gap funding from MOHCD. This is a $\$ 7.07 \mathrm{MM}$ increase from the request in February 2020, for the following reasons:

- The February 2020 request did not include any infrastructure costs in HV3's total development costs ("TDC"), whereas the current request includes $\$ 15.2 \mathrm{MM}$ in infrastructure costs related to the vertical development. Including a portion of the infrastructure in the project costs - a practice followed by Sunnydale and Potrero HOPE SF projects -- allows the Sponsors to leverage as much tax credit equity on the development as possible.
- The costs for the additional 14 parking spaces (approximately $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{MM}$ ) were not included in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation because the decision to include the 14 spaces was made on February $19^{\text {h }}$, one day before the Planning Commission meeting in order to respond to the Supervisor and two days before the Committee meeting on February $21^{\text {st }}$.

The MOHCD vertical loan includes a to-be-defined commercial cold shell loan for the commercial spaces in Blocks 14 and 17. Some warm-shell costs related to construction of the community kitchen are also included in the MOHCD vertical loan, in keeping with MOHCD's commercial space policy. The construction line items included in the commercial warm-shell loan will be provided to MOHCD for review and approval prior to the gap loan request and will include a schedule and marketing strategy indicating that the commercial spaces will be occupied at construction completion. The strategy for the commercial spaces will be developed in cooperation with the HOPE SF Backbone team. Sources and uses breakdown and commercial operating budget will be provided at gap financing to the Loan Committee.

Permanent Loan (\$34,000,000): The permanent lender has not been selected. The Sponsors issued the lender and investor Request for Proposals ("RFP") in June 2020 and are receiving bids in anticipation of a CDLAC application submission in January 2021. The Sponsors are assuming a credit enhanced loan at a $4.20 \%$ fixed interest rate with a 35 -year term, 35 -year amortization, and 1.15 DSCR. However, in accordance with MOHCD's underwriting, the budget shows a DSCR of 1.10 in Year 1. If at the final vertical gap evaluation, the lenders and investors require a 1.15 DSCR, Sponsors and staff will request Committee approval. Current assumptions are conservative due to the timing of the project's schedule (closing in summer of 2021) and nature of the financial market.

Construction Loan (\$88,000,000): The construction loan will be paid off by the permanent loan, MHP, and tax credit equity. The tax-exempt bond request exceeds the per-project cap (\$50M) and per the CDLAC regulations the project will be able to provide compelling evidence as to why it cannot be developed in phases and must exceed the cap. In addition, the Sponsors are aware of other similar projects that have successfully received the waiver to the cap. is aware of other similar projects that have successfully received the waiver to the cap. Based on the tax-exempt bond calculation cap (different than the per project cap and calculated to be approximately $\$ 71 \mathrm{M}$ ), the request to CDLAC is currently estimated to be $\$ 69 \mathrm{MM}$. This allows the project to meet the $50 \%$ test safely while asking for as little bonds as necessary to maximize efficiency for scoring purposes. The remaining portion of the construction loan is assumed to be a taxable tail underwritten at a rate of $4.50 \%$. The project as currently underwritten meets its $50 \%$ test for the bonds. However, Sponsors will continue to analyze and prior to the CDLAC Commitment Letter request and final gap request must provide MOHCD with an analysis. It should be noted that the CDLAC scoring is potentially being revised significantly. The Sponsor has been involved in comments to the scoring rubric revision and believes based on the best information available that HV3 will be competitive, however no final regulations have been released to date.

Tax Credits ( $\$ 49,107,958$ ): The investor has not been selected. The Sponsors issued the lender and investor Request for Proposals ("RFP") in June 2020 and are receiving bids in anticipation of a CDLAC application submission in January 2021. MOHCD will require a review of the raw data received from the RFP respondents and must approve the selected investor. The tax credit equity is based on a pricing of $\$ 0.950$ per credit, lower than the amount of 1.00 assumed in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation. Phase IIIA's tax credit pricing estimate is reasonable, and staff will require that any additional equity raised will be used to off-set the City's gap loan. Also, the Sponsors are considering applying for State
credits in January 2021 in order to reduce MOHCD gap loan request. The Sponsors have not included State credits in this MOHCD loan request and are not showing State credits on their MHP application since secured sources are competitive for MHP.

It is important to note that total infrastructure for HV3 is $\$ 29,990,664$. The infrastructure has not been evaluated by staff or presented to the Committee. Infrastructure presented with the vertical development is financing mechanism only and an allocation only. The infrastructure with this request does not include any soft costs or construction escalations and contingencies.

To determine the amount of infrastructure allocated to the vertical design, the Sponsors consider the infrastructure improvements total square footage and do a proportional allocation of affordable development versus market rate developments; followed by an analysis of the cost to construct the various types of infrastructure improvements. Infrastructure improvements that are necessary for residents to access the affordable developments and for the properties to operate are assigned to the vertical construction; typically, public right-of-way and utilities. Parks are not included in the vertical construction. This infrastructure cost allocation analysis is consistent with the process that occurred on Hunters View Phase IA and IIA. Also, it should be noted that the Sponsors, as the first developers to begin construction on a HOPE SF site inclusive of infrastructure, share this analysis process with the Sunnydale team prior to the Sunnydale HOPE SF development beginning construction. Also, this infrastructure cost allocation process was reviewed by the Sponsors' council and discussed with some tax credit investors about the best way to package the infrastructure for tax credit purchase. Further, based on guidance for the Sponsors' tax attorney, the Sponsors will also have 3 general contractor contracts: vertical development, infrastructure allocated to the vertical development, and infrastructure for the park and building pads for developments without tax credit financing. This approach to the general contractor contracts is also consistent with previous phases and allows the partners to maximize tax credits equity for infrastructure development.

HCD Programs: In the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation, staff provided an analysis of HCD's Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities ("AHSC"), Infill Infrastructure Grant ("IIG"), and Transit Oriented Development Housing ("TOD") programs as possible financing available to the project. Since the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation, the Sponsors with staff support also analyzed No Place Like Home ("NPLH"), a HCD program administered by MOHCD and HSH, as a financing option for HV3. Based on the NPLH analysis below, MHP is the only HCD Program available to leverage City funds. (The NPLH analysis is numbered to follow the bulleted analysis in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation.)
v. NPLH: This is a State source of funds administered by MOHCD and includes a capital source for permanent support unit development. In spring, the Sponsors discussed using NPLH as a capital source on the LOSP units. NPLH is not a good source of funding for Hunters View Phase III for some of the reasons listed below.
o While a key HOPE SF principle is to develop mixed income communities, the addition of chronically mentally ill households adds a service component in an already service strained community.
o HV3 is not located in a transit rich neighborhood or in the central city, where most behavioral health services are available.
o It is recommended by LSS and DPH that supportive services be available to chronically mentally ill household member after hours and on weekends and offset LSS services. Due to the location of HV3, finding a provider for this aspect of service provision was extremely difficult.

General Partner Equity (\$6,380,000): On the vertical development, the Sponsors will take developer fee that is reasonable for an MHP sponsored development with high cost and allowable developer fee under TCAC and the general partner will contribute to Hunters View Phase IIIA consistent with MOHCD guidelines.

Deferred Developer Fee (\$1,300,000): The Sponsor will take the maximum MOHCD allowable deferred developer fee.

FHLB AHP ( $\$ 1,170,000$ ): MOHCD will require that the Sponsor apply to the FHLB-San Francisco for AHP in an amount up to $\$ 1,170,00060$ days after construction has started in order to maximize competitiveness. Any AHP funds awarded will reduce the MOHCD loan by an equal amount. The Sponsor's equity and debt RFP mentioned the desire of the Sponsor to apply for AHP and stated that if the selected debt and/or equity lender is not a member bank, it must commit to working with the Sponsors to find a member bank to submit an AHP application.

## Uses Evaluation

| DEVELOPMENT BUDGET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit are within standards | Y | Hard costs are \$799,212 per unit for hard cost excluding infrastructure related to the affordable housing development. Cost exceed the average of most MOHCD developments, including HOPE SF developments because of the large number (53) of 3-bedroom and larger units, the steepness of the site, and additional parking. Per bedroom cost are below the MOHCD average. The Sponsor will work with MOHCD to reduce overall project costs that includes infrastructure. |
| Construction Hard Cost Contingency is at least 5\% (new construction) | Y | Hard cost contingency is 5.0\%. |
| Escalation amount is commensurate with time period until expected construction start, not to exceed $15 \%$ | Y | Design, bid, and plan check escalations total $11 \%$ as shown on the permanent budget. |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees are within standards | N | The Sponsor will refine architectural fees prior to gap financing request. |
| Construction Management Fees are within standards | N | Construction Management fees exceed MOHCD guidelines. Sponsors should reduce or provide an explanation. |
| Permit Fees | Y | \$1,100,105 is the total permit fee amount. |
| Developer Fee is within standards, see also disbursement chart below | Y | Total Maximum cash out fee is $\$ 1.0 \mathrm{MM}$. The total At-Risk Fee is $\$ 1.0 \mathrm{MM}$. See Section 6 below. |
| Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ per standards | N | Soft cost contingency is $2.6 \%$. Sponsor recognized the total development costs and |


|  |  | soft costs exceed similar projects in <br> MOHCD's portfolio and have elected to <br> keep the soft cost contingency low. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capitalized Operating Reserves are a <br> minimum of 3 months of operating <br> budget | N <br> (per below) | Sponsors has 6 months of operating <br> expenses excluding debt service which <br> exceeds HCD guidelines. |
| Debt Service Reserve | N | This is 6 months of debt service only. This <br> is not included in the Capitalized <br> Operating Reserves and it is based on <br> Sponsors experience with the other <br> Hunters View deals. Staff accepts this fee. |
| HCD Transition Reserve | N | Staff does not consent to the HCD <br> transition reserve at this time. If awarded <br> MHP, Sponsor must work with MOHCD <br> and HCD to reduce this reserve. |

The Project's development budget does not include TCAC's maximum developer fee of $15 \%$ of eligible basis, at a total of $\$ 19,624,666$, with a maximum of $\$ 2,943,700$ in cash developer fee to Sponsor. The developers are financing a lesser fee of $\$ 9,680,000$ because the overall TDC is high and the high project costs due to infrastructure has an effect on the MHP application. Because the Sponsors are taking less cash developer fee on the vertical development ( $\$ 2,000,000$ instead of $\$ 2,380,000$ ) to have a competitive MHP development, they are requesting that the additional $\$ 200,000$ allowed as project management fee in MOHCD's Developer Fee Policy and the $\$ 180,000$ for $\$ 10,000$ for every unit over 100 units paid as AtRisk Fee in MOHCD's Developer Policy instead be disbursed through the infrastructure portion of the project's master developer fees. These additional amounts do not increase the MOHCD loan. Also, this type of re-allocation of vertical developer fee payments has occurred on previous Hunters View phases and staff recommends the change.

Re-allocation of some vertical developer fee to the master planning developer fee results in the residential vertical developer fee and master planning developer fees as shown below.

| Revised Residential/Vertical Developer Fee Disbursement Schedule |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Payment Milestone | \% of Project <br> Mgmt Fee | Amount |
|  <br> Predevelopment | $50 \%$ | $\$ 500,000$ |
| 100\% Schematic Design (DISBURSED) | $15 \%$ | $\$ 150,000$ |
| Submission of Site Permit (DISBURSED) | $10 \%$ | $\$ 100,000$ |
| MHP Application Submission | $10 \%$ | $\$ 100,000$ |
| Submission of TCAC/CDLAC Application | $5 \%$ | $\$ 46,667$ |
| Remaining Project Management Fee paid at Construction Closing | $10 \%$ | $\$ 103,333$ |
| PM Fee: Construction Close | $20 \%$ | $\$ 200,000$ |
| PM Fee: During or at End of Construction - The interim payments <br> in the two previous loan evaluations apply | $20 \%$ | $\$ 200,000$ |
| PM Fee: At Project Close Out | $10 \%$ | $\$ 100,000$ |
| Total Project Management Fee | $100 \%$ | $\$ 1,000,000$ |



MP-VARA: Master Planning - the portion of At-Risk Additional Project Management Fee allowed under MOHCD's Developer Fee Policy, but unable to claim on HV3 vertical development due to HCD's MHP limit of \$2MM developer fee for competitiveness. Disbursement milestones are the same as the MOHCD Developer Fee Policy At-Risk Disbursements.

TOTAL MASTER PLANNING \& INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPER FEE

## \$988,526

There are no changes to the Infrastructure Developer Fee chart provided in the Predevelopment Loan Evaluation dated April 11, 2016 and the infrastructure developer fee chart shown below

| DEVELOPER FEE INFRASTRUCTURE DISBURSEMENT SCHEDULE <br> Payment Milestone of Project <br> Mgmt Fee |  | Amount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Issuance of Infrastructure Permits | $25 \%$ | $\$ 250,000$ |
| $100 \%$ Completion of Demolition (PAID) | $25 \%$ | $\$ 250,000$ |
| $50 \%$ Infrastructure Completion | $25 \%$ | $\$ 250,000$ |
| $100 \%$ Infrastructure Completion (excluding landscaping) | $20 \%$ | $\$ 200,000$ |
| B.O.S acceptance of public infrastructure | $5 \%$ | $\$ 50,000$ |
| TOTAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT | $\$ 1,000,000$ |  |
| Total Infrastructure Developer Fee | $\$ 1,000,000$ |  |

## 5. PROJECT OPERATIONS

## Operating Budget Evaluation

|  | Operating Proforma |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio is <br> between minimum 1.10:1 in year 1 <br> and maximum 1.00:1 in year 17 | N | DSCR is 1.10:1 in Year 1 and 1.36 in year 17. |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays <br> above 1.00:1 for entirety of <br> projected 20-year cash flow | Y | DSCR in Year 20 is 1.41 |  |
| Vacancy meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy is 5\%. |  |
| Annual Income Growth is increased <br> at 2.5\% per year | N | Income escalation factor is 2.0\%. <br> DGI, the financial advisor and co-Developer <br> underwrites at a less aggressive escalation than <br> MOHCD and uses 2.0\%. However, there is a <br> 1\% difference between the Annual Income <br> Growth and Annual Operating Expenses. |  |


| Annual Operating Expenses are increased at 3.0\% per year | N | Expenses escalation factor is $3.0 \%$. <br> DGI, the financial advisor and co-Developer underwrites at a less aggressive escalation than MOHCD and uses $2.0 \%$. However, there is a 1\% difference between the Annual Income Growth and Annual Operating Expenses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base year operating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | Y | Total Operating Expenses are \$13,834 per unit per annum ("PUPA"), excluding reserves and ground lease payment is lower than the current average on developments with LOSP, but higher than the development with $30 \%$ or less of LOSP units. Security costs due to an extensive camera system increases the PUPA. |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total Property Management Fee is $\$ 87,456$ or $\$ 62$ per unit per month ("PUPM"). |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | No change from <br> February 21, 2020 - Loan Evaluation. <br> 1 FTE property manager, 2 FTE occupancy specialist, 0.5 office assistant, 1.5 FTE maintenance technician, 2 FTE grounds/janitor. |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Reflects a 2023 operating start Annual AM Fee is $\$ 21,910 / \mathrm{yr}$ Annual PM Fee is $\$ 25,000 / \mathrm{yr}$ Total AM \& PM is $\$ 46,910 / \mathrm{yr}$ <br> Maximum Total Project Sponsor AM and PM fee in 2023 is $\$ 48,550$, per MOHCD's Operating Fees Policy. |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or exceed TCAC minimum standards | Y | Replacement Reserves are \$600 PUPA, per HCD standard. |
| Limited Partnership Asset <br> Management Fee meets standards | Y | \$5,000 per year. |
| Homeowner's Association (HOA) | N/A | No change from <br> February 21, 2020 - Loan Evaluation. <br> \$77,000 per year project-wide (based on Phase I \& II HCD cap). <br> (See comment below this chart.) |
| Resident led Community Stewardship (\$25 PUPY) | Y | HV3 has no RAD supported units. However, JSCo, the property manager, agreed to provide the $\$ 25$ PUPY on the non-RAD PBV and on tax credit units in order to create equity among all |


|  |  | Hunters View affordable housing developments <br> and provide funding to the resident council that is <br> made up of legacy and new residents to the <br> community. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rental Subsidies? | Y | No change from <br> February 21, 2020 - Loan Evaluation. <br> HV3 has 53 PBV's and 20 LOSP units |

## 6. Staff Recommendations

Conditions prior to additional funding request or financing gap
Below are conditions prior to financing gap related to this request.

- Sponsors should continue to craft a value engineering plan to significantly reduce costs, including analysis related to moving some infrastructure related to the affordable development to the horizontal development.
- Sources and uses breakdown and commercial operating budget will be provided at gap financing to the Loan Committee.
- Sponsors must provide an analysis of project's ability to be funded under the competitive CDLAC rules given the high cost. The analysis should include analysis of the $50 \%$ test because the project currently as budgeted is almost $\$ 20 \mathrm{MM}$ over the bond cap.
- Any additional equity raised with the selection of the investor will be used to offset the City's gap loan.
- Prior to the funding request for infrastructure final gap loan approval or update of vertical design, the Sponsors to analyze lowering escalation contingencies because of current market conditions.

Below is the status of the conditions prior to additional funding request or financing gap shown in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation.

- Sponsors to confirm the completion of the process to remove the requirement for recycled water ("purple piping") in Hunters View Phase III that was part of Phase I and II.

Status: Completed. In spring 2020, it was determined that the purple pipe is not required for HV3, an affordable development. The park and the market rate lots built with the infrastructure must contain recycled water piping.

- Sponsors must submit a cash flow for MOHCD approval showing an acceptable debt service coverage ratio (DSCR), income trending, reserve funding, and surplus cash split. Re-stated in February 2020 loan evaluation as, Sponsors will work to reduce the DSCR to MOHCD underwriting standards.

Status: Completed. DSCR meets MOHCD guidelines. DSCR is 1.10:1 in Year 1, 1.36 in year 17 and 1.41 in Year 20.

- Sponsors will provide a schedule and marketing strategy indicating that the commercial spaces will be occupied at least 6 months after residential temporary certificate of occupancy (TCO) is received.

Status: In process. Due to the coronavirus pandemic, marketing strategy for the learning library area in Block 14 has been delayed. Working with a La Cocina vendor, JSCo has made progress regarding the commercial cooking space in Block 17 and has secured a $\$ 10,000$ design development grant from SF Foundation.

- Sponsors must show in their operating assumptions some information related to operating the commercial spaces and rental assumptions in the MOHCD commercial operating budget.

Status: In process. Due to the coronavirus pandemic, negotiation and assumptions regarding the commercial spaces have been on hold. However, as designed, the community serving learning space in Block 14 and the commercial kitchen in Block 17 are separately metered from the residential housing. By November 1, 2020 and prior to the infrastructure gap final commitment and vertical update, Sponsors must provide assumptions whose doing common area maintenance (CAM) work and costs for CAM work that will be applied to the commercial areas.

- Sponsors will provide an explanation for the architectural fee overruns based on architect's estimated hours of work for proposed scope. Sponsors should include in the analysis a breakdown of the architectural fees related to split unit work for three-bedroom and larger public housing replacement units in order to respond to exact type unit replacement zoning requirement in the Hunters View Special District (City Resolution 080692, Ordinance Number 201-01). By June 1, 2020, Sponsors will provide a comparison of Hunters View phases for vertical architecture services that demonstrate reasonable architectural costs for Phase III. If fees remain over MOHCD underwriting guidelines, Sponsors will provide an explanation for the architectural fee overruns based on architect's estimated hours of work for proposed scope.

Status: In process. Sponsors have provided an explanation of the costs overruns and the additional costs are due to the extended entitlement process that has taken over 12 months due to delays at the Planning Department. By October 1, 2020, the sponsors will provide a comparison of Hunters View phases for vertical architectural services to demonstrate reasonable architectural costs for Phase III.

- On the permanent budget, the Sponsors must show construction management services on the appropriate line item.

Status: Completed. The construction management services are shown on the appropriate line item in the permanent sources and uses budget.

- Sponsors to provide MOHCD with a breakdown of their assumptions for hard-shell, warm-shell and tenant improvements for the two commercial spaces. Sponsors must include commercial shell costs on the appropriate line items on the MOHCD permanent budget. Sponsors to verify that the commercial spaces have separate utility connections from the residential.

Status: In process. The Sponsors' general contractor is pricing the 35\% CDs. A breakdown of the hard shell will be provided to MOHCD by September 2020, when the overall pricing is completed and submitted to MOHCD. As the marketing for an educational provider for the learning space is slowed down due to the coronavirus pandemic, the Sponsors do not have any cost assumptions for a warm-shell and tenant improvements. For the commercial kitchen in Block 17, the Sponsors have resumed communication with a potential vendor. However, warm shell and tenant improvement costs based on an assumed design have not been developed. With the submission of the $35 \%$ pricing, the Sponsors should include a cold and warm shell cost breakdown for both commercial spaces. By February 1, 2021, Sponsors should have an estimate of tenant improvements for the reading/library space. Since the tenant improvements for the community kitchen maybe developed by the tenant, tenant improvement costs are anticipated to occur after the residential closing. It should be noted that there is a discussion with the Hunters View residents about whether the commercial kitchen is designated for a tenant economic advancement. The MOHCD loan for community serving spaces covers cold shell and warmshell tenant improvements with the tenant improvements not involving the warm shell paid for by the community serving tenant. If the community kitchen space will be for a tenant economic endeavor, it is possible that the MOHCD loan may include tenant improvements in addition to the cold and warm shell costs of the commercial kitchen. As use of the commercial kitchen is an ongoing conversation with HOPE SF and the Hunters View residents, both HOPE SF, MOHCD staff and residents need to have a direction for this space
prior to the final gap request in order for the tenant improvement cost, if necessary, to be incorporated into the MOHCD loan.

- Sponsors to evaluate swapping up to 5 tax credit without subsidy units and no more than 10 units affordable to families at or below $32 \%$ MOHCD AMI/25\% TCAC AMI with an equivalent amount of PBV's.

Status: Complete. This condition was based on an MHP project that included all 118 units as presented in the February 21, 2020-Loan Evaluation. With the change to an MHP competitive project that has some units at or below $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI and 20 units at or below $70 \%$ TCAC AMI, this comment no longer applies. Also, it should be noted that breakeven operating cost per unit requires a $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI; any unit lower than $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI requires an operating subsidy to be financially feasible.

- Sponsors must reduce the capitalized operating reserves to MOHCD acceptable guidelines.

Status: Not complete. The MOHCD budget shows 6 months of capitalized operating reserves while MOHCD underwriting requires 3 months. However, DGI, the financial advisor and co-development Sponsor, states that initial interest in the Request for Proposal from the investors and lenders is resulting in all lenders and investors requiring 6 months capitalized reserves during this financially challenging time. Sponsors requests that for this MHP Commitment Letter they be allowed to keep the 6 months capitalized operating reserves but prior to the gap request, Sponsors will negotiate a capitalized operating reserve more in line with MOHCD underwriting guidelines if the tax credit pricing is not reduced. Staff accepts this request.

- Sponsors must evaluate the necessity for a debt service reserve. MOHCD must review and approve the debt service analysis.

Status: Not complete. The MOHCD budget with this request shows 6 months of capitalized debt service reserves and this is based on experience with the completed Hunters View developments. Sponsors request that for this MHP Commitment Letter they be allowed to keep the 6 months of capitalized debt service reserves but prior to the gap requests, Sponsors will seek to eliminate this reserve or reduce it as long as elimination or reduction does not reduce the tax credit pricing. Staff accepts this request.

- If awarded MHP, Sponsors must seek to significantly reduce the HCD Transition Reserve or eliminate it entirely.

Status: Not complete. The MOHCD budget with this request includes an HCD Transition Reserve for the 53 public housing replacement units supported by PBVs. As MOHCD has agreed with HCD, the HCD Transition Reserve does not include the 20 units for homeless families supported by LOSP. Sponsors request that for this MHP Commitment Letter they be allowed to keep the HCD Transition Reserve. If awarded MHP, the Sponsors will seek to reduce the HCD Transition Reserve or eliminate it entirely. Staff recommends that MOHCD accept this request.

- Sponsors must provide an updated proposed staffing plan to MOHCD prior to CDLAC gap financing request. The updated plan must include a staffing plan comparison to completed phases with annual total and per unit per annual totals.

Status: In process. The staffing plan in the February 21, 2020 Evaluation is consistent with the staffing at other Hunters View affordable developments. This condition was related to the addition of supportive housing units, since JSCo, the property management agent, had to determine if it would have front desk security at both HV3 buildings or at one building, or not at all. As supportive housing units are new to the HOPE SF model and none of the previous Hunters View developments have a front desk, by October 2020 with the infrastructure gap request, JSCo must determine the best model for HV3 that is consistent with its management practices at the newly completed Hunters View properties but also addresses cost concerns.

- Sponsors will work with the HOPE SF team to have a proposed services plan for the entire site and a plan for the unplanned services funds prior to CDLAC gap loan request.

Status: In process. Please see attached February 21, 2020 Preliminary Gap Loan Evaluation for MHP Commitment Letter for a discussion about unprogrammed/unplanned services. With the addition of the 20 homeless units with services provided by LSS and supported by HSH, if awarded MHP, JSCo, the lead developer, will begin to hold monthly meetings with all service providers to discuss service provision and property management that supports all residents, including the permanent supportive housing households. JSCo will involve HOPE SF staff in those meetings and will discuss programming the unplanned services funds paid through the operating budget.

- Sponsors must submit a draft services plan to HSH for review and approval as required for the MHP application due March 2nd.

Status: Completed. HSH reviewed and approved the plan and budget that was submitted in the March 2, 2020-MHP application. Sponsors plan to resubmit that approved plan for the September application

Below is the status of the conditions prior to financing gap shown in the November 4, 2016-Loan Evaluation that were not restated in the Loan Evaluation on February 21, 2020.

- Sponsors must submit a financing plan and line-item budget that meets MOHCD underwriting guidelines, is within range of comparable projects, and conforms to TCAC and CDLAC requirements.

Status: In process. MOHCD continues to meet with the Sponsors to discuss overall budget and construction pricing. These activities will continue prior to gap financing request. prior to gap loan funding request, and prior to next developer fee milestone.

- If covered bicycle parking is part of vertical design, access to bicycle parking must have secured access not connected to the parking garage entrance.

Status: Complete. Bicycle parking is on the ground of Phase IIIA's building and is not accessed through the garage.

- Sponsors must submit an infrastructure only cost comparison. The cost comparison should include infrastructure related to a vertical development and unrelated to a vertical development to demonstrates reasonable costs for the phase.

Status: In process. This request only includes infrastructure that is related to the vertical development. MOHCD continues to meet with the Sponsors to discuss infrastructure costs.

- Sponsors must submit comparison of Hunters View phases for vertical architecture services that demonstrate reasonable architectural costs for Phase III.

Status: In process. While Staff and the Sponsors have discussed overall architectural cost, the comparison has not been provided as of yet. The architect comparison and breakdown must be provided by October 1, 2020 with the $35 \%$ construction development design drawings ("CDs").

- Sponsors must provide construction management services contract detailing and separating vertical construction management services from infrastructure.

Status: Not Applicable. This request only includes infrastructure that is related to the vertical development Construction management services for vertical construction are not shown on the budget. Prior to gap financing, the Sponsors must show construction management services on the appropriate line item.

## LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS
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Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, August 27, 2020 8:14 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Gotthelf, Felicia (MYR) |
| Subject: | Hunters View Loan Committee |

I approve

Get Outlook for iOS

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Oerth, Sally (CII) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, August 21, 2020 12:05 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR); Heavens, Cindy (MYR) |
| Subject: | 8/21/20 Loan Committee: Hunters View Ph III preliminary Gap Loan commitment - MHP Letter |

On behalf of Nadia Sesay, I approve the Hunters View Phase III preliminary gap loan commitment to support the project's MHP application that was presented at the 8/21/20 Loan Committee.

## Sally Oerth

Deputy Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, August 27, 2020 10:47 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | RE: Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee - Friday, August 21, 2020, 11:00 a.m. |

Hi Rosanna,

I approve the loan to the Hunters View Phase III project.

Best,

Salvador


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

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF_HSH \| Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

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

From: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:32 AM
To: Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org)
Subject: FW: Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee - Friday, August 21, 2020, 11:00 a.m.

Hello Salvador,

Please find Loan Committee Agenda and materials

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

From: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 1:49 PM
To: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org); Felicia [felicia.gotthelf@gmail.com](mailto:felicia.gotthelf@gmail.com); Oerth, Sally (CII)

| From: | Tonia Lediju, PhD [ledijut@SFHA.ORG](mailto:ledijut@SFHA.ORG) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, August 21, 2020 12:06 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Hunter View Phase III |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My vote is yes.

Respectfully,

## Tonia Lediju, PhD

SF Housing Authority Transition Lead
Acting Executive Director
Oficice of the Mayor
(415) 715-3276
(415) 619-1936

Clear is kind. Unclear is unkind -- Brene' Brown, PhD
From: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) [rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org](mailto:rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org)
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 1:49 PM
To: Shaw, Eric (MYR) [eric.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.shaw@sfgov.org); Felicia [felicia.gotthelf@gmail.com](mailto:felicia.gotthelf@gmail.com); 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); Tonia Lediju, PhD [ledijut@SFHA.ORG](mailto:ledijut@SFHA.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); Mara Blitzer [mara.blitzer@sfgov.org](mailto:mara.blitzer@sfgov.org);
Defiesta, Agnes (MYR) [agnes.defiesta@sfgov.org](mailto:agnes.defiesta@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); 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); Kitchingham, Kevin (MYR) [kevin.kitchingham@sfgov.org](mailto:kevin.kitchingham@sfgov.org)
Subject: Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee - Friday, August 21, 2020, 11:00 a.m.

Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) (rosanna.chavez@sfgov.org) has sent you a protected message.


## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Van Degna, Anna (CON) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, August 21, 2020 12:05 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Hunters view Phase II |

Approved

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

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.
Date: $\qquad$
Tonia Lediju, Acting Executive Director Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.
Date: $\qquad$
Anna Van Degna, Director
Controller's Office of Public Finance

Attachments: A. Vertical Permanent Development Budget
B. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget
C. 20-year Operating Pro Forma
D. MOHCD OCII Family Cost Comparison Chart
E. February 21, 2020 Preliminary Gap Loan Evaluation for MHP Commitment Letter

## Attachments A through D

See attached.





## 






| InCome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2027}^{\text {Year } 5}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 6 \\ & 2028 \\ & 2028 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2026 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Losp | increase | (reataed toanual inc assumptions) | Losp | non-Losp | Total | Losp | non-Losp | Total | Losp | non-Losp | Total |
| Onter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| InCome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Year 7 2029 |  |  | ${ }_{2030}$Year 8 |  |  | Year 92031 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Losp | increase | (reataed toanual inc assumptions) | LOSP non-LOSP |  | Total | Losp | non-Losp | Total | LoSP | non-Losp | Total |
| Onter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |











## Attachment E

February 21, 2020 Preliminary Gap Loan Evaluation for MHP Commitment Letter

# Citywide HOPE SF 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 Housing Authority of San Francisco 

Hunters View HOPE SF<br>Blocks 14 and 17 Vertical \$7,304,973 MHP Application Gap Commitment Request

Evaluation of Request for:

Loan Committee Date:

Prepared By:
Source of Funds Recommended:

NOFA/PROGRAM/RFP:
Total Previous City Funds Committed

Funds Requested:

Applicant/Sponsor Name:

Vertical Construction Onty - MHP
Application Gap Loan Commitment Letter
February 21, 2020
Cindy Heavens
Certificates of Participation

HOPE SF
\$9,455,027 (horizontal and vertical construction)
LMIHAF: \$3,000,000
Certificates of Participation: $\$ 6,455,027$
$\$ 7,304,973$ (vertical construction)
Certificates of Participation: \$2,804,973
Tax Increment Excess Proceeds: \$4,500,000
Hunters View Associates, L.P

1. Phasing Map

This loan evaluation is for a State Housing and Community Development ("HCD") Multifamily Housing Program ("MHP") Application Gap Commitment Letter for the final affordable housing development ("Blocks 14 and 17") of the Hunters View HOPE SF project. Blocks 14 and 17 are mixed-use vertical developments within the third and final infrastructure phase of Hunters View. All previous affordable developments, Phase I (Blocks 4,5, and 6) and Phase II (Blocks 7, 11 and 10) are completed and fully operational.

Phase IIIA, identified below, is located east of Middlepoint Road on the former Hunters View public housing site. Blocks 14 \& 17 are in the center of Phase IIIA. Phase IIIA will include 118 units of affordable housing and 3,635 s.f. of ground floor community-serving commercial space in Block 14 and ground floor commercial in Block 17. Phase IIIB, the horizontal infrastructure, is outside the scope of this loan evaluation. The horizontal infrastructure gap loan request will be submitted in summer 2020.


## 2. Phasing Summary and Updates

The current buildout by phase is projected as follows with the current request in bold:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Start } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Block Name | Phase | Phase Type | Total units | Status | Total MOHCD Loan Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total OCII } \\ & \text { Loan Amoun } \end{aligned}$ | TDC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 2011 | All <br> Blocks in <br> Phase ! | 1B | Infrastructure |  | Complete | \$3,060,494 | \$3,000,000 | \$11,917,980 |
| 2010 | 2012 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Phase 1 } \\ & \text { Blocks } 4 \text {, } \\ & 5.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1A-0 | Affordable | 107 | Complete | \$3,994,745 | \$19,449,014 | \$80,842,334 |
| 2015 | 2017 | All <br> Blocks in <br> Phase 2 | 2B | Infrastructure |  | Complete | \$5,679,807 | \$0 | \$6,383,202 |
| 2016 | 2017 | Blocks 7 \& 11 | 2A | Affordable | 107 | Complete | \$2,267,137 | \$16,721,514 | \$136,746,201 |
| 2016 | 2017 | Block 10 | 2B | Aftordable | 72 | Complete | \$17,393.406 | \$0 | \$48,417,529 |
| 2020 | 2023 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Blocks 2, } \\ & 3, \& 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{A} \& \\ 2 \mathrm{~A} \end{gathered}$ | Markct Rate | 64 | In Process | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2020 | 2021 | All <br> Blocks in <br> Phase 3 | 3B | Infrastructure |  | N/A | \$29,478,578 | \$0 | \$29,478,578 |
| 2021 | 2022 | Blocks 14 \& 17 | 3A | Aftordable | 118 | Previously awarded Predev \& MHP Commitmen $t$ | \$16,260,000** | 1 | \$115,992,506 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total to Date | 579,068.418 | \$39,170,528 | \$429.778,330 |

**Includes $\$ 4,500,000$ in formerly OCII funds now under MOHCD's jurisdiction.

## Sponsor Information

| Project Name: | Hunters View Ph. 3A, <br> Blocks 14 and 17 | Sponsor: | Hunters View Associates, L.P. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Address   <br> (w/cross St): Fairfax Avenue and Ultimate Borrower <br> Ironwood Way, HV124 Partners 3, L.P. Entity: |  |  |  |

This loan request is for a MHP Application Gap Commitment Letter for the final affordable housing development (Blocks 14 and 17) of the Hunters View HOPE SF project. Blocks 14 and 17 are mixeduse vertical developments within the third and final infrastructure phase of Hunters View. None of the funds requested in this loan evaluation will be disbursed during predevelopment. All previous infrastructure and affordable housing developments are complete.

Together, Blocks 14 and 17 total 118 units. The current unit mix is 49 one-bedrooms, 13 twobedrooms, 16 three-bedrooms, 34 four-bedrooms, 5 five-bedrooms and 1 two-bedroom onsite staff unit. Of the 118 units, 53 are public housing replacement units; except for 5 three-bedroom units, all other 3bedroom and larger units are public housing replacement units. The public housing replacement units are supported by project based vouchers ("PBVs"). Of the 118 units, 20 units will be set aside for formerly homeless families and will be supported by the Local Operating Subsidy Program ("LOSP") and 44 units are tax credit units without any rental subsidy. All of the tax credit units are at or below the $50 \%$ of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Area Median Income ("MOHCD AMI") and all of the public housing replacement units and units set aside for homeless familes are at or below 32\% MOHCD AMI/25\% Tax Credit Allocation Committee ("TCAC") AMI.

The Sponsor was awarded a predevelopment loan for both horizontal and vertical construction in November 2016. With the predevelopment loan, the Sponsor has demolished to their foundations 18 public housing building in Phase 3 and completed several predevelopment milestones. The Sponsor plans to apply for a Califormia Debt Limit Allocation Committee ("CDLAC") allocation in August 2020 and will return to the committee for a gap request in July 2020.

## Vertical Loan Request - Project Description

Note: For HOPE SF master project summary narrative, see Attachment A.

| Project Name: | Hunters View Block 14 \& 17 | Sponsor: | Hunters View <br> Associates, L.P. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Address: | Fairfax Avenue and Ironwood Way, 94124 | Ultimate Borrower Entity: | HV Partners 3, L.P. |
| Construction Type: | Type IIIA over Podium for both blocks | Project Type: | New Construction |
| Land Owner: | SFHA | Supervisor and District: | Walton, D10 |
| Number of Stories: | 5 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 1.56 acres/68,168 SF |
| Number of Units: | 118 | Architect: | David Baker Architects |
| Total Residential Area: | 172,853 GSF | General Contractor: | Cahill Nibbi Joint Venture |
| Total Commercial Area; | 3,635 GSF | Property Manager: | John Stewart Company |
| Total Building Area: | 176,488 GSF | Acquisition Costs: | \$0 |
| TDC/unit w/ Infrastructure Assignment: | Not Applicable to this request | TDC Less <br> Infrastructure Cost/Unit: | Not Applicable to this request |
| Parking? | Yes, 42 spaces (1:0.36 ratio) | HOME Funds? | No |
| Bicycle Parking? | Yes, 42 in Block 14 and 76 in Block 17 |  | - |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- High Costs: The hard costs without infrastructure are the highest in MOHCD's portfolio of similar projects. High costs are attributable to the large proportion of units with three-bedrooms or more; the 42 parking spaces; and the project's significant service-enriched spaces. See Section 5.2.
- The MOHCD loan amount is $\$ 16.7 \mathrm{MM}$ and assumes a $\$ 20 \mathrm{MM}$ MHP loan as a permanent source. If MHP is not awatded, the MOHCD loan will increase by the equivalent amount of the MHP loan. See Section 5.1.
- The project varies from the typical HOPE SF project in two key ways intended to increase its competitiveness for MHP funding: 1) 20 units are set aside for homeless families, and; 2) all of the public housing replacement units, which are subsidized by PBVs, will be affordable to households at or below 32\% MOHCD AMI/25\% TCAC AMI. See Section 4.6.
- While the previous Hunters View predevelopment request included both infrastructure and vertical costs, this request is for vertical costs only, in keeping with MHP requirements. The project will return to Loan Committee in July 2020 with a gap request to include infrastructure and vertical costs. Please see Section 5.I.


## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Predevelopment Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD | $\$ 9,455,027$ | 55 yrs. @ $0.25 \%$ Def $/ R R$ | Awarded |
|  |  |  |  |
| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| MOHCD Vertical | $\$ 16,760,000$ | 55 yrs. @ $0.25 \%$ Def/RR | This Request |
| Permanent Bank Loan | $\$ 26,315,000$ | 30 yrs. @ $4.50 \%$ | Not Committed |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 44,347,506$ | $\$ 1.00$ per credit | Not Committed |
| HCD MHP | $\$ 20,000,000$ | 55 yrs. @ $3.00 \% / \mathrm{RR}$, | Not Committed |
| GP Equity Contribution | $\$ 7,200,000$ |  |  |
| Def Dev Fee | $\$ 1,300,000$ |  | Not Committed |
| Total | $\$ 115,922,506$ |  | Not Committed |
|  |  |  |  |
| Uses | Amount |  |  |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 84,628,945$ |  | Per Unit |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 20,413,516$ | $\$ 717,194$ | $\$ 480$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 10,880,000$ | $\$ 172,996$ | $\$ 116$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 5 , 9 2 2 , 5 0 6}$ | $\$ 92,203$ | $\$ 62$ |

## 1. BACKGROUND

I.1. Project History Leading to This Request

Hunters View was the first HOPE SF development to begin and complete infrastructure improvements and a vertical affordable development, Phase I. Phase I affordable developments have been in operations since April 2013. Two additional affordable housing sites, Phase IIA Blocks 7 \& 11, and Phase IIB - Block 10, along with Ironwood Park and infrastructure, were completed in 2017. With the completion of Phase IIA, all former residents of Hunters View public housing were successfully relocated to new units.

In early 2018, the Sponsor demolished the dilapidated 18 public housing buildings to their foundations to address public safety. During predevelopment, the Sponsor has further defined the Phase III plans, increasing the number of units from the predevelopment loan request of 100 to 118 , increasing the size of the privately owned public open space, Bayview Park, and eliminating a small park that was located on steep terrain that is too difficult to develop. On January $31^{s t}$, the Sponsor's architect completed $100 \%$ development design drawings. On February $20^{\text {th }}$, the Sponsor seeks to extend the sitewide entitlements with the City's Planning Commission.

With MOHCD staff assistance, the Sponsor has designed the project to be competitive for HCD's MHP program. The MHP application is due on March $2^{\text {nd }}$. Infrastructure costs are not part of the application to HCD and are not included in this loan request.
2. BORROWER/GRANTEE PROFILE. (See Attachment A for HOPE SF Project Summary)
2.1 Master Developer and Borrower of Predevelopment Loan.

Hunters View Associates, L.P. ("HVA"), a California limited partnership formed by John Stewart Company, Hunters Point Affordable Housing lnc., (Ridge Point Non-Profit Housing Corporation) and Devine \& Gong, Inc., is the Master Developer, borrower of the
predevelopment loan, and Sponsor of this loan request. HVA will assign infrastructure and demolition costs related to Phase III affordable development to HV Partners 3, LP, a California limited partnership formed by the same three development partners of HVA. HV Partners 3, LP will ultimately be the borrower for Phase IIIA, the affordable housing development. HVA will retain the loans that are solely for horizontal infrastructure construction ("Phase IIIB").

### 2.2 Development Team for Vertical.

In 2003, San Francisco Housing Authority ("SFHA") issued a Request for Qualifications for a developer to redevelop the Hunters View public housing site. In August 2005, SFHA selected the development team originally formed as Hunters View Community Partners "HVCP" (and now currently formed as HVA) and comprised of the John Stewart Company ("JSCo"), Devine \& Gong, Incorporated ("DGI"), and Hunters Point Affordable Housing, Inc. (a subsidiary of Ridge Point Nonprofit Housing Corporation ("Ridge Point").

JSCo is the Lead Developer and project manager of Phase III. Devine and Gong, Inc. is the financial corisultant and Co-Developer. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") is the procurement agency for Hunters View as determined through the Master Development Agreement between HVA and SFHA dated July 23, 2009 in Article $11.4(f)$ and further defined in Interagency Memorandum between the former Redevelopment Agency, SFHA, MOHCD, and the Office of Workforce \& Development ("OEWD") dated January 21,2011. MOHCD became the housing delivery agent of Hunters View after the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency and is responsible for carrying out the former Redevelopment agreements that apply to Hunters View. Through these agreements, MOHCD is responsible for completing Hunters View, including all market rate parcels and Phase III.

Working with OCII's Compliance Specialist, Hunters View has complied with the OCII procurement protocols for the vertical design team.

| Consultant Type |  |  | Vame |
| ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Project Manager | Catherine Etzel, The John <br> Stewart Company | N | Outstanding <br> Procurement <br> Issues |
| Architect (Lead) | David Baker Architects | N |  |
| Architect (Co-Lead) | Min Design | N | N |
| Landscape Architect | Fletcher Studio | N | N |
| General Contractor | Cahill-Nibbi Joint Venture | N | N |
| Owner's Rep/CM | Allan Butler | N |  |
| Financial Consultant | Devine \& Gong, Inc. | N | N |
| Legal | Charles Olson, Lubin Olson | N | N |
| Property Manager | The John Stewart Company | N | N |
| Services Provider for the | Bayview YMCA | N |  |
| entire Hunters View: | N <br> DPH <br> FranDelja Enrichment Center | N | N |

3. PRIOR MOHCD/OCII FUNDING FOR CURRENT REQUEST

Predevelopment loan for $\$ 9,455,027$ was executed in June 2017.

### 3.1 Disbursement Status.

As of January $2020, \$ 4,138,388$ has been drawn with $\$ 5,316,639$ remaining.
3.2 Fulfillment of Loan Conditions. The following "Conditions to Prior to Gap Financing" were stipulated in the predevelopment loan agreement for $\$ 9,455,027$.

- Sponsor must submit a financing plan and line-item budget that meets MOHCD underwriting guidelines, is within range of comparable projects, and conforms to TCAC and CDLAC requirements.

Status: In process. MOHCD continues to meet with the Sponsor to discuss overall budget and construction pricing. These activities will continue prior to gap financing request.

- Sponsor must submit a cash flow for MOHCD approval showing an acceptable DSCR, income trending, reserve funding, and surplus cash split. Status: Incomplete. DSCR and reserves exceeds MOHCD gujdelines. Sponsor must correct this prior to gap loan funding request.
- If covered bicycle parking is part of vertical design, access to bicycle parking must have secured access not connected to the parking garage entrance.

Status: Complete. Bicycle parking is on the ground of Phase IIIA's building and is not accessed through the garage.

- Sponsor must submit an infrastructure cost comparison among Hunters View phases that demonstrates reasonable costs for the phase.

Status: In process. Infrastructure is not part of this request. MOHCD continues to meet with the Sponsor to discuss infrastructure costs.

- Sponsor must submit comparison of Hunters View phases for vertical architecture services that demonstrate reasonable architectural costs for Phase III.

Status: In process. Staff and the Sponsor have discussed overall architectural cost. However, the comparison has not been provided yet. The architect comparison and breakdown must be provided by June 1, 2020.

- Sponsor must provide construction management services contract detailing and separating vertical construction management services from infrastructure.

Status: Not Applicable. This request does not include infrastructure cost. Construction management services for vertical construction are not shown on the budget. Prior to gap financing, the Sponsor must show construction management services on the appropriate line item.
4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN
4.1. Site Description

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Parcel Mapping: | The Tentative Map is complete. The Final Map is under review with <br> Department of Public Works ("DPW") - Bureau of Street Use and <br> Mapping ("BSM"). The Sponsor anticjpates Final Map approval at <br> the Board of Supervisors in June/July 2020. The new map creates the <br> vertical parcel that underlies Phase IIIA. |


| Zoning: | RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low-Density) which allows 1 dwelling unit per 800 square foot ("sf or SF") of lot area. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Maximum units allowed by current zoning: | Up to 1,000 units allowed for the entire Hunters View development area. |
| Seismic (if applicable): | The entire Hunters View site is located in Seismic Zone 4. Seismic requirements for the building will be determined prior to gap funding request. |
| Soil type: | The near surface soil consists primarily of $11 / 2$ to 15 feet of dark brown to grayish-brown silty clay and silt with varying amounts of sand/gravel. Under this is serpentine bedrock. Further information is in the Phase I report by ENGEO dated May 21, 2010. |
| Environmental Review: | CEQA/NEPA was approved in 2008 for the entire site. <br> With the extension of the sitewide entitlements, the Sponsor seeks to increase the height limit from 45 feet to 65 feet. Because the initial EIR did not contemplate Phase III, an EIR Addendum will be included with the sitewide entitlement request to the Planning Commission on February $20^{\text {th }}$. |
| Adjacent uses (North): | PGE site. |
| Adjacent uses (South): | Residential neighborhood on Innes Avenue. |
| Adjacent uses (East): | Privately owned homes. |
| Adjacent uses (West): | Hunters View Phase IIA - Block 7 \& 11. |
| Neighborhood Amenities within 0.5 miles: | Malcolm X Academy is directly adjacent to the site; Hilltop Park is within 0.25 miles, and Promontory Park, the new park in Phase I is 2 blocks away. The new Bayview Park in Phase III is located between Block 14 and 17. Foods Co. is approximately 1.12 miles away. |
| Public Transportation within 0.5 miles: | Muni 19 and 44 bus lines run directly through Hunters View along Middle Point Road with stops about a block from Blocks 14 and 17. |
| Article 34: | Article 34 authorization was completed with the predevelopment loan. However, with the increase of affordable units, an update to the Article 34 authorization is in process. |
| Article 38: | Exempt. While the project will be a new construction development, it is not listed within the Article 38 Air Pollution Exposure Zone Map area. |
| Accessibility: | Per TCAC requirements there are a total of $13(10 \%)$ mobility units and 5 (5\%) communication units. |
| Green Building: | Blocks 14 and 17 will be LEED Silver. |


| Recycled Water: | Phase IIIA was originally in the zone for recycled water (Middle Point <br> is the bisecting cut off). However, affordable housing projects are <br> exempt from this requirement due to pending legislation. The Sponsor <br> is including the recycled water piping in the infrastructure. Recycled <br> water piping is not planned for the affordable housing on Blocks 14 <br> and 17. Confirmation that the recycled water may be deleted from <br> infrastructure will be made prior to gap loan closing. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Storm Water <br> Management:Hunters View Phase IIA - Blocks 7 \& II has an existing Storm Water <br> Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") that was applied to Block 10 <br> and will apply to Phase III demolition due to overlap. If any part of <br> Phase III extends beyond Phase IIA, a discrete and specific SWPPP <br> for the extended work may be required. As necessary, development of <br> the SWPPP will occur during the infrastructure planning process and <br> is not part of this loan request. |  |
| Prop I Noticing: | Completed in 2016 prior to the Mayor's execution of predevelopment <br> loan. |

### 4.2. Site Control

The site is owned by SFHA, which in keeping with the HOPE SF model is responsible for approving business terms and transaction documents. The form of the long-term vertical ground lease will be in place before vertical construction begins. The short-term horizontal ground leases will be in place prior to or at the construction loan closing for horizontal construction.

### 4.3. Proposed Design

As the last affordable housing development of the Hunters View Revitalization, Phase IIIA's unit mix for the buildings must comply with Community Redevelopment Law ("CRL") Section 33413 which requires that "an equal number of replacement dwelling units that have an equal or greater number of bedrooms as those destroyed or removed units at affordable housing costs within the territorial jurisdiction." While CRL does not require the exact unit-type replacement to occur onsite the Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance Number 201-01 in 2008 requiring that at Hunters View one-to-one replacement "shall mean replacement with a unit mix with the equivalent or greater number of bedrooms per unit as currently exists."
All of the original 267 public housing units at Hunters View must be replaced. Up to $48 \%$ of these, or 127 units, were vacant at the time of the negotiations and before Phase I infrastructure began. The 140 families in the occupied units were eligible for replacement housing. OCII, MOHCD, and SFHA made a priority to relocate and permanently house the residents living onsite so they could live comfortably while active construction continued near their homes and in their immediate neighborhood. Many of the existing households were too small for the large units they occupied and were considered "overhoused" per HUD regulations. OCII, MOHCD, SFHA, and the developer jointly decided to provide more one-bedrooms and two-bedrooms in Phase I, IIA, and IIB in order to meet the housing needs of existing residents. As a result, replacement of the larger unit sizes has fallen to Phase IIIA.

The chart below summarizes the number of replacement units and the unit mix that existed at the time of negotiations. The chart also summarizes the unit mix constructed in Phase I and II and the units to be constructed to comply with CRL requirements for HV Phase III.

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 of bedrooms | \# of SFHA <br> Replacement Units by Unit Size at Hunters View prior to demolition of Phase I | Total \#SFHA Replacement Units by Unit Size In Phase I \& II that comply with Enditlaments | \# of Units by Unit Size without Rental Subsidy at 50\% AMI that are excluded from SFHA Replacement Unit Count (Column 1) | Total \#\# of Units by Unit Size that comply with CRL, SFHA Replacement Units, and Entitiements completed in Phase I 8 II | Total ${ }^{\text {In }}$ of Uitts by Unit <br> Sle to construct in Phase III that comply with CRL, SFHA Replacement Units, and Entitiements |
| 1 | 7 | 53 | 19 | 72 | 0 |
| 2 | 78 | 59 | 20 | 79 | 3 |
| 3 | 113 | 78 | 24 | 102 | 11 |
| 4 | 60 | 20 | 6 | 26 | 34 |
| 5 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
|  | 267 | 214 | 69 | 283 | 53 |

Based on the replacement requirement, Phase IIIA will include 50 public housing replacement units that are 3 or more bedrooms in order to meet the exact unit replacement required by the project's entitlements; an additional 5 tax credit units will have 3 or more bedrooms. In 2016, Cahill-Nibbi Joint Ventures ("CNJV), the general contractor for HV Phase I and II, provided a cost estimate for a 53 -unit building matching the unit mix in Column 5 ; the per unit cost was over $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{MM}$ including infrastructure. The current 118 -unit development on two parcels mitigates the higher cost of the smaller program by distributing the costs of the larger units across a larger project overall.

Block 14 is designed to be a five-story, Type IIIA wood construction over podium building. Residential units are on floors 1 through 5 and total 42 units. Some of the first floor units have stoops that open to Bayview Park, which is located between Block 14 and 17. The ground floor also contains property management offices, laundry room, indoor bicycle storage, activity room, and a 2,123 square feet ("sf") community-serving space planned as a "library" and/or education center available to Hunters View families and the greater Hunters View neighborhood. Preliminary design for Block 14 also contained 42 parking spaces for all residents of Block 14 and 17 at a parkjng ratio of 0.36. The garage and units are accessible by two elevators. In February 2020, he Sponsor, MOHCD, HOPE SF and the District Supervisor agreed to increase the off-street parking by 14 spaces, from 42 to 56 units. Costs for the additional'parking spaces are not in this loan request, but will be incorporated into the gap loan request in Summer 2020: current estimates are about $\$ 1.4 \mathrm{MM}$ for these additional parking spaces.

Block 17 is a U-shaped building designed to be a five-story Type IIIA wood construction over a small podium. The podium portion of the building is at the 1,512 s.f. commercial space on the ground floor. Residential units are also on the ground floor and up to the fifth floor and are accessible by two elevators. The residential units in Block 17 total 76 units. Three of the first floor units have stoops that open onto Bayview Park and four ground floor units open onto the interior courtyard picnic area. The ground floor also contains property management offices, laundry room, indoor bicycle storage, two service offices, a meeting/activities room, and large community room with kitchen and storage. Block 17 does not contain parking.

| Avg. Unit SF by type: | 1-brdm avg sf: 620 sf (Bik $14=17$ units \& Bik $17=32$ unils) <br> 2-brdm avg sf: 920 sf (Blk $14=7$ units \& Bik $17=7$ units) <br> 3-brdm avg sf: $1,050 \mathrm{sf}$ (Blk $14=8$ units \& Bik $17=8$ unils) <br> 4-brdm avg sf: $1,350-1,540$ sf (Blk $14=10$ unis \& Bik $17=24$ units) <br> 5 -brdm avg sf: $1,630-1,800 \mathrm{sf}$ (Blk $17=5$ units) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Residential SF: | 172,853 sf  <br> Block 14 Residential: $77,406 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Block 17 Residential: $40,216 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Combined Total Circulation sf: $26,491 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Block 14 Parking: $16,778 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Combine Total Common Area: $10,806 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Combined Total Property Management \& Resident Services Offices:  <br> $1,146 \mathrm{sf}$  |
| Total Commercial SF | 3,635 <br> For Block 14: 2,123 sf <br> For Block 17: 1,512 sf |
| Total Parking SF: | 16,788 <br> Parking Garage SF: 16,788 (42 parking spaces in Block 14 only) <br> In February 2020, the Sponsor, MOHCD, HOPE SF and the District Supervisor agreed to increase the off-street parking by 14 spaces, from 42 to 56 units. Costs are not in this loan request, but will be incorporated into the gap loan request related to a CDLAC project application, and current estimates are about $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{MM}$ for these additional parking spaces. |
| Building Total SF | 176,488 |

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

HV Phase IIIA estimates a $\$ 84,628,945$ construction budget based on $100 \%$ SD drawings dated July 2019. JSCo will provide to MOHCD updated contractor pricing by March 30, 2020 for $50 \%$ DD's dated $12 / 05 / 19$ and informed by the $100 \%$ DD's dated $1 / 31 / 2019$. The "informed by" pricing means that the differences between the $50 \%$ DD's and the $100 \%$ DD's will be re-bid by the general contractor's subcontractors. The MHP application is due on March $2^{\text {nd }}$, and due to timing the $100 \%$ DD's construction pricing could not be incorporated into this loan evaluation request. The Construction Specialist will review $50 \%$ DD's informed by the $100 \%$ DD's pricing in March. Loan Committee will have another opportunity to review this project in July 2020 when it seeks a CDLAC application gap loan commitment. At the time of that request, the construction numbers will be based on $35 \%$ construction drawings or greater.
4.5. Commercial Spaces. Along the new Hunters View Drive with entrances to Bayview Park, the Sponsor has plans for a 2,123 sf library/educational center in Block 14 and a 1,512 sf to-bedetermined community-serving commercial space in Block 17. The "library" space grew out of discussions with San Francisco Public Library ("SFPL") and HOPE SF about common areas in the affordable housing spaces that would be open to and designed to encourage interactions between the affordable housing households and market rate households. Due to budget constraints SFPL is only able to provide a state-of-the-art book vending machine rather than a built out and staffed SFPL branch. The Sponsor with assistance from the HOPE SF Backbone

Team is looking for a community-serving educational partner that would complete the tenant improvements of the space and operate it under the HOPE SF guiding principles.

### 4.6. Target Population

In order to submit a competitive MHP application, the project includes additional affordability and special needs requirements as follows:

1) 20 units are set aside for homeless families. This is the first time that a HOPE SF project has fncluded both public housing replacement and homeless units. Together, the number of units set aside is $62 \%$, which is less than the recent public housing replacement ratio of $75 \%$ at Hunters View Phase I and II, Sunnydale and Potrero. With services support from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("DHSH") and LOSP subsidies for the formerly homeless families, the combination of household types is expected to be successful.
2) All of the PBV units, which are also public housing replacement units, will be affordable to households at or below $32 \%$ MOHCD AMI $/ 25 \%$ TCAC AMI. While the maximum affordability for Hunters View units is $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI, 159 units of 286 units built or $56 \%$ in prior Hunters View phases are targeted to lower AMIs, also to increase competitiveness for State funding sources. The deeper income targeting is mitigated by the fact that all Hunters View households that lived onsite have exercised their right to return to a revitalized unit. The 53 public housing replacement units will be available to former Hunters View residents under the new Right to Return legislation passed in December 2019, which establishes priority and preference to households who can document Hunters View residency.

The Sponsor may opt to designate five tax credit units at $32 \%$ MOHCD AMI/25\% TCAC AMI, freeing up five PBV units to serve households up to $50 \%$ MOHCD AMI/40\% TCAC AMI.

### 4.7. Marketing \& Occupancy Preferences

Three target populations -- homeless families, public housing replacement households, tax credit-eligible households without rental subsidies -- will require three kinds of marketing, outreach and preferences.

For the 20 units set-aside for homeless families: Households will be referred to these units through the Coordinated Entry System operated by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("DHSH"). JSCo Property Management will work with the LOSP service provider, Lutheran Social Services, MOHCD, and DHSH td implement the City's Housing First model. The marketing and final supportive services plan for these units will be submitted to DHSH and MOHCD six-months prior to the issuance of the temporary certificate of occupancy ("TCO").

For the 53 public housing replacement units: Households will be referred to these units by SFHA based on Hunters View Public Housing Replacement Units preference listed in the current SFHA Admin Plan. The HOPE SF Resident Selection Criteria must be submitted to MOHCD six-months prior to the issuance of TCO.

For the 44 tax credit units without rental subsidy: The tax credit units will be marketed through MOHCD's typical DAHLIA lottery process, including MOHCD's required preference system detailed below.

| MOHCD Preference <br> Level | Applicant Category |
| :---: | :--- |
| $* 1$ | Former Hunters View households who can document their previous <br> Husters View tenancy but do not have a formal right to return. |
| 2 | Certificate of Preference ("COP") Holders |
| 3 | Displaced Tenants Housing Preference ("DTHP") Certificate Holders <br> (20\%) |
| 4 | Neighborhood Residential Housing Preference ("NRHP") (40\%"*) |
| 5 | Live or Work in San Francisco |
| 6 | All Other |

*In December 2019, the Board of Supervisors passed legislation that establishes an additional preference in tax credit and public housing replacement units at HOPE SF sites. Former Hunters View households who can document their previous Hunters View tenancy but do not have a formal right to return will have priority for these units. A similar preference has been implemented at Alice Griffith and, based on that experience, will most likely be exercised by households who (1) were not on the original SFHA lease; (2) were on lease but now want or need to start their own household, or; (3) moved away from the property before HOPE SF launched and the Right to Return was instituted.
**If MHP funding is awarded, the NRHP is decreased to $25 \%$ of TCAC units.

## 5. FINANCING PLAN

5.1. Potential/Proposed Permanent Financing. The Sponsor and Co-Developer propose to use the combination of the following permanent sources for the vertical Phase IIIA development:

MOHCD ( $\$ 16,760,000$ ): For the MHP Application Gap Loan Commitment request, the MOHCD sources included in this loan request are listed below.
i. Low Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund ("LMIHAF") ( $\$ 3,000,000$ ): This predevelopment source was included in the total MHP Application Loan Commitment Letter
ii. Certificate of Participation ("COP Funds") (\$9,260,000): This total amount includes the predevelopment COP Funds amount of $\$ 6,455,027$ and an additional $\$ 2,804,973$.
iii. Tax Increment Excess Proceeds ( $\$ 4,509,000$ ): This is the amount of excess proceeds returned to MOHCD from the Phase IIA QCII loan.
The MOHCD loan includes a to-be-defined commercial warm-shell loan for the commercial spaces. The construction line items included in the commercial warm-shell loan will be provided to MOHCD for review and approval prior to the gap loan request and will include a schedule and marketing strategy indicating that the commercial spaces will be occupied at construction completion. The strategy for the commercial spaces will be developed in cooperation with the HOPE SF Backbone team.

Permanent Loan ( $\$ 26,315,000$ ): The permanent lender has not been selected. The Sponsor plans to issue the lender Request for Proposals ("RFP") in May or June of 2020 and make a selection by July 2020 prior to the CDLAC/TCAC application. The Sponsor is assuming a credit enhanced loan at a $4.50 \%$ fixed interest rate with a 30 -year term, 30 -year amortization, and 1.15 DSCR. The Sponsor will work to reduce the DSCR to MOHCD underwriting standards before the gap loan request.

Tax Credits ( $\$ 44,347,506$ ): The investor has not been selected. The Sponsor will issue the investor RFP along with the lender RFP. MOHCD will require a review of the raw data received from the RFP respondents and must approve the selected investor. The tax credit equity is based on a pricing of $\$ 1.00$ per credit. While Hunters View has historically received higher pricing (see chart below), the current market for tax credits has been negatively impacted by recent federal tax changes.

| Hunters View Phase | Tax Credit Pricing |
| :--- | :--- |
| Phase IA - Blocks 4, 5, 6 | $\$ 0.94$ (4\% tax credits) |
| Phase IIA - Blocks 7 \& 11 | $\$ 1.16$ (4\% tax credits) |
| Phase IIB - Block 10 | $\$ 1.14$ (9\% tax credits) |
| Phase IIIA | $\$ 1.00$ (4\% tax credit estimate) |

The Sponsor and staff have underwritten the loan conservatively given the complicated nature of this transaction and based on Sponsor's experience with previous Hunter View phases. Phase IIIA's tax credit pricing is conservative, and staff will require that any additional equity raised will be used to off-set the City's gap loan.

HCD Programs: MOHCD requires that all developers receiving City funds for new construction and substantial rehabilitations seek to leverage City financing with available and applicable HCD financing programs. The proposed project budget does not include financing from HCD's Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program ("AHSC"), Infill Infrastructure Grant Program ("IIG"), or Transit Oriented Development Housing Program ("TOD") per the reasons provided below. Based on the analysis below, MHP is the only HCD Program available to leverage City funds.
i. AHSC: This program funds land use, housing, transportation, and land preservation to support infill and compact developments that reduced greenhouse gas emissions. A competitive development in San Francisco typically is associated with Municipal Transportation Agency ("MTA") developments. Currently, there are no MTA projects associated with Hunters View.
ii. 11G: The Sponsor and MOHCD were awarded $\$ 30 \mathrm{MM}$ IIG funds in May 2011 for the entire Hunters View developmeht. IIG has been allocated to each Hunters View phase based on the number of affordaple units and the cost of infrastructure work.
Approximately $\$ 20.9 \mathrm{MM}$ has been allocated to Phase IA, Phase IB, and IIA. The Sponsor and MOHCD estimate approximately $\$ 3.9 \mathrm{MM}$ will be used exclusively for the Phase IIIB - infrastructures.
iii. MHP ( $\$ 20,000,000$ ): The Sponsor will apply for MHP in March 2020. During the predevelopment period, the Sponsor completed work to make the Hunters View Phase IIIA as competitive as possible for an MHP award. These competitive changes are (1) added 20 units set-aside for homeless families, and (2) sought and received approval from the HOPE SF Backbone team to restrict the public housing replacement units to $32 \%$ MOHCD AMI $/ 25 \%$ TCAC AMI. The Sponsor and staff assume the project will receive threshold points under MHP , and will have an average income restriction of approximately $46 \%$ MOHCD AMI/35\% TCAC AMI project-wide. However, if not awarded the MOHCD loan will increase by the equivalent amount of the MHP loan.
iv. TOD: TOD seeks to increase the overall supply of housing, increase the supply of affordable housing, increase public transit ridership, and minimize auto trips. Since Hunters View is not located near any public transit stations, Hunters View is unlikely to be ineligible for TOD funding.

General Partner Equity ( $\$ 7,200,000$ ): The Sponsor will take the maximum allowable developer fee under TCAC and the general partner will contribute to Hunters View Phase IIIA consistent with MOHCD guidelines.

Deferred Developer Fee $(\$ 1,300,000)$ : The Sponsor will take the maximum MOHCD allowable deferred developer fee and contribute the fee to the Project

Federal Home Loan Bank ("FHLB") Affordable Housing Program ("AHP"): The proposed budget does not show AHP financing. MOHCD will require that the Sponsor apply to the FHLB-San Francisco for AHP in an amount up to $\$ 1,170,00060$ days after construction has started in order to maximize competitiveness. Any AHP funds awarded will reduce the MOHCD loan by an equal amount. Also, the Sponsor's equity and debt RFP must mention the desire of the Sponsor to apply for AHP. If the selected debt and/or equity lender is not a member bank, it must commit to working with the Sponsor in their RFP response to partner with and/or find a member bank to submit an AHP application.

| DEVELOPMENT BUDGET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit are within standards | N | Hard costs are $\$ 717,194$ per unit. The Sponsor will work with MOHCD to reduce overall project costs. |
| Construction Hard Cost Contingency is at least 5\% (new construction) | N | Hard cost contingency is $6.2 \%$,but includes $1.2 \%$ of escalation. |
| Escalation amount is commensurate with time period until expected construction start, not to exceed $15 \%$ | Y | Design, bid, and plan check escalations total $13.2 \%$ as shown on the permanent budget. |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees are within standards | N | The Sponsor will refine architectural fees prior to gap financing request. |
| Construction Management Fees ard within standards | N/A | Construction Management fees are currently not shown on estimated budget. |
| Permit Fees | Y | \$277,374K for Permit Fees and processing fees, $\$ 2.42 \mathrm{MM}$ for impact fees. |
| Developer Fee is within standards, see also disbursement chart below | Y | Total Maximum cash out fee is $\$ 1.10 \mathrm{M}$. The total At-Risk Fee is $\$ 1.280 \mathrm{MM}$. See Section 6 below. |
| Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ per standards | N | Soft cost contingency is $2.9 \%$. Sponsor recognized the total development costs and soft costs exceed similar projects in MOHCD's portfolio and have elected to keep the soft cost contingency low. |


| Capitalized Operating Reserves are a <br> minimum of 3 months of operating <br> budget | Y(per below) | Sponsors has 6 months of operating budget <br> and the amount exceeds HCD guidelines. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Debt Service Reserve | N | Staff does not consent to the debt service <br> reserve at this time. Sponsor must <br> evaluate the necessity for a debt service <br> reserve given that 45\% of the units are <br> PBV's. MOHCD must review and <br> approve analysis prior to gap financing. |
| HCD Transition Reserve | N | Staff does not consent to the HCD <br> transition reserve at this time. If awarded <br> MHP, Sponsor must work with MOHCD <br> and HCD to reduce this reserve. |

### 5.2. Permanent Uses Evaluation

Hard Costs: On a per-unit basis, HV Phase IIIA has the highest hard construction costs and total development costs ("TDC") of similar projects within the MOHCD portfolio. A key cost driver for Phase IIIA is that $47 \%$ of the units are three-bedroom or larger, adding project costs including additionalsquare footage, roof area, windows, corridor space in units. Other cost drivers are related to the HOPE SF goals and include parking, additional plumbing for washer/dryer hooks ups in all units three-bedrooms or larger, and additional community serving commercial spaces and services offices to assist in building community

Despite the high per unit-costs, HV IIIA is one of the lower cost developments in the MOHCD portfolio on a per-bedroom basis.

Architectural Fees: As currently budgeted, fees are over MOHCD's architectural fee policy by $\$ 935,750$. Architectural fees were based on fees from previous Hunters View phases, which were underwritten based on the MOHCD architectural fee policies in place in 2016. The Sponsor will refine architectural fees prior to gap financing request. If fees remain over MOHCD underwriting guidelines, Sponsor will provide an explanation for the architectural fee overruns based on architect's estimated hours of work for proposed scope.

Please note that a portion of architectural expenses includes costs already incurred by HVA to conduct master planning analysis and studies and respond to a request by MOHCD fo explore creative solutions to meet the exact-unit type replacement required by City Resolution 080692, Ordinance Number 201-01. Sponsor will provide a breakdown of the architectural fees related to this ordinance analysis and cost associated with vertical development only

Capitalized Operating Reserve: Per HCD underwriting guidelines, the capitalized operating reserve is calculated as three months of operations plus debt service minus social services. This project's capitalized operating reserve totals $\$ 846,309$ and is 6 months of operating expenses, including services, and not including debt service. The six months is based on reserves at completed Hunters View Phase I, IIA, and IIB. Prior to the gap request, the Sponsor will reduce this to MOHCD acceptable guidelines and will exclude the social services as required by HCD.

Debt Service Reserve: This is 6 months of must pay debt only and totals $\$ 845,005$. The six months is based on reserves at completed Hunters View Phase I, IIA, and IIB. Sponsor has underwritten 6 months due to lender/investor underwriting requirements on the previous Hunters

View phases. Prior to the gap request, the Sponsor will reduce this to MOHCD acceptable guidelines.

HCD Transition Reserves: HCD will require a rental assistance transition reserve in the amount sufficient to prevent one year rent increases for units that formerly received rental assistance and were restricted to households with incomes not exceeding a percent of AMI. For Hunters View Phase IIIA, this amount is calculated at $\$ 2.5 \mathrm{MM}$ for the public housing replacement units pnly and does not include LOSP units. If awarded MHP, the Sponsor must work with MOHCD and HCD to reduce this reserve.

## 6. DEVELOPER FEE

The Sponsor is requesting cash out developer fee of $\$ 2,380,000$, of which $\$ 1,280,000$ will be at risk. Additionally, the Sponsor is proposing $\$ 1,300,000$ in deferred developer fees supported by project cash flow and $\$ 7,200,000$ in GP equity. Staff supports this request.

### 6.1. Permanent Financing Developer Fee



## 7. PROJECT OPERATIONS

### 7.1. Annual Operating Budget

The total annual operating expenses are $\$ 13,845$ per unit per annual (PUPA). While the project has units for formerly homeless households, no front desk is currently planned at Phase IIIA. Security cost for Hunters View are shared with the other sites and with other JSCo managed developments in Hunters Point. Security Payroll/Contract is divided proportionally between LOSP-supported units and non-LOSP units.

The Project's operating income includes LOSP rental subsidy in the amount of $\$ 119,014$ annually ( $\$ 7,934$ PUPA). For the number of units, the LOSP subsidy is high, but the higher cost is due to the higher operating cost at Hunters View.

Project Based Section 8 (PBV) Units: Hunters View Phase IIIA was awarded 53 Project Based Vouchers in June 2016. The award was for 15 year contracts. In March 2020, SFHA will extend the contract to 20 years with an automatic 20 -year renewal. Income from the PBV Section 8 units is based on current payment standards less utility allowances. If payment standards increase before the HAP contract is executed, the Project gap will decrease.

Commercial Rents: While the project plans for a commercial tenant, no commercial income or expenses are associated with the project at this time. Prior to gap, Sponsor must show in their operating assumptions some information related to operating the commercial spaces and rental assumptions in the MOHCD commercial operating budget.
7.2. Unit Matrix. Based on 2019 MOHCD AMI. These numbers will be updated before Gap.

| Unit <br> Type | Unit <br> Count | S.F. | Max Gross <br> Rent | Max \% <br> MOHCD AMI | Target \% <br> MOHCD AMI | Rent, Operating <br> Subsidy |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1BR | 15 | 620 | $\$ 686$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | LOSP |
| 1BR | 34 | 620 | $\$ 1,231$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| 2BR | 3 | 920 | $\$ 809$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | LOSP |
| 2BR | 3 | 920 | $\$ 1,129$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | PBV |
| 2BR | 7 | 920 | $\$ 1,386$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| 3BR | 11 | 1,050 | $\$ 1,237$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | PBV |
| 3BR | 3 | 1,050 | $\$ 1,540$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| 3BR | 2 | 1,050 | $\$ 1,540$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | LOSP |
| 4BR | 34 | 1,35010 | $\$ 1,319$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | PBV |
| 1,540 | $\$ 1,630$ | $\$ 1,402$ | $50 \%$ | $33 \%$ | PBV |  |
| 5BR | 5 | 1,800 |  |  |  |  |
| 2BR <br> Manager | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total <br> Units | 118 |  |  |  |  |  |

### 7.3. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation

| Underwriting Standard | Operating Proforma <br> Meets <br> Standard? | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio is <br> between minimum 1.10:1 in year 1 and <br> maximum 1.00:1 in year 17 | N | DSCR is 1.16:1 in Year I and 1.41 in year <br> 17. Developer will adjust the DSCR to meet <br> MOHCD underwriting before Gap. |


| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays above $1.00: 1$ for entirety of projected 20-year cash flow | Y |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacancy meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy is 5\% |
| Annual Income Growth is increased at 2.5\% per year | N | Annual Income Growth is 2.0\% |
| Annual Operating Expenses are increased at $3.5 \%$ per year | N | Annual Income Growth is 3.0\% |
| Base year opefating expenses per unit are reasonable per comparables | N | Total operating expenses are $\$ 13,845$ PUPA before reserves and ground lease rents, slightly higher than HOPE SF developments and on the higher end of projects in MOHCD's portfolio. |
| Property Management Fee is at allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total property management fee is $\$ 62$ PUPM |
| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Y | 1 FTE property manager, 2 FTE occupancy specialist, 0.5 office assistant, 1.5 FTE maintenance technician, 2 FTE grounds/janitor |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Y | Based on a 2022 first year occupancy |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or exceed TCAC minimum standards | N | Replacement reserves are $\$ 600$ PUPY, higher than the TCAC and HCD underwriting guidelines. Prior to gap request, Sponsor must reduce this amount to be within TCAC, HCD, or MOHCD standards. |
| Limited Partnership Asset Management Fee meets standards | Y | Based on a 2022 first year occupancy |
| Homeowner's Association (HOA) | N/A | \$77,000 per year project-wide (based on Phase I \& II HCD cap). (See comment below this chart.) |
| Rental Subsidies? Yes |  | Phase IIIA has 53 PBV and 20 LOSP units. |

Property Management Staffing: HV Phase III property management staff and maintenance staff will be shared with HV Phase I, IIA, and IIB. Sponsor will continue to evaluate staffing for all of Hunters View and will inform MOHCD Asset Management and HOPE SF as staffing patterns changes. Sponsor must provide an updated proposed staffing plan to MOHCD prior to the CDLAC gap financing request. The updated plan must include a staffing plan comparison to completed phases with annual total and per unit per annual totals. Below is a chart showing the staffing across all phases based on annual totals per phase.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Phase } 1 \\ & 107 \text { Unlts } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Phase 2A } \\ 107 \text { Units (609) } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Block } 10 \\ 72 \text { Units } \text { (40\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Combined Phase 2A/ Block 10 | Phase 3 <br> 118 Units |  | $\begin{gathered} P 1,2 A, 2 B, 3 A \\ 398 \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# of staff |  | \# of staff |  |  |  | 4 of staff |  |  |
| Property Manager | 1 | 588,000 | 1 | \$45,000 | \$30,000 | \$75,000 | $\pm$ | 575,000 | 5238,000 |
| Assistant Property Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Occupancy Specialist | 1 | \$55,200 | 1 | 529,952 | \$19,968 | S49,920 | 1 | \$45,000 | \$151,120 |
| Office Assistant | 0.5 | \$18,000 | 1 | 526,208 | \$17,472 | \$43,680 | 0.5 | \$18,000 | 579,680 |
| Maintenance | 1 | 578,000 | 1 | 529,952 | \$19,968 | \$49,920 | 1.5 | \$86.400 | \$214,320 |
| Mainterance | 0.5 | \$19,760 | 0.5 | \$12,636 | \$8,424 | \$21,060 |  |  | \$40,820 |
| Grounds/ Janitor weekends only | 1.5 | 557,210 | 2.5 | 545,864 | \$30,576 | 576,440 | 2 | 573,200 | \$206,850 |
| Janitors 8/hour |  | \$12,400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Processing (1.656) |  | \$5,640 |  | \$3,600 | \$2,400 | \$6,000 |  | 53,500 | \$15,240 |
| Payroll Tax (11\%) |  | \$33,600 |  | 520,465 | \$15,010 | \$35,4才5 |  | 533,000 | \$102,075 |
| Workers Compensation (7\%) |  | 518,000 |  | \$10,778 | \$8,047 | \$18,825 |  | \$20,400 | \$57,225 |
| Health lenefits (\$725pp) |  | \$45,600 |  | 537,548 | \$25,065 | \$62,613 |  | \$56,400 | \$164,613 |
| 401 K |  | \$3,600 |  | \$2.520 | \$1,680 | \$4,200 |  | 51,200 | \$9,000 |
| Total |  | \$435,010 |  | \$264,523 | \$178,610 | \$443,133 |  | \$413,200 | \$1,291,343 |

*Office Assisant - Shared 50\% HVP1 and 50\% HVP3

HOA Fees: All developed units in Hunters View pay an HOA fee, which is capped at $\$ 1,000$ per unit per year by the project's Master Development Agreement for the affordable housing units. The HOA fee is an operating cost paid by the property owner and not the residents. At Hunters View, development of the affordable housing and parks (Promontory Park, completed in Phase I, and Ironwood Park, completed in Phase II) have preceded the market rate developments. When the forsale parcels are completed, the affordable housing's HOA fees will be reassessed and reduced. Both prior phases funded by HCD MHP financing (Phase IA \& IIA), capped the total HOA fee at $\$ 77,000$ per phase. The Sponsor proposes to cap the HOA fees for Phase IIIA at $\$ 77,000$ ( $\$ 652$ PUPA), the amount is shown in the operating budget.

## 8. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

### 8.1. Services Plan

For the 97 non-LOSP units, it is anticipated that the current service provider, Bayview YMCA, will extend its services to Hunters View Phase III, as assumed by the License Agreement with Bayview YMCA. Bayview YMCA is the primary service provider at Hunters View, providing housing stability services, resident activities, service coordination, and sponsor of the residentled food bank. All Hunters View Phase HIIA residents will have access to the services and amenities offered at 901 A Fairfax, the Hunters View hub which contains the Wellness Center operated by the Department of Public Health ("DPH") and includes an on site nurse, as well as mental health support services and peer leaders provided by Urban Services YMCA. The hub also contains a recording studio operating by Blue Bear, Inc., a gym, a lending library, and the resident-led food bank. Phase IIIA residents may also access the childcare center located at 901B Fairfax operated by Frandelja Enrichment Center ("FranDelJa"). FranDelja provides childcare and early childhood education with subsized slots for all infants, toddlers and preschool age children at Hunters View.

### 8.2. Service Budget

Resident services are budgeted at $\$ 79,800$ per year, or $\$ 682$ per unit, and are consistent with the underwriting of services site-wide. None of the operating budget or services budget expense in Phase IIIA or any prior phases support the FranDelJa childcare spaces. The services budget includes \$25 PUPA for tenant engagement as required under RAD, even though Phase IIIA has no RAD units; JSCo has agreed to extend this RAD benefit to the tenant association that represents all phases.

Only a portion of Bayview YMCA's budget is supported by the services budget of Phase I and II. The Phase I and II total resident services budget totals $\$ 245,200$ for 286 units (approximately 800 residents) or $\$ 857$ PUPA. Bayview YMCA's budget represents only $\$ 125,000$ or $\$ 437$ PUPA or $51 \%$ of the completed phases resident services budget. Tenant engagement for the completed units is $\$ 7,150$ ( $\$ 25$ PUPA). There is currently $\$ 113 \mathrm{~K}$ unplanned services funds available for Hunters View ( $\$ 245,200$ minus Bayview YMCA contract amount and tenant engagement). If the unplanned funds are not expended at the end of the each affordable building's fiscal year, the funds are returned to the project and available for the waterfall. The Phase IIl unplanned services total $\$ 28,284$ ( $\$ 79,800$ mipus assumed Bayview YMCA's extended contract); thus making the all phases unplanned services budget equal $\$ 141,284$. The $\$ 141,284$ unplanned services funds will be available in 2022, the first full year of Phase III operations. Sponsors are to work with the HOPE SF team to have a proposed services plan for the entire site and use of the unplanned services funds prior to the gap loan request.

### 8.3. HOPE SF Assessment of Service Plan and Budget

The services plan is under development, and once complete will be reviewed by HOPE SF. The Sponsor will submit the services plan and budget to HOPE SF before final MOHCD gap loan approval.

### 8.4. Supportive Services Plan for formerly homeless family units

Lutheran Social Services will be the services provider for the 20 LOSP units. Services for these units will be provided in a direct contract between DHSH and the services provider. The Sponsor must submit a draft services plan to DHSH for review and approval as required for the MHP application due on March 2nd. Nine months prior to TCO, the Sponsor must submit a final copy of the supportive services plan to DHSH for review and approval prior to marketing and leasing units.
9. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
9.1. Proposed Loan/Grant Terms

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | $\$ 7,304,973$ |
| Loan Term: | 3 years |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2023 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Residual Receipts |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $0.25 \%$, to be revisited at Gap commitment |

9.2. Recommended disbursement conditions/schedule

No funds will be disbursed with this loan request. This request is for an MHP Application Commitment letter. Previously awarded predevelopment funds will continue to be disbursed.

### 9.3. Recommended conditions prior to additional funding request or financing gap

- Sponsor to confirm the completion of the process to remove the requirement for recycled water in Hunters View Phase III that was part of Phase I and II.
- Sponsor will work to reduce the DSCR to MOHCD underwriting standards.
- Sponsor wilt provide a schedule and marketing strategy indicating that the commercial spaces will be occupied at construction completion.
- Sponsor must show in their operating assumptions some information related to operating the commercial spaces and rental assumptions in the MOHCD commercial operating budget.
- Sponsors will provide an explanation for the architectural fee overruns based on architect's estimated hours of work for proposed scope. Sponsor should include in the analysis a breakdown of the architectural fees related to City Resolution 080692, Ordinance Number 201-01. By June 1, 2020, Sponsor will provide a comparison of Hunters View phases for vertical architecture services that demonstrate reasonable architectural costs for Phase III, If fees remain over MOHCD underwriting guidelines, Sponsor will provide an explanation for the architectural fee overruns based on architect's estimated hours of work for proposed scope.
- On the permanent budget, the Sponsor must show construction management services on the appropriate line item.
- Sponsor to provide MOHCD with a breakdown of their assumptions for hard-shell, warm-shell and tenant improvements for the two commercial spaces. Sponsor must include commercial shell costs on the appropriate line items on the MOHCD permanent budget. Sponsor to verify that the commercial spaces have separate utility connections from the residential.
- Sponsor to include a construction schedule for the commercial spaces and a marketing strategy indicating whether the commercial spaces will be occupied at least 6 months after residential TCO.
- On the operating budget and/or commercial operating budget, Sponsor must show their leasing and operating assumptions related to operating the commercial spaces.
- Sponsor to evaluate swapping up to 5 tax credits without subsidy units and no more than 10 units affordable to families at or below $32 \%$ MOHCD AMI/25\% TCAC AMI with an equivalent amount of PBV's.
- Sponsor must reduce the capitalized operating reserves to MOHCD acceptable guidelines.
- Sponsor must evaluate the necessity for a debt service reserve. MOHCD must review and approve the debt service analysis.
- If awarded MHP, Sponsor must seek to significantly reduce the HCD Transition Reserve or eliminate it entirely.
- Sponsor must provide an updated proposed staffing plan to MOHCD prior to CDLAC gap financing request. The updated plan must include a staffing plan comparison to completed phases with annual total and per unit per annual totals.
- Sponsor is to work with the HOPE SF team to have a proposed services plan for the entire site and a plan for the unplanned services funds prior to CDLAC gap loan request.
- Sponsor must submit a draft services plan to DHSH for review and approval as required for the MHP application due March 2nd.


### 9.4. Recommended conditions prior to gap closing

- MOHCD must review Request For Proposals (RFPs) for equity investors before it is finalized and released. The Sponsor's equity and debt RFP must mention the MOHCD requirement that the Sponsor apply for AHP. If the selected debt and/or equity lender is not a member bank, it must commit to working with the Sponsor in their RFP response to partner with and/or find a member bank to submit an AHP application.
- MOHCD must review raw financial data from developer or financial consultant prior to selection of debt lender and investor.
- MOHCD must approve all selected investors.
- MOHCD must review and approve all Letters of Intent with investor
9.5. Recommended conditions prior to funding Developer Fee
- Prior to funding Project Management Fee of $\$ 120,000$ paid during construction for receipt of TCO, Sponsor must apply for FHLB AHP.
- If awarded MHP, nine months prior to TCO and prior to Project Management Fee of $\$ 120,000$ paid during construction for receipt of TCO, the Sponsors must submit a final copy of the supportive services plan to DHSH for review and approval prior to marketing and leasing units.

10. LOAN COMMITTEE
10.1. Modifications

- Prior to gap loan request, complete parking survey and provide MOHCD with the results.


### 10.2. Recommendations

Approval indicates approval with modifications, when so determined by the Committee.

[] TAKE NO ACTION

Date:


## [] APPROVE []DISAPPROVE

## Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing


Nadia Sesay, Interim Executive Director Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

## [] APPROVE <br> [] DISAPPROVE

Tonia Lediju, Acting Executive Director San Francisco Housing A \&hority

## [] TAKE NO ACTION

Date: $\qquad$
[] TAKE NO ACTION

Date:
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## ATTACHMENTS

A. HOPE SF Project Summary
B. Applicable HOPE SF Developer Fee Policy
C. Project Milestones and Schedule (Vertical and Infrastructure)
D. Site Map with Amenities
E. Vertical Building Elevations
F. Infrastructure Budget - Not Applicable for this loan request
G. Vertical Predevelopment Development Budget
H. Sources and Uses
I. $1^{\text {ts }}$ Year Operating Budget
J. 20-year Operating Pro Forma
K. MOHCD OCII Family Cost Comparison Chart

## Attachment A: HOPE SF Project Summary

## HOPE SF Initiative:

The vision for all HOPE SF developments, as stated in the HOPE SF Taskforce Summary dated March 23, 2007 is to "Rebuild our most distressed public housing sites, while increasing affordable housing and ownership opportunities, and improving the quality of life for existing residents and the surrounding communities". HOPE SF seeks to transform four of San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites into new mixed-income communities. HOPE SF sites share uniffed principals and goals to eradicate intergenerational poverty by:

- Ensuring No Loss of Public Housing, which includes unit-for-unit replacement, building modern high-quality homes, and minimizing temporary and permanent displacement.
- Creating an Economically Integrated Community.
- Maximizing the Creation of New Affordable Housing.
- Involving Residents in the Highest Levels of Participation in the Entire Project.
- Providing Economic Opportunities through the Rebuilding Process.
- Integrating Process with Neighborhood Improvement Revitalization Plans.
- Creating Economically Sustainable and Accessible Communities.
- Building a Strong Sense of Community.

The four HOPE SF sites are Alice Griffith, Hunters View, Sunnydale/Velasco and Potrero Annex/Terrace.

## Proiect Summary:

Hunters View HOPE SF site is located on the eastside of Third Street in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood of San Francisco. Formerly owned and operated by the Housing Authority of San Francisco Housing Authority ("SFHA"). In 2002, SFHA completed a comprehensive physical needs assessment of all SFHA properties and identified a number of sites with extensive physical problems. One of the sites identified was Hunters View, located within the former Redevelopment Agency Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area.

In 2003, SFHA issued a Request for Qualifications for a developer to redevelop the Hunters View public housing site (the "Development"). In August 2005, SFHA selected the development team originally formed as Hunters View Community Partners "HVCP" (and now currently formed as HVA) and comprised of the John Stewart Company ("JSCo"), Devine \& Gong, Incorporated ("DGI"), and Hunters Point Affordable Housing, Inc. (a subsidiary of Ridge Point Nonprofit Housing Corporation ("Ridge Point").
In Aprll 2011, the Affordable Housing Loan Committee and the formet Redevelopment Agency Commission approved a loan of $\$ 31,406,982$ for Hunters View affordable housing vertical developments, Phases IA and IIA, with the condition that each future phase would require approval by the Loan Committee as they become further refined. Shortly thereafter, Hunters View broke ground as the first HOPE SF development to begin infrastructure and its tranformation. In 2013, Phase I affordable developments were completed and operations began.

In November 2016, HVA with assistance from SFHA, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII"), and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD") began relocation of existing Phase III residents into Phase IIA - Blocks 7 \& 1I. Relocations was completed in 2017, and all residents formerly living onsite at Hunters View were successfully relocated. In early 2018, the developer began asbestos removal, lead abatement and demolition of 18 public housing building in the final phase of Hunters View, Phase III. Early demolition of the existing buildings prior to

MHP Application Commitment Letter Requests
the start of infrastructure was a community safety measure requested by residents and service providers working at Hunters View.

## Proiect Funding Summary - Funded to Date:

Vertical and Horizontal Funding to Date:

| Start Year | Finish Year | Block Name | Phase | Phase Type | Total units | Status | Total MOHCD Loan Amount | Total OCII <br> Loan Amount | TDC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 2011 | All <br> Blocks in <br> Phase ! | 1 B | Infrastructure |  | Complete | \$3,060,494 | \$3,000,000 | \$11,917,980 |
| 2010 | 2012 | Phase ! Blocks 4, 5.6 | IA-0 | Affordable | 107 | Complete | \$3,994,745 | \$19,449,014 | \$80,842,334 |
| 2015 | 2017 | All Blocks in Phase 2 | 2B | Infrastructure |  | Complete | \$5,679,807 | \$0 | \$6,383,202 |
| 2016 | 2017 | Blocks 7 \& 11 | 2A | Affordable | 107 | Complete | \$2,267,137 | \$16,721,514 | \$136,746,201 |
| 2016 | 2017 | Block 10 | 2B | Affordable | 72 | Complete | \$17,393.406 | \$0 | \$48.417.529 |
| 2020 | 2023 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Blocks 2, } \\ & 3 . \& 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1A\& } \\ 2 \mathrm{~A} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Market Rate | 64 | In Process | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2020 | 2021 | All <br> Blocks in <br> Phase 3 | 3B | Infrastructure |  | N/A | \$29,478,578 | \$0 | \$29,478,578 |
| 2021 | 2022 | Blocks 14 \& 17 | 3A | Affordable | 118 | Previously awarded Predev \& MHP <br> Commitmen t | \$16,260,000 |  | \$115,992,506 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total to Date | \$79.068.418 | \$39.170.528 | \$429,778,330 |

## Attachment B: Applicable HOPE SF Developer Fee Policy

The HOPE SF Developer Fee Policy for Hunters View HOPE SF is attached as Exhibit B to this loan evaluation. A summary of the policy is as follows:


In the predevelopment loan evaluation approved on November 4, 2016, the MPR fee was $\$ 600,000$. This fee was an additional residential fee not provided on Phase IIIA when the project assumed permanent AHSC financing. In 2016, AHSC limited developer fee to $\$ 1.4 \mathrm{MM}$ while MOHCD allowed total project management developer fee to be $\$ 2 \mathrm{MM}$. In November 4, 2016, MOHCD agreed to allow the Sponsor to receive the additional $\$ 600,000$ as part of Hunters View's Master Planning Developer Fee. Under HCD's MHP and MOHCD's new policy that increases the total developer fee, the Sponsor's no longer need $\$ 600,000$ paid through the Hunters View's Master Planning Developer Fee. All vertical developer fee is as shown in Section 6 of this loan evaluation.

Attachment C: Project Milestones (Horizontal)
Phase 3, Blocks 14 and 17 Vertical

| No. | Performunce Milestone | Estimated or <br> Actual Date | Contractual <br> Deadline |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) | Completed 2016 |  |
| 1. | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | October 5, 2016 |  |
| 2. | Site Acquisition | July 2, 2017 | November 1, 2017 |
| 3. | Development Team Selection - Infrastructure |  |  |
| b. | Civil Engineer | November 2016 |  |
| c. | General Contractor | January 2017 |  |
| d. | Owner's Representative | March 2017 |  |
| 4. | Development Team Selection - Vertical |  |  |
| a. | Architect | January 2017 |  |
| b. | General Contractor | January 2017 |  |
| c. | Owner's Representative | TBD |  |
| d. | Property Manager | N/A |  |
| e. | Service Provider | June 2017 |  |
| 5. | Final Map Processing |  |  |
| a. | Tentative Map Submittal | March 2017 |  |
|  | Final Tentative Map and Conditions of Approval <br> Received | April 2020 |  |
|  | Final Map Approved | August 1, 2020 |  |
| 5. | Design - Vertical |  |  |
| a. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Eslimate | March 2019 | March 2019 |
| b. | Submittal of 50\% Design Development \& Cost <br> Estimate | February, 2020 |  |
| c. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | July 1, 2020 |  |
| d. | Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate (75\%- <br> 80\% CDs) | October 2020 |  |
| 6. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | CEQA Environ Review Submission | 2008 |  |
| b. | NEPA Environ Review Submission | 2008 |  |
| c. | CUP/PUD/Variances Submission | 2008 |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| d | Extension of PUD/ Entitlements | February 21, 2020 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | September 2019 |  |
| b. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | September 2020 |  |
| c. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | January 2021 |  |
| 8. | Request for Bids Issued | September 2020 |  |
| 9. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | March 2020 |  |
| b. | Interim | June 2020 |  |
| c. | Update | September 2021 |  |
| 10. | Additional City Financing |  |  |
| a. | Predevelopment Financing Application \#2 | N/A |  |
| b. | Gap Financing Application | July 2020 |  |
| 11. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | Lender/Investor RFP | May/June 2020 |  |
| b. | AHP Application | January 2021 |  |
| c. | CDLAC Application | August 2020 |  |
| d. | TCAC Application | August 2020 |  |
| e. | Section 8 application and award | 2016 |  |
| 12. | Closings |  |  |
| a. | Construction Closing - Demolition | December 2016 |  |
| b. | Construction Closing - Infrastructure | July 2020 |  |
| c. | Construction Closing - Vertical | December 2020 |  |
| d. | Permanent Financing Closing - Vertical | August 2023 |  |
| e. | Permanent Financing Closing - Infrastructure (acceptance of streets by City) | August 2024 |  |
| 13. | Construction |  |  |
| a. | Notice to Proceed - Demolition |  | January 2018 |
| b. | Notice to Proceed - Infrastructure | July 2020 |  |
| c. | Notice to Proceed - Vertical | January 2021 |  |
| d. | Completion - Demolition |  | March 2018 |
| e. | Completion - Infrastructure | January 2022 | January 2022 |


| f. | Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Cert of <br> Substantial Completion - Vertical | May 2022 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 14. | Marketing/Rent-up | May/June 2022 |  |
| a. | Marketing Plan Submission | March 2021 |  |
| b. | Commence Marketing | November 2021 |  |
| c. | $95 \%$ Occupancy | August 2022 |  |
| 15. | Cost Certification/8609 |  | July 2023 |
| 16. | Close Out MOH/OClI Loan(s) | December 2023 |  |

## Attachment D: Site Map with Amenities

Site Amenity Map


| $\#$ | Service Type | Address | Distance <br> from Site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | School | Malcolm X Elementary School <br> 350 Harbor Rd. | 0.14 mi. |
| 2 | Public Park | Hilltop Park <br> LaSalle \& Whitney Young Circle | 0.21 mi. |
| 3 | Medical Clinic | Southeast Health Center <br> 2401 Keith Street | 0.95 mi. |
| 4 | Grocery | Foods Co. <br> 345 Williams Ave. | 1.12 mi. |
| 5 | SFMTA Bus Stop - 44 \& 19 | Hare and Middle Point Roads | 390 ft |

## Attachment E: Vertical Building Elevations

## Attachment F: Infrastructure Budget

Not applicable for this loan request.
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