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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Sponsor Information:



Mercy Housing California ("Mercy" or the "Sponsor"), through Transbay 2 Family L.P., is requesting $\$ 3,500,000$ in predevelopment financing for Transbay Block 2 East ("Block 2 East"). Block 2 East will be a 101 -unit mixed-use affordable rental housing development serving low-income families, with approximately $20 \%$ of units set-aside to serve formerly homeless families, subsidized by the Local Operating Subsidy Program ("LOSP").

Block 2 East will be comprised of 36 one-bedroom, 35 two-bedroom, and 29 three-bedroom units, as well as one two-bedroom manager's unit. Units will serve households at a wide range of income levels, with an average at or below $60 \%$ of Area Median Income as defined by the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("SF AMI" or "AMI"). In addition to residential units and resident serving amenities, the Block 2 East development includes a child care center and ground floor retail (the residential and commercial together are the "Project").

Block 2 East will be developed in coordination with Transbay Block 2 West ("Block 2 West"), a mixed-use affordable rental project serving low-income and formerly homeless seniors under development by Chinatown Community Development Center ("CCDC"). Mercy and CCDC will work closely to coordinate design and maximize efficiencies to the extent feasible, including joint consultant selection, a single general contractor shared site studies, and, if possible, concurrent construction.
The Project will be financed with $4 \%$ Low Income Housing Tax Credits and will seek funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development's Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities ("AHSC") and Infill Infrastructure Grant ("IIG") programs, as well as the Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program ("AHP").

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | Type I | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Stories: | 9 | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 0.49 acres / $21,313 \mathrm{sf}^{*}$ |
| Number of Units: | 101 | Architect: |  <br> Planning |
| Total Residential Area: | $109,202 \mathrm{sf}$ | General Contractor: | TBD |
| Total Commercial Area: | $7,330 \mathrm{sf}$ | Property Manager: | Mercy Housing Property |
| Total Building Area: | 116,532 sf | Supervisor and District: | Sup. Haney - District 6 |
| Land Owner: | OCII | Total Acquisition Cost: | N/A |
| Total Development Cost (TDC): | $\$ 98,156,140$ | TDC less land cost/unit: | $\$ 971,843$ |
| TDC/unit: | $\$ 971,843$ | Request Amount / unit: | $\$ 34,653$ |
| Loan Amount Requested: | $\$ 3,500,000$ | No | Parking |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

1. Blocks 2 East/West Coordination. Mercy and CCDC were selected as co-developers under a single RFP for Transbay Block 2 East and 2 West. Mercy will be the lead developer, however, each developer will take primary responsibility for their respective project (as the sole owner). See Section 1.2 for further discussion and Conditions 11.2.1 and 11.3.2. Key considerations include:
a. Cohesive design: the building and streetscape designs must be complementary and cohesive, especially the ground level experience. This will require oversight by Mercy and extensive collaboration throughout predevelopment and construction;
b. Efficiency: the developers will work closely to identify and maximize efficiencies, jointly select key consultants, use the same general contractor, and coordinate logistics; and
c. Schedule: Blocks 2 East and West currently assume a schedule with the same construction timeline. Concurrent construction would reduce hard costs, streamline logistics, and allow key streetscape elements to be delivered along with the mixeduse buildings. However, maintaining a parallel schedule will be challenging due to the uncertainty in securing financing awards. The developers will coordinate project schedules and, if necessary, establish a plan for phased development.
2. Maximize Site Potential. The Transbay design guidelines allow for a building of up to 165 ' on a portion of Block 2 East at Main Street and Folsom Street. However, due to financing considerations, the Sponsor recommended a base scenario with a height of $85^{\prime}$. While financial feasibility is an essential consideration, OCII seeks to ensure that the site is utilized to the fullest extent possible. See Section 4.2 for further discussion and Condition 11.3.1 which requires the Sponsor to further analyze development scenarios at $165^{\prime}$ and $240^{\prime}$ on Block 2 East.
3. Development Costs. Estimated development costs are high in comparison to other comparable OCII/MOHCD projects under construction and in predevelopment. The Sponsor will need to work to contain costs to ensure overall feasibility and to minimize the OCII subsidy. See Section 4.4 for further discussion and Condition 11.3.1.
4. Financing Competition. The Sponsor will seek maximum awards for AHSC and IIG, as well as a sizeable tax-exempt bond allocation from CDLAC. All financing programs are currently highly competitive, and the bond program is expected to continue to be oversubscribed in the coming years. CDLAC regulations may change prior to the Project's anticipated application date, but may continue to disadvantage larger scale, higher cost urban infill projects. The Sponsor will need to closely monitor regulations and, if necessary, recommend program modifications and strategies to ensure the Project's applications are competitive. See Section 6.5 for further discussion and Condition 11.3.8.
5. Retail. Successful retail is crucial to ground floor activation and meeting community needs and expectations. Current restrictions due to COVID-19 and the related economic uncertainty will create a challenging environment in which to design, program, and secure interest in a new retail space. See Section 4.5 for further discussion and Condition 11.3.10 which requires the Sponsor to engage with local non-profit organizations that support small businesses, and other resources in the development of the planned retail space.

## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

| Predevelopment Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| OCII | $\$ 3,500,000$ | 3 years @ 3\% deferred | This Request |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |  |


| Predevelopment Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  <br> Engineering | $\$ 2,350,149$ | $\$ 23,269$ | $\$ 20$ |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 599,851$ | $\$ 5,939$ | $\$ 5$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 550,000$ | $\$ 5,445$ | $\$ 5$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 6 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 0}$ |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms | Status |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 38,760,668$ | $\$ 0.90 /$ credit, $4 \%$ credit rate | Not Committed |
| OCII Loan | $\$ 26,695,472$ | 55 years $@ 0-3 \%$ interest, <br> residual receipts | Not Committed |
| Permanent Loan | $\$ 1,500,000$ | 15 years, $4.35 \%$ interest | Not Committed |
| HCD AHSC | $\$ 20,000,000$ | 55 years $@ 0.42 \%$ residual <br> receipts | Not Committed |
| HCD IIG | $\$ 7,000,000$ | Grant | Not Committed |
| AHP | $\$ 1,200,000$ | 55 years $@ 0 \%$ | Not Committed |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 9 8 , 1 5 6 , 1 4 0}$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 0$ | N $/ \mathrm{A}$ | N/A |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 80,324,257$ | $\$ 795,289$ | $\$ 689$ |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 12,631,883$ | $\$ 125,068$ | $\$ 108$ |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 5,200,000$ | $\$ 51,485$ | $\$ 45$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 9 8 , 1 5 6 , 1 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 7 1 , 8 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 4 2}$ |

## 1. BACKGROUND

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

Blocks 2 East and West are part of the approximately 40-acre Transbay Redevelopment Project Area that was administered by the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency ("SFRA"). Pursuant to state law, redevelopment agencies throughout the State of California were eliminated on February 1, 2012 (California Health and Safety Code Section 34161 et seq (the "Redevelopment Dissolution Law")). OCII is the Successor Agency to SFRA and is responsible for implementing SFRA's enforceable obligations. On April 15, 2013, the California Department of Finance determined "finally and conclusively" that the Transbay Implementation Agreement, Affordable Housing Program, and Tax Increment Sales Proceeds Pledge Agreement are enforceable obligations under Redevelopment Dissolution Law.

The Transbay Redevelopment Plan, established in 2005, is implemented through partnerships between OCII, the City, Transbay Joint Powers Authority ("TJPA"), Caltrans, and for-profit and non-profit developers. The Project Area is divided into two zones: Zone 1 is implemented by OCII and Zone 2 is implemented by the San Francisco Planning Department. When completed, the Transbay Redevelopment Area (including both Zone 1 and Zone 2) will include over 4,000 new residential units, $35 \%$ of which will be affordable, office and retail space, over 9 acres of new parks, and significant transportation and streetscape improvements.

Within Zone 1, a total of 2,196 residential units have been completed (Blocks 1, 6, 7, 8, 9 , and 11a), 721 of which are restricted for affordability. Additional housing units are planned on Blocks 2 East (the subject of this evaluation) and West, Block 4, and Block 12. The planned affordable units on Blocks 2 East and West are essential to achieving $35 \%$ affordability in the Transbay Project Area.

Transbay Block 2, along with Blocks 3 and 4 and the future extensions of Clementina and Tehama Streets, was part of the lot formerly used as the Temporary Transbay Terminal. The Greyhound station building remains on the site but is currently unoccupied. Transbay Terminal operations relocated to the newly constructed Salesforce Transit Center in 2019.

OCII issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP") seeking teams to develop, own, and operate mixed-use affordable rental family and senior housing units, including units setaside for formerly homeless family and senior households at Transbay Blocks 2 East and 2 West in June 2020, with proposals due in September 2020. OCII received 5 proposals, all of which were deemed complete. An evaluation panel comprised of staff from OCII, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD"), the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH"), and a member of the Transbay Citizens Advisory Committee ("CAC") recommended selection of the development team led by Mercy and CCDC. Please see Sections 9 and 10 below for further discussion regarding threshold requirements and scoring.

Mercy and CCDC proposed that while they would collaborate on development of the site as a whole, with Mercy designated as the overall lead developer, each would secure financing for, and own and operate one of the two residential projects. Mercy will own and operate the family project on Block 2 East and CCDC will own and operate the senior project on Block 2 West. See below for further discussion on this relationship.

### 1.2. Borrower/Grantee Profile. (See Attachment B for Borrower Org Chart; See

 Attachment C for Developer Resumes and Attachment D for Asset Management Analysis)The Borrower entity is Transbay 2 Family, L.P. The managing general partner is Transbay 2 Family LLC, a subsidiary of Mercy.

Mercy has significant experience in San Francisco, including many properties developed in collaboration with OCII and MOHCD. Mercy owns and operates 51 buildings in San Francisco, serving low-income families, seniors, disabled persons, and formerly homeless households. In the Transbay Project Area, Mercy completed Transbay Blocks 6 and 7, and is partnering with Hines on development on Block 4.

Michael Kaplan at Mercy will be the Project Manager and will dedicate approximately $40 \%$ of his time to the Project. Elaine Palacios will provide project assistance, and will dedicate approximately $20 \%$ of her time to Block 2 East. Michael and Elaine will be supported by Ramie Dare (Acting Director of Development), Alvin Tuvilla (Regional Director of Resident Services), Jennifer Dolin (Director of Operations), Ed Holder (Vice President of Real Estate Development), and Doug Shoemaker (President).

Mercy Housing Management Group ("MHMG") will be the property manager for the Project and will provide resident services to low-income families. Mercy will also partner with Episcopal Community Services ("ECS"), who will provide services for formerly homeless families.
In addition to leading development on Block 2 East, Mercy will also oversee coordination between Block 2 East and Block 2 West, working closely with CCDC throughout the development process. Mercy and CCDC entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on September 10, 2020 to establish roles and responsibilities for Transbay Block 2. Key Mercy responsibilities beyond Block 2 East (for Transbay Block 2 as a whole) include:

- Contract negotiation including predevelopment loan terms and ground leases;
- Consultants selection;
- Retail programming, commercial shell design, marketing and leasing; and
- Lot split and streetscape improvement design.

Pursuant to Condition 11.2.1, Mercy and CCDC will enter into a joint development agreement to formalize the collaborative partnership and further clarify roles and responsibilities.
2. SITE (See Attachment E for Site map with amenities)

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning: | Zoning for the site is form-based and is governed by the <br> Transbay Redevelopment Plan, Transbay Development <br> Controls and Design Guidelines ("DCDG"), and the <br> Transbay Design for Development. The DCDG establishes <br> that Block 2 is split by a 25' wide ground level pedestrian <br> mews connecting Folsom Street and Clementina Street. On <br> the eastern side (Block 2 East), the DCDG allows a height <br> of up to 50' on the northern portion of Block 2 East along <br> Clementina, up to 85' mid-block along Main Street, and up |


|  | to 165' on the southern side along Folsom at Main. The <br> DCDG also requires a central open space courtyard. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum units allowed by current <br> zoning (N/A if rehab): | The maximum number of units on the site is based on <br> form-based zoning. The number of units is limited only by <br> what can fit within the site's height and bulk restrictions. |
| Number of units added or removed (rehab <br> only, if applicable): | N/A |
| Seismic (if applicable): | The site is within a Liquefaction Zone (per the California <br> Geological Survey) |
| Soil type: | According to the Transbay EIR, the site is located on the <br> Bay side of the historic circa 1848 shoreline. Soils on the <br> site may generally be characterized by the presence of soft <br> and compressible bay mud under the superficial fill placed <br> when the area was reclaimed in the late 1800s or early <br> 1900s. The depth of the sediment varies throughout the site. |
| The Sponsor will assemble a consultant team and will |  |
| perform further geotechnical analysis during |  |
| predevelopment. |  |


| Public Transportation within 0.5 mile: | The site is located 1 block from the Salesforce Transit <br> Center, a regional hub for 11 transit systems, including <br> multiple Muni bus lines. In addition, the site is two blocks <br> from the Muni Metro station at The Embarcadero and <br> Folsom Street and 2 blocks from the Embarcadero BART <br> station. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Article 34: | Article 34 authority is needed and will be requested before <br> the predevelopment loan is encumbered. |
| Article 38: | Not exempt. The site is within the Air Pollutant Exposure <br> Zone. The design will be subject to relevant guidelines and <br> requirements. |
| Accessibility: | Project will provide at least 15\% of tax credit units with <br> mobility features (California Building Code ("CBC") 11B <br> 809.2 through 11B 809.5) and at least 10\% with <br> communications features (CBC 11B 809.5). Adaptability <br> requirements will be determined by the San Francisco <br> Mayor's Office on Disability. |
| Green Building: | Per the RFP, the building must either achieve a Green Point <br> Rating of 125 or above, or LEED Gold rating. The OCII <br> design team will work with the Sponsor to ensure the <br> Project meets one of these two thresholds. |
| Recycled Water: | Not exempt. The Project does fall within the boundaries of <br> the designated recycled water use area, and therefore it will <br> be required to comply with the City's Recycled Water <br> Ordinance. As such, the Sponsors will be required to install <br> purple pipe to recycle grey water within the Project. |
| Storm Water Management: | Developments that disturb 5,000 square feet or more of the <br> ground surface must comply with the Storm Water Design <br> Guidelines and submit a Storm Water Control Plan to the <br> SFPUC for review. The development team will meet with <br> SFPUC during the predevelopment period. |

### 2.1. Zoning.

See above.

### 2.2. Local/Federal Environmental Review.

In April 2004, the Redevelopment Agency Commission certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Transbay Redevelopment Plan. In January 2005, the Agency Commission adopted findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in connection with the adoption of the Redevelopment Plan. The Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and TJPA adopted similar findings.

The Agency Commission, Board of Supervisors, and TJPA subsequently adopted eight addenda to the Final EIR.

The proposed loan is an implementing action and within the scope of the project analyzed under the EIR and subsequent addenda. Unless the Sponsor seeks building height or bulk that are outside of that assumed under the EIR, no additional environmental review is required under CEQA.

The Sponsor will work with OCII staff and other public agencies to ensure that the mitigation monitoring measures for Block 2 East are appropriately documented and
implemented. Also, the Sponsors will order an updated Phase I analysis and a Phase II analysis, as needed.

### 2.3. Environmental Issues.

- Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results.

As part of due diligence in acquiring the site from TJPA, OCII commissioned a Phase I report from AEW Engineering. The report is dated November 3, 2020. The report identified that soil classified as Federal Class I RCRA and California Class I NonRCRA hazardous waste is on the site. The soil was capped by the existing temporary terminal asphalt and terminal building but will need to be addressed as part of the site's development. The Sponsor will work with a consultant to determine whether an updated Phase I is needed.

The Sponsor will seek a Phase II report during predevelopment.

- Potential/Known Hazards.

Soil contaminants currently exist in the Project Area and are assumed to exist at the site. The Sponsor will engage consultants to provide testing and analysis.
2.4. Adjacent uses and neighborhood amenities. See table above.
2.5. Green Building. See table above.

## 3. COMMUNITY SUPPORT

3.1. Prior Outreach.

The Transbay Citizens Advisory Committee ("CAC") is comprised of 11 members who represent neighboring residents, property owners, and Citywide interests. The CAC is charged with providing advice to OCII on all matters pertaining to the planning and implementation of the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area.
Staff presented the RFP to the CAC and to the OCII Commission in June 2020 prior to issuance of the RFP. A member of the CAC participated in the interview and evaluation panel for the developer team selection. Staff presented an update on the selection process and the recommended developer to the CAC on November 12, 2020 in advance of the anticipated upcoming OCII Commission action on the Predevelopment Loan Agreement and Exclusive Negotiations Agreement. At each meeting, the CAC members were supportive of this development.

### 3.2. Future Outreach.

The Sponsor will return to the CAC to present the recommended concept design for Blocks 2 East and West and will return again to seek approval of the schematic design. Pursuant to Condition 11.3.14, the Sponsor will conduct further outreach to neighborhood groups as needed throughout predevelopment. Groups may include the East Cut Community Business District, neighboring homeowner associations, and others.

## 4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

### 4.1.1. Site Control.

OCII currently holds and will continue to hold fee simple ownership of the Site. The Site was transferred from TJPA to OCII in January 2021, along with Transbay Blocks 3 and 4 and the parcels planned for the extensions of Clementina and Tehama Streets.

Pursuant to the terms of a purchase agreement between TJPA and OCII in August 2020, Transbay Block 2 was transferred at no cost to OCII.

The Sponsor, in coordination with the sponsor of Block 2 West, will lead and be responsible for pursuing a subdivision map to facilitate the Blocks 2 East and West projects. Per Condition 11.3.11, Mercy and CCDC will work together to determine appropriate boundaries for the two or more parcels to be created through the subdivision.

### 4.1.2. Proposed Property Ownership Structure

OCII will retain fee interest in the land and, at the close of construction financing, will enter into a long-term ground lease with the Sponsor. The Sponsor will own the improvements.

### 4.2. Proposed Design.

The preliminary massing for Block 2 East features a nine story ( 85 ') building anchoring the corner of Folsom and Main, stepping down to approximately $50^{\prime}$ along Clementina Street. The building will have 101 units, with 36 one-bedrooms, 36 two-bedrooms (including one manager's unit), and 29 three-bedrooms.

As one of the final remaining sites in the Transbay project area, the urban design of Blocks 2 East and West is critical to creating a vibrant pedestrian realm. Units with townhome-style frontages and stoops are located along the planned extension of Clementina Street, while the child care facility will be located at the Main-Clementina corner. This allows for safe child care drop-offs on Clementina and places the child care entry directly across from the planned Block 3 park, which will feature a playground. A retail space on the Main-Beale corner will complement the Woodlands Market located across Folsom and will contribute to the Folsom "main street".

The ground floor also contains the resident lobby as well as management and services offices. The sixth floor features a community room opening up to an approximately 3,000 square foot roof deck overlooking the planned Block 3 park.
A partial basement will provide resident bicycle storage, building storage, utility functions, and trash storage. There will be no resident vehicular parking.
The Block 2 East design will be closely coordinated with the design of Block 2 West. The Sponsors and design teams will collaborate to submit a single schematic design package for OCII review and approval. Designs will feature complementary exterior features and materials for a cohesive look across the block. The design team envisions a masonry material for the façade that will contrast with the glassy towers across Folsom Street. A common landscape architect will work on both Blocks 2 East and West, ensuring consistency in the look and feel of the large "linear parks" on Beale and Main, the wide sidewalk on the Folsom Street frontage, the central pedestrian mews, and the townhome frontages on Clementina.
The Sponsors and design team will revisit the proposed height and massing of Block 2 East and present alternatives to OCII before finalizing a conceptual design. As noted in Section 2 above, the Transbay design guidelines allow for a building of up to $165^{\prime}$ on a portion of the site at Main Street and Folsom Street. Thus at $85^{\prime}$, the Project does not take full advantage of allowable building area. Further, in the RFP for Transbay Blocks 2 East and 2 West, OCII sought consideration of an alternative height of $240^{\prime}$.

A height of 85 ' may be less challenging to finance given the lower bond request and lower anticipated OCII loan, however, preliminary studies indicate that a height of 165 ,
would yield an additional 46 units (bring the Block 2 East unit count to 147) and would likely result in a lower cost per unit, however the OCII subsidy per unit would increase. Pursuant to Condition 11.3.1, the Sponsor will further analyze development scenarios with heights at $165^{\prime}$ and $240^{\prime}$.

Estimated area square footages are as follows:

| Average Unit SF by type: | 1 Bedroom: 550 <br> 2 Bedroom: 850 <br> 3 Bedroom: 1,100 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Residential SF: | 83,054 |
| Circulation SF: | Retail: 13,380 <br> Child care: 5,950 |
| Commercial SF: | 4,568 |
| Common Area SF: | 7,823 |
| Maintenance/Utility SF: | 116,532 |
| Building Total SF: |  |

### 4.3. Proposed Rehab Scope. N/A

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

OCII's Construction Specialist performed a preliminary analysis of the proposed massing concept and construction cost estimate for Block 2 East. The building will provide approximately 101 units for low-income families. The proposed design takes advantage of the southeast corner of Folsom and Main Streets while creating a sunlit courtyard facing the midblock mews to the west. The northern façade, on Clementina Street, provides views to the planned Block 3 park. The midblock mews and streetscape improvements to Clementina, Main, and Folsom will contribute to street level activation and link to similar improvements on surrounding Transbay blocks.

Design and construction efficiencies can be gained by simultaneously developing Blocks 2 East West. To the extent feasible, these projects should maintain coordinated schedules (Condition 11.3.2).

Preliminary cost estimates are at approximately $\$ 842$ per square foot, or $\$ 971,843$ per unit, which is over $20 \%$ higher than the average of $\$ 694$ per square foot for other $\mathrm{OCII} / \mathrm{MOHCD}$ projects currently in predevelopment. Higher costs may in part be attributable to the need to activate all four sides of the building, the inclusion of a child care center and retail space, and added streetscape improvements. However, OCII will work closely with the Sponsor and design team to identify strategies to maximize efficiencies and reduce costs per unit and per square foot.

### 4.5. Commercial Space.

Ground floor commercial on Transbay Block 2 is essential to meeting the overall Redevelopment Plan goal to develop Transbay as a vibrant and functional urban neighborhood. Existing Transbay residents have, through discussions at Transbay CAC meetings, affirmed the need and desire for neighborhood-serving commercial uses. In response to the RFP for Transbay Blocks 2 East and West, Mercy and CCDC proposed a retail plan intended to complement existing area businesses and provide spaces and uses
that act as community connectors. The overall commercial plan for Block 2 provides 11,650 square feet of ground floor commercial. Mercy's affiliate, Mercy Commercial California ("MCC") will lead the planning, lease-up, and build-out of the commercial spaces on both 2 East and West.

During predevelopment, the Sponsor, in collaboration with MCC and the sponsor of Block 2 West, will prepare a commercial financing plan for OCII review and approval and will consider and recommend whether or not to establish separate parcels for the commercial spaces as part of the overall subdivision mapping process for the Transbay Block 2.

The preliminary design for Block 2 East provides an approximately 1,380 square foot retail space on the corner of Folsom Street and Main Street and an approximately 6,000 square foot child care facility on the corner of Clementina Street and Main Street.

The retail space is double height, with adjacent access to loading and other back-ofhouse functions. The entry is planned for Folsom Street. The Sponsor has not yet secured a potential tenant for this space, however, MCC has established a relationship with the San Francisco Neighborhood Business Alliance (SFNBA), a membership-based trade association founded by retailers in the Arab, Asian, and Black communities in the Bay Area. Mercy will collaborate with SFNBA as well as other local organizations supporting entrepreneurs and small businesses to market the space and secure a neighborhood-serving tenant (Condition 11.3.10).

The child care center is intended to serve up to 45 children ages 0 to 5 . The Sponsor will issue an RFP to seek a provider for the space early in predevelopment (Condition 11.3.4) and will collaborate with partner providers from other buildings regarding design until a provider for the Project is confirmed. The split-level space includes a ground floor lobby and classroom space as well as lower level classroom areas. The lower level portion opens to a sunken central courtyard with dedicated outdoor play space. The Sponsor anticipates child care drop-off on Clementina Street.

### 4.6. Service Space.

Preliminary designs provide for ground floor property management and services offices and an approximately 1,400 square foot community room adjacent to the roof deck on the $6^{\text {th }}$ floor. The type and amount of space seems adequate for the target population. Programming and design of the space will be refined during predevelopment and reviewed with service and property management providers as well as OCII housing and design staff.

### 4.7. Target Population

Block 2 East will serve families at incomes ranging from $20 \%$ to $80 \%$ SF AMI, with an average AMI no higher than $60 \%$. Approximately $20 \%$ of the units ( 20 units) will be setaside for occupancy by formerly homeless families, referred to the Project by HSH through the Coordinated Entry program. Pursuant to Condition 11.3.5, the Sponsor will work with HSH to confirm that the number of formerly homeless-serving units is appropriate and allows for an efficient case management ratio.

### 4.8. Marketing \& Occupancy Preferences

As previously noted, tenants in the 20 units serving formerly homeless households will be referred to the Project through the Coordinated Entry System. All remaining affordable units will be marketed and leased through OCII's standard procedures, including early outreach to Certificate of Preference ("COP") holders, broad marketing
and outreach, and applications and a lottery through the MOHCD DAHLIA digital housing portal system. In addition, potential tenants will be prioritized in accordance with preferences.

As of April 19, 2019, the OCII Commission has authorized staff to apply the preferences in City Affordable Housing Programs, as amended from time to time, to affordable housing approved by OCII, to the extent that those preferences are consistent with redevelopment plans, enforceable obligations, and applicable law. The preferences applicable for the Project are:

1. COP holders
2. Displaced Tenant Preference Program for $20 \%$ of lottery units
3. Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference for $40 \%$ of the lottery units if project does not include State funding sources, and $25 \%$ of the lottery units if project does include State funding sources (if such preference does not conflict with other financing sources)
4. San Francisco residents or workers
5. Members of the general public

The Sponsor will, as a condition of the anticipated gap loan, provide an early outreach and marketing plans that describe specific efforts to engage preference program participants, and clearly describe how the marketing is consistent with the Mayor's Racial Equity statement and promote positive outcomes for African American San Franciscans.

Potential tenants, including those prioritized by preference, must meet the Sponsor's established screening requirements for the Project, and final selection will lie with the Sponsor. Any authorized preference shall be permitted only to the extent that such preference: (a) does not have the purpose or effect of delaying or otherwise denying access to a housing development or unit based on race, color, ethnic origin, gender, religion, disability, age, sexual orientation, or other protected characteristic of any member of an applicant household; and (b) is not based on how long an applicant has resided or worked in the area. OCII will work with the Sponsor to resolve potential occupancy conflicts and determine marketing requirements and to ensure adherence to OCII occupancy preferences.

### 4.9. Relocation.

N/A.

## 5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consultant Type | Name | SBE/LBE | Outstanding <br> Procurement Issues |
| Architect |  <br> Planning | Y | N |
| Landscape Architect | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| JV/other Architect | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| General Contractor | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| Owner's Rep/Construction |  |  |  |
| Manager |  |  |  | TBD | TBD | TBD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Manager | Mercy Housing Management <br> Group | N |


| Financial Consultant | CHPC | N | N |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Legal | Gubb \& Barshay | N | N |

### 5.1. Outstanding Procurement Issues.

There are no outstanding procurement issues. Sponsor is working with OCII's Contract Compliance team to issue a RFQ/P for design consultants and will endeavor to meet OCII's goal that a minimum of $50 \%$ of professional services contracts are awarded to certified Small Business Enterprises ("SBEs").
6. FINANCING PLAN (See Attachment G for Cost Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments; See Attachment H and I for Sources and Uses)
6.1. Prior MOHCD/OCII Funding (this project and historical for the project):

There is no prior OCII funding. This predevelopment loan request will be the first sum of money extended to the project.

### 6.2. Disbursement Status.

The proposed predevelopment loan is the only predevelopment source for the Project. No sums of money have yet been disbursed. Staff recommends that the Loan Committee approve payment of costs dating back to November 12, 2020, the date of the informational update staff provided to the Transbay CAC on the developer selection recommendation, so long as these previously incurred costs are deemed acceptable and correspond to the predevelopment budget attached herein.

### 6.3. Fulfillment of Loan Conditions.

N/A.

### 6.4. Proposed Predevelopment Financing

### 6.4.1. Predevelopment Sources Evaluation Narrative

The proposed predevelopment loan is the only predevelopment source for the Project.

### 6.4.2. Predevelopment Uses Evaluation

The Sponsor is seeking a predevelopment loan of $\$ 3,500,000$. The budget includes costs related to design through construction documents, survey and engineering sites studies, permit fees, legal fees, and a portion of the developer fee.
6.4.3.

| Predevelopment Budget |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets Standard? <br> $(Y / N)$ | Notes |
| Acquisition Cost is based on <br> appraisal | N/A | Not applicable. |
| Architecture and Engineering <br> Fees are within standards | Y | A\&E fee during predevelopment is $\$ 2,350,149$ |


| Bid Contingency is at least 5\% <br> of total hard costs | Y |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Escalation amount is <br> commensurate with time period <br> until expected construction start, <br> not to exceed $15 \%$ | N | The Project is carrying a total of $15 \%$ in <br> design, bid, and plan check contingencies, <br> which is consistent with the MOHCD <br> Underwriting Guidelines, but more than the <br> amounts held in typical recent practice for <br> projects of this scale (typical is a total of 8\%). <br> While escalation is not included in the hard <br> cost estimate, it is assumed that these <br> conservative contingency amounts would allow <br> for escalation. |
| Construction Management Fees <br> are within standards | Y |  |
| Developer Fee is within <br> standards | Y | See discussion on Developer Fee below. |
| Soft Cost Contingency is $10 \%$ <br> per standards | Y |  |
| Financing Costs are reasonable | Y |  |

### 6.5. Potential Proposed Permanent Financing

Permanent financing is being presented to demonstrate the project's overall feasibility but not intended to be presented for Loan Committee approval at this time.

### 6.5.1. Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative:

- OCII Loan: The budget assumes an OCII subsidy of approximately $\$ 26,695,472$ or $\$ 264,312$ per unit. The OCII subsidy will be used during predevelopment and construction and will be structured as a loan with up to 3\% interest.
- LIHTC Equity: The Sponsor is projecting LIHTC equity in the amount of $\$ 38,760,668$ or $\$ 383,796$ per unit. This assumes a fixed $4 \%$ credit rate and pricing at $\$ 0.90$. Pricing is assumed at $\$ 0.90$ which may be conservative but is based on recent offers from tax credit investors on other San Francisco projects without project-based Section 8 contracts. Pursuant to Condition 11.3.13, the Sponsor will provide the debt/equity request for proposals for OCII review and will share responses and draft terms sheets.
- HCD AHSC: The budget assumes an AHSC award of $\$ 20,000,000$, the maximum available for eligible residential uses, to support the residential Project. The Sponsor would work with SFMTA and/or other transit agencies to identify a qualified transit project.
- HCD IIG: The budget assumes an IIG award of $\$ 7,000,000$, the maximum available for the program. The funds would be used for site preparation, drainage, and streetscape work. Because Mercy has obtained awards in the recent past, they expect to score well in the tiebreaker, which awards points for IIG experience.
- Construction Loan: The budget assumes a tax-exempt construction loan of $\$ 59,664,964$ with an interest rate of $3.65 \%$ for 30 months. Pursuant to Condition 11.3.13, the Sponsor will provide the debt/equity request for proposals for OCII review and will share responses and draft terms sheets.
- Permanent Loan: The budget assumes a permanent loan of $\$ 1,500,000$ at $4.35 \%$ interest rate with a 15 -year amortization. The Sponsor will seek to maximize the permanent loan (Condition 11.3.7), while maintaining anticipated AMI levels and ensuring an adequate debt service coverage ratio. Pursuant to Condition 11.3.13, the Sponsor will provide the debt/equity request for proposals for OCII review and will share responses and draft terms sheets.
- AHP: The budget assumes an AHP award of $\$ 1,200,000$ or $\$ 11,881$ per unit. The Sponsor's preliminary analysis shows that the Project would be competitive for this source based on income levels. The Sponsor anticipates an AHP award prior to seeking gap funds from OCII.
- GP Capital Contribution: The GP estimates that it will make an equity contribution of $\$ 3,000,000$ or $\$ 29,703$ per unit to maximize tax credit equity. This amount is reflected in the developer fee shown below.
6.5.2. Permanent Uses Evaluation:

| Development Budget |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Underwriting Standard | Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| Hard Cost per unit are within standards | N | Hard costs are \$795,290 / unit (includes <br> contingencies). Costs are very high in <br> comparison to other OCII/MOHCD projects <br> will be monitored closely during the <br> predevelopment period. |
| Construction Hard Cost Contingency is <br> at least 5\% (new construction) or 15\% <br> (rehab) | Y | Hard cost contingency is 5\%. <br> Design, bid, and plan check contingencies <br> total 15\%. |
| Architecture and Engineering Fees are <br> within standards | Y | A\&E fee is \$3,577,506, which is <br> approximately 5\% of hard costs (excluding <br> contingencies). |
| Construction Management Fees are <br> within standards | Y | The construction management fee of \$145K <br> is within the maximum allowable per <br> MOHCD's underwriting guidelines for a <br> large project. |
| Developer Fee is within standards, see <br> also disbursement chart below | Y | Total cash developer fee is \$2.2M, which is <br> below the max. allowed under the MOHCD <br> Developer Fee Policy (See further <br> description below.) |
| Soft Cost Contingency is 10\% per <br> standards | Y | Soft Cost Contingency is at 10\%. <br> Capitalized Operating Reserves are a <br> minimum of 3 months Y |
| Capitalized Operating Reserve is equal to 3 <br> months of expenses |  |  |


| Cash Developer Fee Disbursement Schedule |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Payment Milestone | \% of Project Mgmt. <br> Fee | Amount |
| At acquisition or closing of preconstruction financing | $15 \%$ | $\$ 165,000$ |
| During or at end of predevelopment | $35 \%$ | $\$ 385,000$ |
| At construction closing | $20 \%$ | $\$ 220,000$ |
| During construction/at construction completion | $20 \%$ | $\$ 220,000$ |
| Project close-out | $10 \%$ | $\$ 110,000$ |
| Total Project Management Fee | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| At Risk Fee* |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Total Cash Developer Fee |  | $\underline{\mathbf{\$ 2 , 2 0 0 , 0 0 0}}$ |
| GP Equity |  | $\$ 3,000,000$ |
| Total Developer Fee |  | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 2 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |

* The at-risk fee is below the maximum allowable under the MOHCD Developer Fee Policy due to restrictions from other funding sources (the MOHCD policy would allow up to $\$ 2,210,000$ in total cash fee, as well as commercial development fee). Should the funding sources change, the fee may be revised at consideration of gap financing to an amount up to the maximum allowed under the MOHCD policy. The at-risk fee will be held back from distribution to cover any cost overruns that exceed the contingency amounts held in the Sponsor's budget, per the MOHCD Developer Fee Policy.


### 6.6. This Request/Phasing Narrative

N/A

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

### 7.1. Annual Operating Budget

Since this is a predevelopment loan request, the annual operating budget is presented to demonstrate the project's overall feasibility and is not presented for approval at this time. Please see Attachment J.

### 7.2. Income

Project income will include tenant rents as well as subsidy for LOSP units. The preliminary cash flow assumes that commercial income and expenses will not flow through the residential project. This is subject to further analysis during the predevelopment period. During predevelopment, the Sponsor will work with OCII to confirm the AMI mix and will evaluate the potential for further tiering to include units $50 \%$ AMI. In addition, Sponsor will work with OCII and HSH to confirm the appropriate AMI levels for LOSP units, along with the total number of LOSP units. For example, there may be a need for some LOSP units with AMIs of up to $50 \%$ AMI to accommodate formerly households with full-time employment income.

| Unit Type | No. of Units | Max. AMI | Rent (at Max. AMI)* | Rent/ Operating Subsidy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 bedroom | 6 | 20\% | \$513** | LOSP |
| 2 bedroom | 9 |  | \$576** |  |
| 3 bedroom | 5 |  | \$640** |  |
| 1 bedroom | 4 | 30\% | \$769 |  |
| 2 bedroom | 3 |  | \$865 |  |
| 3 bedroom | 3 |  | \$961 |  |
| 1 bedroom | 18 | 60\% | \$1,538 |  |
| 2 bedroom | 18 |  | \$1,730 |  |
| 3 bedroom | 14 |  | \$1,921 |  |
| 1 bedroom | 7 | 80\% | \$2,050 |  |
| 2 bedroom | 7 |  | \$2,306 |  |
| 3 bedroom | 6 |  | \$2,563 |  |
| 2 bedroom | 1 | unrestricted | n/a | Mngr's Unit |
| Total Units | 101 | Average AMI: 53\% (38\% TCAC) |  |  |

* Based on 2020 MOHCD rents
** Tenants in units subsidized by LOSP are assumed to pay $\$ 300$ per month in rent, actual rent will be
$30 \%$ of tenant income, pursuant to LOSP policies


### 7.3. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation

| Underwriting Standard | Operating Proforma <br> Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR) <br> is between minimum 1.10:1 and <br> maximum 1.15:1 at year 15 | N | The DSCR is at 1.61 in Year 15. As a <br> condition of this loan (Condition 11.3.7), <br> the Sponsors will review assumptions and <br> maximize permanent debt. |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio stays <br> above 1.00:1 for entirety of projected <br> 20-year cash flow | Y | The DSCR is at 1.16 in year 20. |
| Vacancy meets TCAC Standards | Y | Vacancy is 5\% of tenant rents per TCAC <br> and LOSP standards. |
| Annual Income Growth is increased at <br> 2.5\% per year | Y | Income escalation factor is 2.5\% for non- <br> LOSP units and 1\% for LOSP in <br> compliance with OCII/MOHCD standards <br> and LOSP guidelines. |
| Annual Operating Expenses are <br> increased at 3.5\% per year | Y | Expenses escalation factor is 3.5\%. <br> are reasonable per comparables <br> are |
| Property Management Fee is at <br> allowable HUD Maximum | Y | Total base year operating expenses are <br> \$14,403 per unit per year (including <br> reserves), which is comparable to other <br> family projects that include LOSP units. |
| Property Management staffing level is <br> reasonable per comparables | Y | Property Management Fee is \$80,800 and <br> will be set in accordance with the HUD <br> schedule |


|  |  | 1 FTE Janitor <br> This level of property management staffing <br> is consistent with other buildings in the <br> Sponsor's portfolio. The staffing structure <br> will be refined during predevelopment. <br> Sponsor will evaluate the need for 24/7 <br> staffing and/or will explore the potential for <br> shared after hours desk coverage for cost <br> savings/efficiency (Condition 11.3.6). |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Asset Management and Partnership <br> Management Fees meet standards | Y | Annual AM fee is $\$ 24,280$ <br> Annual PM Fee is $\$ 24,270$ <br> These amounts are consistent with MOHCD <br> maximums for 2023. |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or <br> exceed TCAC minimum standards | Y | Replacement Reserves are $\$ 500$ per unit per <br> year (based on comparable projects). |
| Limited Partnership Asset Management <br> Fee (aka Investor Service Fee) meets <br> standards | Y | $\$ 5,000$ per year with no escalation. |

### 7.4. Capital Needs Assessment \& Replacement Reserve Analysis <br> N/A

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

### 8.1. Services Plan.

Mercy will provide resident services for low-income families and Episcopal Community Services (ECS) will provide supportive services for formerly homeless families.
Anticipated staffing is as follows:

| Position | FTE | Description |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Case Manager (bilingual) - ECS <br> (serving families in supportive <br> units) | $1.0^{*}$ | Provides psychological assessments, supportive <br> counseling, and individualize wrap-around case <br> management. Services aligned with Positive <br> Parenting Program. |
| Support Services Manager - <br> ECS (support for families in <br> supportive units) | $0.4^{*}$ | Provides leadership and supervision to ensure <br> quality and resident safety. Responsible for case <br> management program operations including staff <br> supervision and budget oversight. |
| Resident Services Coordinator II <br> - Mercy (serving all residents) | 1.0 | Coordinates on-site service programs, <br> partnerships with outside organizations, and <br> property management. Implements youth <br> programming, community engagement, health <br> and wellness initiatives, and housing stability. |
| Resident Services Manager <br> (serving all residents) | 0.2 | Provides oversight and supervision to support <br> resident services staff and programs. |
| Total FTE | $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ |  |

* The case management ratio of 1.4 FTE for 20 supportive units is higher than typical for HSH supported projects and will need to be reviewed and revised during predevelopment (Condition 11.3.5).


### 8.2. Service Budget.

Resident services at up to one staff person for every 100 units will be paid through the operating budget, pursuant to MOHCD underwriting standards. Case management and supportive services for formerly homeless families will be funded through a separate contract with HSH. The anticipated services budget is as follows:

| Position | FTE | Budget Amount | Funding Source |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Case Manager (bilingual) - ECS | 1.0 | $\$ 56,535$ | HSH Contract |
| Support Services Manager - ECS | 0.4 | $\$ 15,446$ | HSH Contract |
| Resident Services Coordinator II - <br> Mercy | 1.0 | $\$ 65,500$ | Operating budget |
| Resident Services Manager - <br> Mercy | 0.2 | $\$ 12,576$ | Operating budget |
| Fringe | $\$ 57,173$ | HSH Contract/Operating <br> budget |  |
| Operating Expenses | $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 , 1 0 2}$ | HSH Contract/Operating <br> budget |
| Total FTE |  | $\$ 49,872$ |  |

The case management ratio and related staffing costs are higher than typical for a supportive family project and will be reviewed and adjusted in coordination with HSH during predevelopment. The Sponsor will work with OCII and HSH to refine the services plan and budget during the predevelopment period (see Condition 11.3.5).

### 8.3. HSH Assessment of Service Plan and Budget.

To be provided with the gap funding request. Mili Choudhury, Family Permanent Supportive Housing Manager at HSH, was a member of the selection panel for the RFP and will participate in planning for services and management. A condition of this loan request is to work closely with OCII and HSH to develop and appropriate supportive services plan and budget for this Project (Condition 11.3.5).

## 9. THRESHOLD ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

The RFP defined minimum threshold requirements to be considered for selection. The Sponsors satisfied these requirements.

## 10. RANKING CRITERIA

The Sponsor was selected, along with the Sponsor of Block 2 West, based on their submittal in response to an RFP as described in Section 1.1. The team led by Mercy and CCDC received the highest score of the five proposals, with 90 out of 100 possible points. Scoring criteria was as follows:

| Maximum Points | Criteria |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{5 0}$ | Proposed Development Concept |
| 20 | Proposed massing concept |
| 15 | Financial feasibility and level of OCII subsidy |


| 10 | Proposed services plan |
| :---: | :--- |
| 5 | Proposed marketing plan |
| $\mathbf{5 0}$ | Developer Team Experience and Capacity |
| 10 | Developer's experience: comparable mixed-use projects |
| 10 | Developer's experience: affordable housing financing; workload capacity |
| 10 | Workforce and contracting action plan |
| 10 | Architect experience and capacity |
| 5 | Service provider experience and capacity |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Property manager experience and capacity |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | Maximum Total Points |

## 11. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

### 11.1. Proposed Loan/Grant Terms

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | $\$ 3,500,000$ |
| Loan Term: | 3 years or until rolled into a permanent loan for the <br> Project |
| Loan Maturity Date: | 2024 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Deferred |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $3 \%$ (may be recast if necessary due to true debt <br> analysis performed in preparation for the close of <br> construction financing. Interest rate may be between <br> $0 \%$ and 3\%, with approval of the OCII Executive <br> Director) |

### 11.2. Recommended predevelopment disbursement conditions

11.2.1 Subject to OCII approval, Mercy and CCDC will enter into a joint development agreement that clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of Mercy and CCDC in the overall development of Transbay Block 2. The agreement will use as its basis the Term Sheet attached to the MOU dated September 10, 2020 between Mercy and CCDC and will clearly define Mercy's role as lead developer, in close coordination with CCDC for the following matters: contract negotiations, including predevelopment loan terms, and ground leases; general contractor and consultants' selection; retail programming, commercial shell design, marketing and leasing; lot split/subdivision mapping; streetscape and landscape design; respective liabilities for work performed under the agreement; and other matters to achieve cost efficiencies and a cohesive development on Block 2.

### 11.3. Recommended conditions prior to gap financing

11.3.1 Sponsor will, in coordination with OCII, study massing and financing scenarios at $165^{\prime}, 240^{\prime}$, and other design variations as recommended by the design team to balance unit count and financial feasibility on the 2 East site
and will submit a combined conceptual design and cost estimate with Block 2 West.
11.3.2 Sponsor will work closely with the sponsor of Block 2 West throughout predevelopment and will:
a. ensure that the design teams for Blocks 2 East and West collaborate and submit a single combined schematic design package, which demonstrates cohesive design between Blocks 2 East and West, particularly for the ground floor and mid-block pedestrian mews; and
b. use the same general contractor or joint venture for construction and coordinate construction timing between Blocks 2 East and West, either by construction of both sites at the same time or phased development.
11.3.3 Sponsor will cooperate with OCII and the sponsor of Block 2 West to competitively solicit a general contractor with the intent of creating a joint venture or similar partnership opportunity, to the extent practicable and economically feasible, between a general contractor and an OCII-recognized SBE contractor. Furthermore, Sponsor will cooperate and require the general contractor to exercise good faith efforts to select subcontractors who either are SBEs or, if they are not SBEs, are willing to create joint ventures or similar partnership opportunities with SBEs.
11.3.4 Sponsor will seek a child care provider through a competitive RFP process. Sponsor will coordinate with the selected provider to refine space designs and support the provider, as appropriate, in seeking tenant improvement assistance.
11.3.5 Sponsor will work with OCII, MOHCD, and HSH to:
a. finalize the number of permanent supportive units, ensuring consistency with best practice case management ratios;
b. review AMI levels for LOSP-supported units to ensure that the levels of are appropriate to accommodate anticipated tenant needs; and
c. refine the services plan and budget.
11.3.6 Sponsor evaluate the need for 24 hour desk coverage for the Project and will explore the potential for shared after hours front desk coverage/security between Blocks 2 East and West to improve efficiency and reduce costs.
11.3.7 Sponsor will seek to maximize permanent debt, while maintaining an AMI mix as agreed upon with OCII and ensuring an adequate debt service coverage ratio.
11.3.8 Sponsor will closely monitor available funding sources such as AHP, AHSC, IIG, and others, review regulations, and submit timely applications, as appropriate. If necessary, Sponsor will recommend strategies and program modifications for OCII approval to improve the Project's likelihood of securing awards.
11.3.9 Sponsor will ensure that commercial spaces are designed in accordance with the specifications established in the MOHCD Commercial Space Underwriting Guidelines and will provide a commercial financing plan for OCII review and approval.
11.3.10 Sponsor will conduct early outreach to local small business organizations, non-profit entrepreneur organizations, and other entities, groups and organizations, as appropriate, to market the Project's retail space. In addition, Sponsor will engage with the San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development regarding the retail space and the availability of the City's small business, legacy business, and other programs to identify and assist potential local business tenants.
11.3.11 Sponsor will coordinate with OCII and the sponsor of Block 2 West to establish project boundaries and secure a subdivision map for Transbay Block 2.
11.3.12 Prior to submittal of a site permit application and subdivision map application, Sponsor, in collaboration with the sponsor of Block 2 West, will recommend for OCII approval, a specific plan for the development of public or common use areas in Transbay Block 2, e.g. the mid-block pedestrian mews, that establishes the lot lines, allocation of development, a mechanism for ensuring public access, and responsibilities for construction and ongoing maintenance and security.
11.3.13 Sponsor will provide the RFP for debt and equity providers before it is finalized and released.
11.3.14 Sponsor and sponsor of Block 2 West will work collaboratively on a community outreach plan, will conduct ongoing outreach to the Transbay community to solicit input, address concerns, and educate community members on various aspects of the Project. Sponsor will take the lead in obtaining OCII approval for the community outreach plan.
12. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

## Anna Van Degna, Director

Controller's Office of Public Finance
Attachments: A. Project Milestones/Schedule
B. Borrower Organizational Chart
C. Developer Resumes
D. Asset Management Analysis of Sponsor
E. Site Map with Amenities
F. Elevations and Floor Plans
G. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments
H. Predevelopment Sources and Uses
I. Permanent Sources and Uses
J. First Year Operating Budget
K. 20-Year Operating Pro Forma

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From: Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 11:59 AM
To:
Subject:
Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
Predevelopment Financing Transbay East

I approve

Eric D. Shaw
Director

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

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, February 19, 2021 12:53 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Predevelopment Financing for Transbay Block 2 East |

I approve the request for a predevelopment loan in the amount of \$3,500,000 for Transbay Block 2 East.

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.

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Oerth, Sally (CII) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, February 19, 2021 11:58 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR); Obstfeld, Kimberly (CII) |
| Subject: | Predevelopment Financing Transbay Block 2E- 2.19.21 Loan Committee |

I approve the Predevelopment Loan request for Transbay Block 2E, as presented at the 2.19.21 Loan Committee


Sally Oerth
Interim Executive Director

- One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
, 415.749.2588
A www.sfocii.org


## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Katz, Bridget (CON) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, February 19, 2021 11:57 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Predevelopment Financing Transbay East |

Approve

## Bridget Katz

Development Finance Specialist, Office of Public Finance
Controller's Office | City \& County of San Francisco
Office Phone: (415) 554-6240
Cell Phone: (858) 442-7059
E-mail: bridget.katz@sfgov.org

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

| No. | Performance Milestone | Estimated or Actual Date | Contractual Deadline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Prop I Noticing (if applicable) | N/A | N/A |
| 1 | Acquisition/Predev Financing Commitment | February 2021 | (this request) |
| 2. | Site Acquisition | September 2023 | March 2024 |
| 3. | Development Team Selection |  |  |
| a. | Architect | November 2020 | Complete |
| b. | General Contractor | June 2021 | December 2021 |
| c. | Owner's Representative | April 2021 | October 2021 |
| d. | Property Manager | November 2020 | Complete |
| e. | Service Provider | November 2020 | Complete |
| 4. | Design |  |  |
| a. | Conceptual Design \& Cost Estimate | July 2021 | January 2022 |
| b. | Submittal of Schematic Design \& Cost Estimate | November 2021 | May 2022 |
| c. | Submittal of Design Development \& Cost Estimate | September 2022 | March 2023 |
| d. | Submittal of 50\% CD Set \& Cost Estimate | January 2023 | July 2023 |
| e. | Submittal of Pre-Bid Set \& Cost Estimate (75\%-80\% CDs) | May 2023 | November 2023 |
| 5. | Environ Review/Land-Use Entitlements |  |  |
| a. | CEQA Environ Review Submission | N/A | N/A |
| b. | NEPA Environ Review Submission | N/A | N/A |
| 6. | Permits |  |  |
| a. | Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | January 2022 | July 2022 |
| b. | Subdivision Mapping | September 2022 | March 2023 |
| c. | Addendum \#1 Submitted | August 2022 | February 2023 |
| d. | Addendum \#2 Submitted | February 2023 | August 2023 |
| 7. | Request for Bids Issued | June 2023 | December 2023 |
| 8. | Service Plan Submission |  |  |
| a. | Preliminary | September 2021 | March 2022 |
| b. | Interim | N/A | N/A |


| c. | Final | May 2023 | November 2023 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. | Additional City Financing |  |  |
| a. | Predevelopment Financing Application \#2 | N/A | N/A |
| b. | Gap Financing Application | February 2023 | August 2023 |
| 10. | Other Financing |  |  |
| a. | AHSC/IIG Application | November 2021 | November 2022 |
| b. | Construction Financing RFP | January 2023 | July 2023 |
| c. | AHP Application | March 2023 | March 2024 |
| d. | CDLAC Application | March 2023 | September 2023 |
| e. | TCAC Application | March 2023 | September 2023 |
| 11. | Closing |  |  |
| a. | Construction Closing | September 2023 | March 2024 |
| b. | Permanent Financing Closing | September 2023 | March 2024 |
| 12. | Construction |  |  |
| a. | Notice to Proceed | September 2023 | March 2024 |
| b. | Temporary Certificate of Occupancy/Cert of Substantial Completion | August 2025 | February 2026 |
| 13. | Marketing/Rent-up |  |  |
| a. | Early Outreach Plan Submission | October 2023 | April 2024 |
| b. | Marketing Plan Submission | August 2024 | February 2025 |
| c. | Commence Marketing | January 2025 | July 2026 |
| d. | 95\% Occupancy | January 2026 | July 2026 |
| 14. | Cost Certification/8609 | December 2026 | June 2027 |
| 15. | Close Out OCII Loan | December 2026 | June 2027 |

## Attachment B: Borrower Organizational Chart



## Attachment C: Developer Resumes

## Michael Kaplan Project Developer

Live in Hope

## EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, MA
Master of Science in Real Estate Development
and Master in City Planning, 2014
Northwestern University, Evanston, IL
Bachelor of Arts in Economics and History, 2005

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mercy Housing California
Project Developer II, Project Developer, Project
Assistant II San Francisco, CA 2014 - present

- Engaged in new business development opportunities, including negotiating ENA for 3-acre site in Richmond and joint use agreement with BART for easement in Colma, submission of responses to RFPs, and worked with local partners and housing agencies in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Contra Costa Counties.
- Tackled challenging issues with a diverse set of local communities, ranging from disadvantaged communities in Richmond and North Fair Oaks to suburban San Mateo County and Pacific Heights, and adapted projects to address resident issues and gain local buy-in.
- Conducted financial feasibility analysis, prepared proformas, submitted funding applications for state and local sources and tax credits, and closed financing at both the construction and permanent stages.
- Hired and oversaw team of architects, engineers, consultants, and contractors.
- Project-managed completion of 66 -unit supportive housing development for veterans in Colma, including new construction and renovation of historic building, and navigated the project through a CEQA EIR.
- Collaborated with the Department of Veterans Affairs and local homeless agencies to obtain medical assistance in order to house the most chronically homeless and disabled veterans.
- Led 98-unit occupied rehab of old public housing high-rise in San Francisco as part of the RAD program, addressing services and security deficiencies, seismic upgrades, ADA requirements, and energy efficiency.
- Initiated successful development program for 180 unit mixed used development in Redwood City.

Anaina Hou Community Park Co-Founder, Project General Manager, Kilauea, Kaua'i, HI 2006-2011

- Conceptualized, designed and directed creation of 15 -acre community complex and performing arts center.
- Presented proposal at public hearings to Planning Commission, the Mayor, and County Council members, and worked with various State and County agencies through entitlement process.
- Supervised construction and managed budget for successful completion of Phase I of project.
- Developed sustainable business model to reach profitability in first year, generating $\$ 700,000$ in revenue, $11 \%$ profit margin, and over 60,000 customer visits.


## Barbara Gualco

 Vice President, Director of Housing Development
## EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Master of City Planning, Land Use Concentration, University of California Berkeley, 1987
BA, Economics San Francisco State University, 1983

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mercy Housing California, San Francisco, California Director, Housing Development, September 2003 to Present
Direct the multi-family housing and commercial development work in the San Francisco office of a national leader in the acquisition and production of quality affordable multi-family housing developments. Currently overseeing 15 developments, with a budget of $\$ 380$ Million. Responsibilities include developing an acquisitions strategy, negotiating site control; conducting market and demographic analysis, feasibility assessments, preliminary land use analysis, asset repositioning and work-outs; obtaining neighborhood acceptance and land use approvals; managing the bidding and design process; assembling public equity and private debt financing for complex tax credit and bond financing packages. Responsible for the selection and management of retained development team professionals from financing, legal, design, construction and management disciplines. Manage and assist a staff of 7 development professionals.

Mercy Housing California, San Francisco, California Senior Project Manager, November 1987 to August 2003 Perform site analysis and prepare proformas to determine feasibility of new development opportunities. Identify and structure development and operating financing; obtain commitments; close financing including various public sector subsidy sources and conventional financing. Obtain land use entitlements; coordinate community acceptance plans; represent agency in public forums. Identify, select, contract and coordinate team of development professionals including architects, engineers, attorneys, financial consultants, property management, etc. Oversee construction progress including processing construction change orders and payment applications. Develop and administer development budgets and schedules; provide reporting to multiple funding sources. Provided direct project management for nine distinct housing developments comprised of approximately 500 units. These developments included new construction, renovation and adaptive reuse with a wide range of financing including the HUD 202 Capital Advance Program, Low Income Housing Tax Credits both $9 \%$ and $4 \%$, McKinney Programs and Shelter + Care.

## PROFESSIONAL AFFILICATIONS

Board Member, Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (TIHDI)
Board Member, Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California

## Lorie Warnick Regional Director of Operations

## EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

California Department of Real Estate
California Real Estate License, May 1992
Diablo Valley College
Associates in Arts Degree

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mercy Housing Management Group Regional Vice President, May 2020-present Regional Director of Operations, April 2018 to May 2020
Supervises Area Directors and other staff working in her assigned portfolio. Develops and recommends appropriate policies congruent with the strategic direction and plans of Mercy Housing. In consultation with the Asset Management and Compliance Departments, ensures that the necessary systems are in place to monitor site compliance with all Partnership Agreements, Regulatory Agreements, and any other requirements.

Mercy Housing Management Group Regional Director of Marketing/Interim Area Director of Operations, September 2008-April 2018
Provided support to regional leadership in developing and implementing marketing strategies to achieve regional property occupancy goals. Responsibilities included developing marketing campaigns and programs targeting qualified renters for all property incomes set-asides. Worked with division management, communications, and other regional staff to develop short and long range plans and best practices. Completed Marketing Plans, Resident Selection Criteria, AFHMPs and worked with MOHCD and OCll as point person for new developments.

Lennar Homes, San Ramon, CA (1992-2008)
Regional Director of Marketing, 2007-2008
Director of Marketing, 2002-2007
Managed daily operations of Marketing Departments in the Northern California Region. Managed the marketing budgets, advertising campaigns and all marketing collateral materials. Worked with Forward Planning department, Architects, Engineers, Interior Decorators on new communities throughout design and construction phases.

## Construction Area Manager/Purchasing Manager 1992-2002

Responsible for daily activities of Construction Managers assigned to specific projects. Responsibilities included preparation of construction schedules, monitored progression of work on a weekly basis, and provided written reports for progress, subcontractor meeting, agency contacts, problem resolution, safety meetings, storm water management, and other reports for efficient project management. Coordinated with Site Development Manager and Purchasing Manger to develop, design and implement procedures for efficient project planning and subcontractor performance standards to achieve division goals. Coordinated with Customer Service Director to establish and promote a total quality management program, Zero Defect closings and current on CSR's.

Warmington Homes, San Ramon, CA Purchasing Agent 1982-1992
Responsible for day-to-day operations of purchasing department, which included budgets, bidding of all construction work, negotiations, contracting and field interaction.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILICATIONS \& CERTIFICATIONS
California Association of Real Estate
Home Builders Association, Northern California
AHMA Education Committee
NCHM, Tax Credit Specialist Certification

## Alvin Tuvilla <br> Regional Director of Resident Services

Live in Hope

## EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

California State University Sacramento, Sacramento, CA
Bachelor of Arts in Child Development Master of Science in Counseling with a focus on Marriage and Family Therapy

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mercy Housing California, Sacramento, CA Regional Director of Resident Services December 2013 to Present
Ensures that family, senior and supportive properties developed by Mercy Housing California (MHC) provide high quality resident programs and services that are congruent with current practices, trends, and standards. Oversees all Resident Services in the California region. Oversees services provided by contracting agencies. Provide leadership and oversight to MHC staff in the implementation of resident programs and services as outlined in the Mercy program model. Consult with Mercy Housing California senior management and real estate development staff during acquisition and housing project development to ensure that effective and creative programs and services are integrated into the project design and budgets. Remain current on local, state and Federal issues related to programs and services in the affordable housing industry and disseminate the information in an effective manner.

Mercy Housing California, Sacramento, CA Director of Family Services, 2008 to 2013

Mercy Housing California, Sacramento, CA Resident Services Manager, 2003 to 2008

Mercy Services Corporation, Sacramento, CA Health Care Organizer, 2001 to 2003

Resident Services Coordinator, Folsom, CA 1998 to 2001

Counselor/Therapist- White House Counseling Center, San Juan Unified School District, Sacramento, CA 1999 to 2000

Counselor- River Oak Center for Children, 1997 to 1998

PROFESSIONAL AFFILICATIONS
American Association of Service Coordinators

## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

Mercy Housing California (MHC) will assume asset management duties for Block 2 East. Asset management falls under the National Portfolio Management department of Mercy Housing, Inc., led by Senior Vice President Melissa Clayton.

Total number of projects and average number of units per project currently in Sponsor's asset management portfolio: Mercy's asset management department currently oversees 154 properties in California, including 53 in San Francisco.

Sponsor's current asset management staffing including job titles, full time employees, an organizational chart and the status of each position (filled/vacant): Yelena Zilberfayn is the Director of Asset Management at Mercy Housing where she has worked for the past 20 years, 8 of which in the asset management department, and is responsible for a portfolio of real estate assets serving families, seniors, and special needs individuals. She leads a team of 5 asset Managers, 4 in San Francisco, 1 in Sacramento. Yelena's team is supported by 2 asset management analysts and 1 commercial asset management analyst based in the Denver office, and one commercial asset manager based in San Francisco. In addition, 2 asset managers oversee other regions in California and a capital project investment manager report directly to Melissa Clayton.

Yelena is located in the San Francisco office and interfaces directly with Doug Shoemaker, President of MHC, and Jennifer Dolin, Vice President of Operations of MHC. Yelena and her team act as Mercy's representatives in relation to the physical and financial status of each asset and protect its financial health and long-term viability.

Mercy's portfolio management also includes a transaction team comprised of 2 staff devoted to other specialized needs such as the year 15 buy out and the refinance of properties.

All positions are currently filled and are all full time. The breakdown of the Bay Area asset management staff positions is as follows:
(1) Director of Asset Management
(1) Director of Portfolio Analysis
(4) Asset Managers
(2) Asset Management Analysts
(1) Commercial Asset Management Analyst
(1) Commercial Asset Manager

Each asset manager oversees a portfolio of up to 25 assets. The asset managers in the San Francisco office currently have 90 assets in their portfolio. Eight of these properties are in predevelopment, under construction or in rehab in San Francisco or the Bay Area. In San Francisco, asset managers manage fewer than the maximum of 25 assets to allow capacity for future developments. Once development is complete, a San Francisco-based asset manager will assume asset management duties for Block 2 East.

Description of scope and range of duties of Sponsor's asset management team: Asset management staff has oversight over all operations of the properties. The portfolio is analyzed monthly through a portfolio scorecard, which provides metrics regarding physical and economic occupancy, trade and intercompany payables. In addition, the team performs quarterly risk ratings according to Affordable Housing Investment Council (AHIC) standards, of every property to
evaluate occupancy, management, capital needs and available reserves. If a property is placed on the watchlist, there is a quarterly meeting with the asset management team, Mercy Housing Management Group and Mercy Housing California President to identify strategies to get the property off the watchlist.

Asset Managers are responsible for tracking all capital needs on their portfolio on a quarterly basis as part of Mercy's watchlist process. They are assisted by various staff of Mercy Housing Management Group, including the regional facilities manager and the various area directors of operations assigned to the properties. Using various analysis tools including the watchlist and budget planning, reviewing CNAs, and reserve analysis, the asset managers determine when the necessary capital needs can be completed in the short and long term.

The analyst team submits reserve replacement requests bi-annually. In addition, the analyst team helps with the compliance with financing requirements and regulatory reporting requirements by sending quarterly and annual reporting to investors and funders.

Portfolio preservation planning is accomplished through balancing the use of reserves with the payment of scheduled partnership and deferred development fees through cash flow. The transaction team handles some of the longer term needs of the portfolio such as year 15 analysis and investor buyout and a property restructuring such as a refinance.

Description of Sponsor's coordination between asset management and other functional teams, including property management, accounting, compliance, facilities management, etc.: There is regular coordination between property management, related departments, and asset management. Asset management oversees all aspects of operations so there is communication with property management on a daily basis. Asset and property management work together on annual audits and budgets. In addition, there is constant coordination around cash management and financial oversight of each property, as well as preparation of financial statements. Asset management and compliance primarily coordinate on compliance issues that directly affect ownership and the partnership. Asset management and facilities coordinate on budget preparation and capital projects. Asset management staff also coordinates around emergencies.

## Developer's Budget for Asset Management Team Shown as Cost Center for SF Projects:

The annual asset management staffing budget is $\$ 2,460,839$.
Number of projects expected to be in Sponsor's asset management portfolio in 5 years and, if applicable, plans to augment staffing to manage growing portfolio: Mercy anticipates that the portfolio will grow from 154 buildings to approximately 170 buildings in the next five years. Two new asset manager positions were added in 2017 and one in 2019.

MOHCD Asset Management staff assessment of Sponsor's asset management capacity: The Sponsor's description of their asset management functions, duties and coordination with related teams within the organization demonstrates an adequate asset management operation for their existing portfolio. With 7 FTE asset managers and a portfolio of 154 projects in California, the project/asset management staff ratio is 22 , which is in line with the industry standard of 20-25 recommended by NeighborWorks America. In addition, the Sponsor's asset management staff includes asset management analysts who support the asset managers. The full range of asset management responsibilities are covered by the asset managers and the analysts. With an increase of 15-16 projects in the Sponsor's portfolio anticipated over the next 5 years, the ratio will increase but remain within the industry standard.

## Attachment E: Site Map with amenities

Aerial image of Transbay Block 2 (southern portion of block formerly occupied by the Temporary Transbay Terminal


Transbay Block 2 site location and amenities


## Attachment F: Elevations and Floor Plans
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## Attachment G: Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments

| PROJECTS COMPLETED |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Toat Dov. Cost } \\ \text { wland }}}^{\text {and }}$ | Local Susisids | Total oev. Cost wo lond | Notes on Financing | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Address | Lot sq.f. | Compl Date | \# of unis | \#of $\mathrm{Br}^{\prime}$ | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non.Res. | Total | Acc. Cost3 | Constr. cost4 | Sott cost |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{222}$ Beale Streat | ${ }_{\text {292093 }}^{6 \times 250}$ | $\frac{\mathrm{OCH}+18}{}$ | ${ }^{120}$ | ${ }^{208}$ | ${ }_{1}^{18,251}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5.000}$ | $\xrightarrow{123,254}$ | ${ }_{\text {350,00 }}^{148.155}$ |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{25.560 .00}$ |  | HCD AHSC Loan <br> HCD AHSC L Lan <br> 2 HCD L Lans (MP \& TOD) <br> 2 HCD AHC Loan | 3 Buildings - Type I Podium, 4-8 stories (Pueblo structural system), plus Childcare shell Type IIIA \& V over Type I podium, 41 pkg spaces, Mission Bay soils and infrastructure Type IB - 9 story <br> ype V over Type I from approved eval dated 05/05/17 <br> Type IB - 8 story, extensive PG\&E regional switch required |
|  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 6.2.200 }}}^{15}$ |  | ${ }_{88}^{148}$ | ${ }_{134}^{2184}$ | -102062 | ${ }_{6,955}$ | ${ }_{\text {99,477 }}$ | ${ }_{5,551,209}$ |  | cise |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcelo | ${ }^{455} 5$ Feilstreat | ${ }^{377288}$ | Jun-19 | ${ }^{108}$ | ${ }_{\substack{165 \\ 215}}$ | 82,17 | ${ }^{31,128}$ | ${ }^{113,24}$ |  |  | 9,99400 |  | ${ }_{\text {17,390,250 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {c6,6 }}^{6}$ |  |  |
| Eady and Tavor ramil Housing | Travor Average: | ${ }^{23,486}$ |  | ${ }^{1114}$ | ${ }_{129} 19$ | ${ }_{1020,40}^{12,70}$ | ${ }^{214,7878}$ | ${ }^{1227,488}{ }^{129}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{12,589,475}^{14,459}$ |  | s | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |
| PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Notes of Financing |  |
| Project Name | Address | Lot sa.ft | Compl Date | \# of units | \# of8R' | Res. ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | Non.Res. | Total | Acc. Cost3 | Constr. Cost4 | soft cost | ${ }_{\text {Totat Dov. Cost }}^{\text {wland }}$ | Local Susisiy 5 | Total oev. Cost wo land |  | Comments |
| 4095 Sut Van Ness | 490 S. Van Noss Avemue | 14,250 | Sop 20 | 81 | ${ }^{121}$ | 51,639 | ${ }^{28,985}$ | 880.24 | 18,500,00 | $43.647,993$ | ${ }_{13,393,81}$ | $75.541,180$ | 28,892,303 | 57,04, 3 ,04 | HCD AHSC LaanHCD AHSC LoanHCD AHSC L LanHCD MHP Loan | Type IA - 7 stories over partial basement <br> 9 Story Type IB - TAY, Childcare, Community Hub w/AHSC Improvements of \$6MM ype IA - 9 stories with significant ( $30 \%$ of sf) art and PDR spaces and Paseo Des Artes Type IIIA \& V over Type I Podium (5-6 stories) - family <br> Type I 8 stories on constrained site <br> Type IB 9 stories, 8,400+/- PDR |
|  | ${ }^{203060 ~ F o s o m ~}$ | ${ }_{\substack{20,075 \\ 30.50}}$ | $\frac{\text { Deoc.20 }}{\text { Norze }}$ | ${ }^{127}$ | ${ }_{2}^{232}$ | ${ }_{\text {IS5,648 }}^{11343}$ | 11,810 | \|l7,458 | 134.930 |  | 20,100,12 | $\frac{91,80,76}{}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 888 croadwe - -amily Housing | 88 Broasway | ${ }_{\text {3, }}^{3,182}$ | ${ }_{\text {Norat }}^{\text {Nar-21 }}$ | ${ }_{125}^{125}$ | ${ }_{221}^{221}$ | ${ }_{\text {140,279 }}$ | ${ }^{8.700}$ | ${ }_{\text {14, } 14.5979}$ | 1,4,900,000 |  | 27,758,226 | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{\text {2, }}^{2,909,6,676}$ | - |  |  |
| 500 Tuk Steet (5s Larkin) | So Tuk Steet | 18.906 | Dec.21 | 108 | 186 | 82805 | ${ }^{26,586}$ | 109,391 | 1.853.895 | $54,251,461 \mathrm{~s}$ | 29,85,020 | ${ }^{85,920,37}$ | 324000.0 | 84,06,681 |  |  |
| ${ }^{689}$ Frivida | 818 Floridas Steet |  | Jun-22 | ${ }^{130}$ | ${ }^{199}$ | 120,830 | 9,250 | 138.080 |  | ${ }^{69,184,293}$ s | 20.54,7,939 | 899855,177 |  | ${ }^{89,780,086}$ |  |  |
| Under Construction: | Average: | ${ }^{26,001}$ |  | ${ }^{121}$ | 207 | 111,772 | ${ }^{22,246}$ | 134,018 | $5^{\text {7,588,153 }}$ | ${ }_{65,641,033} \mathrm{~s}$ | 21,130,733 | ${ }_{\text {94,319,939 }}$ | ${ }^{33,278,344}$ | ${ }^{86,771,786}$ |  |  |
| PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square $\digamma$ |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name | Address | 9.th |  | \# of units | \#of $\mathrm{Br}^{\prime}$ | Res. ${ }^{2}$ | Non.Res. | Total | Acc. Cost3 | Constr. Cost4 | sot Cost | ${ }_{\text {Totat Dov. Cost }}^{\text {whand }}$ | Local Susidy | Total Dev. Cost wo land |  | Comments |
| Nission Bay Sout 9 A (ownesship) | 350 China Basis Stret | ${ }^{29.939}$ | Feb 22 | ${ }^{140}$ | ${ }^{280}$ | ${ }_{\text {cki }}^{136,165}$ | ${ }_{50.611}^{1014}$ | ${ }^{186,776}$ |  | 110.000.000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{22,055,375}$ | ${ }^{1322093,375}$ | 79,200,000 | ${ }^{132093,737}$ | Notes on Financing |  |
| 44 thand Fosom | ${ }^{2} 268$ thtr Stoeet | ${ }_{8,400}$ | ${ }_{\text {Dea } 21}$ | 70 | ${ }_{9} 9$ | ${ }_{60,515}$ | ${ }_{1.580}$ | ${ }_{62005}$ | 133,100 |  | , | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ ¢ $64,058,730$ |  | 63,925,630 |  |  |
|  |  | 37,80 <br> 28,83 | ${ }_{\text {Apr }}^{\text {Apr } 21}$ | 200 <br> 203 | 290 | 181,30 <br> 235680 | 5.000 <br> 1.90 | $\xrightarrow{186,390}{ }^{23,650}$ | ${ }_{10,081,129}^{10,}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 730 Staryan | 7330 Sarvan Street | - | Dec21 | ${ }_{1}^{120}$ | ${ }_{2}^{225}$ | ${ }_{\text {I }}^{124.750}$ | $\xrightarrow{20.000}$ | ${ }^{1144.750} 1$ | ${ }_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{s}^{\text {s }}$ | 为 |  | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  | (eamen | Type I, 8 stories over MUNI substation tu <br> Type IA, 18 stories, 3 parking spaces \& retail (April 2020 SD estimate) |
| in Preaevelopment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





| PROJECTS In PREDEVELOPMENT |  | Acquisition |  |  | Construction |  |  | Soft Costs |  |  | Total Development Cost (Incl. Land) |  |  | Subsidy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Start Date (anticipated) | Acquunit | AcqIBr | Acallot sq.th | Constunit | StBr | Constsa.t. ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | nit | Sotilier | Sottsq.ft6 | ss TDC/unit | Ss TCCIBR | Gross TDC/s9.fi6 | Sussidy / unit | Leveraging ${ }^{\text {7 }}$ |
| Mission Bay South 9A (owests ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Feb-22 | - | . | . | ${ }^{786,000}$ | 393.000 | ${ }_{569}^{598}$ | ${ }^{157,527}$ | ${ }_{\text {78,763 }}$ | ${ }^{118}$ | ${ }_{\text {94, }}^{94.57}$ | ${ }_{4717.763}^{4}$ | ${ }^{7} 7$ | ${ }_{\text {665,747 }}$ | 40.0\% |
| $\frac{\text { BPUY }}{4 \text { thand Folsom }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Apr } 21}{ }_{\text {Doc } 21}$ | 1.901 | ${ }_{1.344}$ | 16 |  | ${ }^{418,3088}$ | ${ }_{5}^{505}$ | $\xrightarrow{2039,202}$ | ${ }^{12120.843}$ | ${ }^{1225}$ |  | ${ }_{6}^{5477,058}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1.032}$ | ${ }_{2}^{223,283}$ | ${ }^{74.50 \%}$ |
| 6007 trstreet | Apr-22 | 50 | ${ }^{34}$ | 0 | 536.540 | ${ }^{370,028}$ | 576 | 215,413 | ${ }^{148,560}$ | ${ }^{231}$ | ${ }^{752,003}$ | 518,623 | ${ }^{8}$ | ${ }_{\text {s }}$ | 2004 |
| $\frac{927 \text { Howard }}{730 \text { Stanyan }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Apr-21 }}^{\text {Dec } 21}$ |  |  | 487 | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{3959}^{49,76}$ | ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | ${ }_{96}{ }^{\text {93 }}$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad \frac{648,213}{}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{5}$ |  |
| In Predevelopment | Average | 11,886 | 9,291 | 84 | s 657,774 | 418,562 | s 585 | 178,373 | 116,594 | 162 | 853,480 | ${ }_{547,667}$ | 762 | s $\quad 293,247$ | ${ }_{66 \%}$ |

[^0]

## Attachment H: Predevelopment Sources and Uses



## Attachment I: Permanent Development Budget

| Application Date: | 917720 |  |  |  | 101 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: Proiect Address: | Transbay Block 2 | 2 Family |  | rooms: | 195 |  |  |  | LosP Project |  |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { Project Adaress: }}$ Projet Sponsor: | Mercy Housing Ca | Caliomia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Sources | Comments |  |
| SOURCES | 26,995,472 | 1,200,000 | 20,00,000 | 7,000,000 | 1,500,000 | 3,00,000 | 38,760,688 | 98,156,140 |  |  |
| Name of Sources: | монCDOCCII | АнР-¢HLB | нсD-AHSC | ${ }_{\text {Loan }}^{1 / \mathrm{S} \text {-sone }}$ | TE-Perm Loan | ${ }_{\text {con }}^{\text {Contrution }}$ | LP Equity |  |  |  |
| USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquistion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquistion costor value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Closing costs/ $/$ Brokers Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heding Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Acausition |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| CONSTRUCTION (HARD Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit ConstructionReehab | ${ }^{72,716}$ | 1,200,000 | 7,096,138 | 3,390,000 | 1,296,017 |  | 38,76,668 | 51,815,539 | Include FFSE |  |
| Coinmercial Shell Construction | ${ }^{3.452,715}$ |  |  | 300.000 |  |  |  | 3,452.715 |  |  |
| Eemivoition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Onsight ImprovementstLandscaping |  |  |  | 2,810,000 |  |  |  | 2,810,000 |  |  |
| Offstel Improvements |  |  |  | 500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Infastucture Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | HOPE SFIOCII cosis for streels elc |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Caking }}$ Soond Premium/GC Insurancel/GC Taxes |  |  |  |  | 203,983 |  |  |  |  |  |
| GC veremead $\ell$ Proft |  |  | 4,699,438 |  |  |  |  | $4,699,488$ | reduced to 14\% of tota hard cost | 8.0\% |
| 66 General Condtions Sub-total Constuction Cosis | 3.525,431 | 1,200,000 |  | 7,000.000 | 1.500.000 |  | ${ }^{38,76,668}$ |  |  |  |
| Design Contingency (remove at $D$ D) |  |  | 3.024,738 |  |  |  |  | 3.024,738 |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{3,024,788 \\ \hline, 0438}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5.1 \%}$ |
| Plan Check Contingency (remove/reduce during Plan Rey Hard Cost Construction Contingency | ${ }_{\substack{3,024,788 \\ 3,98882}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | - ${ }_{\text {3,024,788 }}^{3,988,682}$ |  | 56.7\% |
| $\frac{\text { Sub-toala Construction Contingencies }}{\text { arem }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total construction costs | ${ }^{13,513,589}$ | 1,200,000 | 18,35,000 | 7,000,000 | 1,500,000 |  | 38,76,668 | ${ }_{80,324,257}$ |  |  |
| soft costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architecture \& Design | 2.164 .506 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Subbonsultant to the Architect (incl. Fees) | 1,043,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,043,000 | 俍 per A\&E Schedule |  |
| Acchitect Construction Admin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Reimburables }}{\text { Additiona Serices }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Senices $\quad$ Sub-total Acrchitect Contract |  | 0 | , | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3,207,506 |  | - | - |  |  |  | 3,207,506 | Grien consulting - sook, Joint Trench- - souk, Exereio |  |
| Acrohiect ontract) | 225,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 225,000 | building maintenance - $\$ 25 \mathrm{k}$, Acoustics - $\$ 40 \mathrm{k}$, Special inspections - \$80k, Elevator - \$20k |  |
|  | 3,432,506 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | 3,432,506 |  |  |
| Survey | 25.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25,000 |  |  |
| Geotechnical studies | 60,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 |  |  |
| Phase 1 \& 1 Report | 35.000 55000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.000 2500 |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { CEQA/ Environmental Review consultants }}{\text { NEPA } / 106 \text { Review }}$ | 25.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{25,000}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other environmental consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Name consultants \& contract amount |  |
| Total Engineering \& Environmental Studies osts | 145,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 145,000 |  |  |
| Construction Financing Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Laan oinigation Fee | ${ }^{4474.487} 3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{4474.487} 3$ |  |  |
| Tite e Recororing | , 30.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30,000 |  |  |
| CDLAC 8 Codil fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond ssuer Fees | 150,633 100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{100,0000}$ | Sydicatio costs |  |
| 0 Other Lender Costs (specity) | ${ }^{150.000}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{155.000}$ | Lender Inspections |  |
| Sub-total Const. Financing Costs | 4,199,278 |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{0}$ | 0 |  |  | 4,191,278 |  |  |
| Permanent Loan origination Fee | ${ }^{13,342}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{13,342}$ |  |  |
| Credit Enhance. \& Appl. Fee Title \& Recording | 25,000 20.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25,000 20.000 |  |  |
| Sub-total Peme. Financing Cosis | 20,000 488,322 $4.20,20$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 5, 5 , 3,02 |  |  |
| Legal costs Total Financing Costs | 4,249,620 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,249,620 |  |  |
| Borrower Legalfees | .000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |  |  |
| Lend See I CeEAAAtomey fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baxd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Lender Counsel | 100.000 65.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.000 65000 |  |  |
| Other Legal (spectif) | 65,00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Development Costs Total Legal Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 215,000 |  |  |
| Appraisal | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25,000 |  |  |
| - Market Study | 900,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150,000 900,000 |  |  |
| - Property Taxes | 1.600 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Accounting A Audit | 40.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40.000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Marketing/ Rent-up | ${ }_{376,642}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{377,642}$ |  |  |
| Fumishings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PGE / Utitity Fees TCAC App / Alloc / Monitor Fees | 400,000 76,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{400,000} 7$ |  |  |
| - Einancial Consultant fees | 65.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65,000 |  |  |
| Construction Management fees / Owners Rep | 145,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 145,000 |  |  |
| . Securit during Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Relleation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Other Development Costs | 3,044,457 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 3,044,457 |  | coin |
|  |  | - | 0 | 0 | $\square$ | 0 | 0 |  | Should be either $10 \%$ or $5 \%$ of total sott costs |  |
| TOTAL SoFt Costs | (12,03,620 |  | 0 | , | 0 | , | 0 | 12,083,620 |  |  |
| reserves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserves | 408,263 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 408.263 |  |  |
| Replacement Reserves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant mprovements Reseves | 140,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140,000 |  |  |
| Other (specity) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specity) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Reserves | 548,263 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 548,263 |  |  |
| DEVELOPER Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developer Fee- - Cashout Paid at Milestones |  |  | 1.650,000 |  |  |  |  | 1.650,000 |  |  |
| Developer Fee- Cashout A A Risk | 550.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 550000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.000,000 |  | $3.000,000$ |  |  |
| Developer Fee- Deferered (also show a s source) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Consultant Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Nopiectis |  |
| Oither (specify) TOTAL DEVELOPER CoSTs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL DEVELOPER Costs | 550,000 | $\bigcirc$ | 1,650,00 |  | 0 | 3,000,000 | 0 | 5,200,000 |  |  |
| total development cost | 26,95, 472 | 1,200,000 | 20,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 1,500,000 | 3,000,000 | 38,760,668 | 98,156,140 |  |  |
| Development Cost/Unit by Source Development Cost/Unit as \% of TDC by Source | - $264.3,312$ | - ${ }_{\text {a }}^{11,881} 1$ | $\frac{198,020}{20.46}$ | $\underset{\text { c, }}{69.307}$ | ${ }_{\text {14, }}^{1.581}$ | 29,703 | -383,769 | 971.843 |  |  |
| Accuisition CostUnit by Source | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency) Mnit Ey Source | 133,798 | \|11,881 | 181.683 | 69,307 | ${ }^{14,851}$ | 0 | 383,769 | 290 |  |  |
| Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency)/SF | 115.96 | 10.30 | 157.47] | 60.07 | 12.87 | 0.00 | 332.62 | 689.29 |  |  |
| *Possible non-eligible GO Bond/COP Amount: City Subsidy/Unit | ${ }_{5}^{5,616,936]}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.900 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Bond Amount | 59,664,964 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Attachment J: First Year Operating Budget



## Attachment K: 20-Year Operating Pro Forma

| Total \# Units: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Losp } \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-LOSP } \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2025}^{\text {Year } 1}$ |  |  | ${ }_{2026}$Year 2 |  |  | ${ }_{2027}$ |  |  |
| mcome | \% | \|oanual |  | Losp | non-Losp | Total | Losp | Lon- | Total | Losp | Losp | Total | Losp |
| Residenilal- - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 25\% |  | ${ }_{12,00}$ | 1.655.304 | 1.687,30 | ${ }^{22,22}$ | 1.68443 | 1.67, 157 | ${ }^{73,44}$ | 1.864 ,588 | ${ }_{\text {1,771.99 }}$ | ${ }^{7,188}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { na } \\ \text { na }}}^{\text {la }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { na } \\ \text { na }}}$ |  | ${ }_{222}^{2285}$ |  | ${ }^{228882}$ | ${ }^{252270}$ |  | ${ }^{225270}$ | ${ }^{233848}$ |  | ${ }^{23,3888}$ | ${ }^{2427745}$ |
| Coimercis Soxe | ${ }_{\text {Na }}^{\text {Nam }}$ | ${ }^{\frac{0}{25 \%}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {25\%\% }}^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportwe sevices income | ${ }^{2.5 \% \%}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{25 \% \%}$ |  | ${ }_{1,3,33}$ | 5. | 6.565 | ${ }_{1,3,36}$ | 5.853 | 6.729 | 1,379 | ${ }_{5,518}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6.897}$ | ${ }_{1,44}$ |
| Terana Chareses |  | ${ }^{2526}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Misteraneous Residenial | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{\text {nama }}$ | ${ }_{2.5 \%}^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loss. Restamili - Tenan Reens Gross Potential hrome |  |  |  | ${ }^{296,655}$ | ${ }_{\text {1.507.556 }}$ | ${ }_{1.866,721}$ | ${ }_{\text {299,36 }}$ | ${ }^{1.609,920}$ | 1,909,155 | ${ }^{300,775}$ | ${ }^{1.650,0,5}$ | 1,98,740 | 318, |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n/a } \\ & \hline \text { n/a } \end{aligned}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { na }}$ | policy, annual incrementing usually not |  | (88209) |  | ${ }^{1} 6$. |  |  | (3.6) | (8222 | (8.900 |  |
| OPERATING EXPENSES EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME Management |  |  |  | ${ }^{22,265}$ | ${ }^{1,992}$ | ${ }^{1,784,856}$ | ${ }^{295,700}$ | 1,529,598 | ${ }_{1,825,298}$ | ${ }^{305,03}$ | ${ }_{\text {1,567,383 }}$ | $1.872,841$ | ${ }^{314,631}$ |
| Management fee | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | citat |  | ${ }_{\text {16,766 }}$ | cis.022 |  | (17311 |  | ces55 | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{17.977}$ |
| Assect Manasement Fee Sub-total Mmagement Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\text {L, } 1,966}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {240,800 }}^{\text {20, }}$ | ${ }_{\text {L, }}^{\text {2, } 2,56}$ | ${ }_{\substack{20.104 \\ 87,065}}$ | ${ }_{\text {20, }}^{20,30} 1$ | ${ }^{\frac{5}{22,52]}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{20.8071 \\ 90,051}}$ | ${ }_{\text {20,099 }}^{21254}$ | ${ }_{\text {c, }}^{\text {5,384 }}$ |
| Salariesinenefis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 44.983 | 179,921 | ${ }^{224,9,95}$ | 46,55] | 188230 | ${ }^{232787}$ | ${ }^{48,187}$ | ${ }^{1927789}$ | ${ }^{24,0,935}$ | ${ }_{49873}$ |
| Menagers Stary | ${ }_{\substack{3.5 \% \\ 3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }_{\text {3,5\% }}^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 64,000 } \\ 127594}}$ | ${ }_{\text {80, }}^{\substack{\text { 80000 } \\ 15993}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{16.560 \\ 33015}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{66240 \\ 132000}}$ | ${ }_{\text {82800 }}^{165075}$ | ${ }_{\substack{17,40 \\ 34171}}^{\text {3/ }}$ |  |  |  |
| Other Salaies Benefits | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adminstrative Rent-Free unt Sub-otal Salariesisenefits |  | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{02882}$ | ${ }^{37,526}$ | 464,408 | ${ }^{56,132}$ | ${ }^{384,50}$ | ${ }^{380.662}$ | ${ }^{99,977}$ | ${ }^{37} 7.988$ | ${ }_{479,45}$ | ${ }^{102939}$ |
| Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aaterising and Makesing | ${ }^{3.50 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{606 \\ 8080}}^{\text {808 }}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{3.300}}^{\substack{\text { a0, }}}$ | ${ }^{8.311}$ | ${ }^{2.509} 3$ |  | ${ }^{6.692}$ | ${ }_{\substack{2.597 \\ 348}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{3.266 \\ 4300}}^{\substack{4 \\ \hline}}$ | ${ }^{8.003}$ |
| \%otice erpent | ${ }_{3}{ }^{3.56 \%}$ | ${ }^{\text {3.5.5\% }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 500 | 2000 | 2.500 | ${ }_{518}$ | 2.070 | ${ }_{2}^{2588}$ | ${ }_{566}$ | ${ }_{2,1,2}$ | ${ }_{26} 68$ | ${ }_{564}$ |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{1.3,4 .}$ | ${ }_{\substack{5.656 \\ 9.211}}$ | ${ }^{1.514}$ | ${ }_{2,88}$ | \%,544 | 11.9 | ${ }^{2,46}$ | 9,966 | ${ }_{12,34}$ |  |
| Baadeols | ${ }^{356 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| miscelaneous Sub-toat Administration Expenses | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{12,853}$ | ${ }_{51,411}$ | ${ }_{64,264}$ | ${ }^{13,303}$ | 53,211 | ${ }_{66,513}$ | ${ }_{13,788}$ | 55,073 | ${ }^{6,889}$ | ${ }^{14,250}$ |
| Unilties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eleaticily | ${ }^{3.5 \% \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 9,5955 } \\ 8.595}}^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }_{4}^{47,9295}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 9,981 } \\ 8.855}}$ |  |  | \|i0278 |  |  |  |
| Gas | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer Sub-totalutilitios | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{\text {I5, }}^{1530}$ | $\frac{60.600}{133200}$ | ${ }_{\substack{7,5050}}^{16850}$ | $\frac{15.680}{34497}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{162909}$ |  | $\frac{817.45}{178,50}$ | $\frac{16,777}{\substack{38954}}$ |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real Estate Taxes <br> Payroll Taxes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ 3.5\% | ${ }_{3.5 \%}^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2,490 | ${ }_{\substack{9.962 \\ 9,962}}$ | ${ }^{124452}$ | ${ }_{\substack{2.578 \\ 2.58}}$ |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{128888 \\ 12.888}}$ | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{2.668 \\ 2.688}}$ | ${ }^{10.671}$ | ${ }^{133339}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2766_{1}}$ |
| Insurance $\quad$ Sub-totat Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{3.5 \% \\ 3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }_{\text {3, }}^{3.5 \% \%}$ |  | ${ }^{20.0}$ | 80000 | 100.00] | ${ }^{20.700}$ | ${ }^{82800}$ | 103,500 | 24.25 | ${ }^{85,989}$ | 107.123 | ${ }^{22}$ |
| Worers Compensation | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{\text {3,5\%\% }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 20.000 | 80,000 | 100,000 | ${ }^{20,700}$ | 82800 | 103,500 | ${ }^{21,295}$ | ${ }_{85,688}$ | 107,123 | ${ }_{22,174}$ |
| Maintenance \& Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplies | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \% \%}}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{3} 2650$ | ${ }_{102020}$ | ${ }^{122000}$ | ${ }_{2} 2650$ | ${ }^{10.5958}$ | ${ }_{13,388}^{13,28}$ | ${ }^{2724}$ | ${ }^{10,969}$ | ${ }_{1}^{13,7}$ |  |
| Contract | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3}{ }^{3,5 \%}$ |  | 18,900 | ${ }^{756,60}$ | 94,500 |  |  | 97008 | ${ }^{20226}$ | ${ }_{\text {80,995 }}$ | ${ }^{1012231}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4, 4.800 | ${ }_{\text {cose }}$ | ${ }_{\text {24000 }}$ | +4.988 | ${ }_{\text {19882 }}$ | ${ }_{24840}^{240}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {L }}$ | Stis2 |
| HVAC Repait sand Mainenare | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscolineous P Peataing and and Manimenance Expenses | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 3,745 | 14.980 | 18.725 | ${ }_{3,876}$ |  |  | 4.012 | 16,077 | 20.59 | 4.152 |
| Sub-toal Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  |  | 77,240 | 296,922 | ${ }^{377,202}$ | 7,8839 | ${ }^{30,355}$ | ${ }^{384,194}$ | ${ }^{7,598}$ | ${ }^{318,133}$ | 393,641 | ${ }^{82,312}$ |
| Suporive Serices | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  | ${ }^{105,176}$ | 105,176 |  | 100,857 | 10, 8 ,85 |  | ${ }^{112,687}$ | ${ }^{112,867}$ |  |
| total operating expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{256,811}$ | 2,132,421 | ${ }_{\text {2,382,23 }}^{135}$ | 265,800 | 1,72,056 | 1,437,85 | 275,03 | 1.213,077 | 488,180 | 288,731 |
| Reservesticround Lease Ease Renenteond fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ground Lease Base Rent |  |  |  | 3.00 | 12000 | ${ }^{15,000}$ | 3.00 | 12000 | 15.000 | 3.00 | 12000 | 15.000 | 3.000 |
| Repocement Reseeve Deposit |  |  |  | ${ }^{10,10}$ | 20,40 | 50.50 | 10,100 | 10.900 | 5.500 | 10,100 | ${ }^{40,90}$ | 50.50 | 10.100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-toal Reservesticrund Lease Base RentBond Feos |  |  |  | ${ }^{13,200}$ | ${ }_{52,40}$ | ${ }^{6,5,50}$ | 13,100 | 52,00 | 65.500 | 13,200 | 52,00 | 65,500 | ${ }^{13,200}$ |
| total operating Expenses (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent Bond Fes) <br> PUPA (w/ Resernest GL Base Rentizond Fees) |  |  |  | 269,911 | ${ }^{1,184,821}$ | 1,4547732 | 278,900 | 20,456 | 1,503,35 | 288,20 | 1265477 | .555,80 | 29,831 |
| NET OPERATING $\operatorname{INCOME~(INCOME~minus~} 0$ P EXPENSES) |  |  |  | 22,54 | 30,470 | ${ }^{333}, 124$ | 16,800 | ${ }^{305,143}$ | ${ }^{32,943}$ | 16.800 | ${ }^{302361}$ | 319,61 | 16,800 |
| DEBT SERVICE/MUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans) Hard Debt - First Lender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Note Hatere ofo | Sal. | ${ }^{65280}$ | 65,200 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 16,800 |  | 84,000 | 16.800 | 67200 | 84000 | 16.800 | 67200 | 84000 | 16.8 |
| Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) Hard Debt - Fourth Lender |  |  | Eneme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercil Hard Debl Senice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CASH FLow ( NOI minus debt service) |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {c,s4 }}$ | 174,900 | 180,44 | 10,00 | ${ }_{172,68}^{12,40}$ | ${ }_{172,683}$ | 16,000 | $\begin{aligned} & 132,480 \\ & 169,881 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 149,, 28 \\ & 169,881 \end{aligned}$ | 16,800 |
| Commercial ony Cash fow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 5,854 | 174,900 | 180,44 |  | ${ }_{172,63}$ | ${ }_{12} 7,683$ | - | ${ }_{16,981}$ 81 | ${ }_{16,981}$ |  |
| USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL |  |  | ${ }^{\text {oscre }}$ |  |  | 221 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.14 |  |
|  | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \%}}$ |  |  | 4.854 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  |  |  | 4, |  | $\stackrel{\text { c.000 }}{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-monozizg Loan Pmmi-Lender 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 5,554 | ${ }^{23.46}$ | 20.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | моНсD) |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{122.663}$ | ${ }^{12,663}$ | 0 | ${ }^{16,881}$ | ${ }^{16,881}$ |  |
|  |  | Ves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resisual Receipis spift or all years - Lenderommer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mohco resilual recelits debt service |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Dist. Soft } \\ \text { Debt Loans } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground |  |  | 隹 |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{754592}$ |  |  | ${ }^{74.2414}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender 4 Aesidual Receipts Due <br> Lender 5 Residual Receits Due <br> To |  |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | $\div$ |  |  | $\because$ |  |
| Total Non-MOHCO Residual Receipits dent Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REMANDER(Should do erero unless there are isistriutions below) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,554 |  |  | 56.67 |  |
| ther Distributions/Uses |  |  | - |  |  | ${ }^{50.25}$ |  |  | 5,564 |  |  | ${ }^{56,627}$ |  |
| REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BaLLANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Starting Balance Replacement Reserve Deposits |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 5,5.50 |  |  | (101.000 |  |
| Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) <br> Replacement Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| RR Running Ealarce |  |  | RR Ealanee |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\substack{10,000 \\ \text { stioo }}}{\text { cose }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATMG RESESVEVE- RUNNNG BALANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance Operating Reserve Deposits |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  | $\square$ |  |
| Operating Reserve Withdrawals Operating Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OR Running Ealance |  | OR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |  |
| OTHER REQuIEE RESERVE1- - UUNNNG BALLANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance Other Reserve 1 Deposits |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | : |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals <br> Other Reserve 1 Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 隹 |  |  | - |  |  | . |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Total I Units: <br> 101 <br> INCOME |  |  |  | Total | Year 8 <br> 2032 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 9 \\ 2033 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 10 } \\ 2034 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Losp |  | non-LOSP | Total | Losp | non-LOSP | Total | Losp | non-Losp | Total |
| Resisionial -Tenat Rents | ${ }^{\text {a/a }}$ | ${ }^{2.56 \%}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{7} 7.19$ | 1.880,655 | ${ }_{\text {1,977, }}$ |  | . $1.007,71$ |  | ${ }_{18,74}$ | 1.954,80 | ${ }^{2003,566}$ |
| Resememen | ${ }_{\substack{\text { na } \\ \text { na }}}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { na }}$ |  | ${ }^{271,466}$ | ${ }^{281,741}$ |  | ${ }^{289,741}$ | ${ }^{222804}$ |  | ${ }^{202444}$ | ${ }^{303,459}$ |  | 3.35 |
| $\frac{\text { Commercial Soae }}{\text { Ressema }}$ | $\frac{\mathrm{nas}}{25 \mathrm{~m}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking $2.5 \%$ $2.5 \%$ <br> Supportive Services Income $2.5 \%$ $2.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Services Income | ${ }_{\text {25\%\% }}^{2.5}$ | ${ }_{\text {2 } 2 \text { 2\% }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundr and vending | ${ }^{25 \%}$ | ${ }^{252 \%}$ |  | 7.613 | 1.561 | ${ }_{6.24}$ | 7.804 | 2.60 | 6,39 | 7,99 | 1.640 | 6,59 |  |
| TTenat Chares | ${ }_{2.5 \%}^{2.5 \%}$ | ${ }_{2}^{25 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Onter Commercial Inoome | ${ }_{\text {nla }}$ | ${ }^{25 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | n/a | na |  | ${ }^{2,170,77}$ | 380.945 | 1,86, 8,38 | ${ }^{2227,933}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {1,913,570 }}$ | ${ }^{2285.590}$ | ${ }_{38,3,45}$ | 1.962,099 | ${ }^{2,345.554}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss - Commercia | na <br> n/a <br> na | $\begin{array}{r} \text { n/a } \\ \hline \text { nla } \\ \hline \text { nla } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Enter formulas manually per relevant } \mathrm{MOH} \\ & \text { policy, annual incrementing usually not } \\ & \text { appropriate } \end{aligned}$ | (19.400) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| OPERRTING EXPENSESMangement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manaegener Fee | ${ }^{3.50 \%}$ |  | per MOHCD policy | $\begin{array}{r} 99,344 \\ \hline 92,846 \\ \hline 129,170 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 82,240 \\ \hline 24773 \\ \hline 106,953 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 102,800 \\ \hline 30,891 \\ \hline 13,691 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21,280 \\ \hline \\ \hline 6,3944 \\ \hline 2,674 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 85.119 \\ \hline \\ \hline 15.587 \\ \hline 10,696 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 106,988 \\ \hline 39,972 \\ \hline 13,370 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22,294 \\ \hline 6,618 \\ \hline 28,643 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 88,098 \\ \hline 26,73 \\ \hline 14,571 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 110,122 \\ \hline 3,290 \\ \hline 143,213 \end{array}$ |
| Assat Manasement Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{276.788}$ | ${ }^{572} 23$ | ${ }^{288,94}$ | ${ }^{268,155}$ | 59234 | ${ }^{2369966}$ | ${ }^{298,701}$ | ${ }^{6,1,307}$ | ${ }^{2452929}$ | ${ }^{3065}$ |
|  | ${ }^{3.56}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{20.356}}^{\text {40.54 }}$ |  | ${ }^{101,782} 2$ | ${ }_{\substack{21,069 \\ 42.204}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{21,068 \\ 43,45}}$ | 87235 <br> 173898 |  |
|  | 3.5\% |  |  | 50,0,76 |  | ${ }_{\text {42, } 685}^{\text {ces }}$ | 50, Br $^{\text {c }}$ | ${ }^{122,307}$ | 489,229 | 611,537 | 126,588 |  | ${ }^{632,90}$ |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{50,3,32}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aateratisgand Markeing | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{355 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{3,725 \\ \hline 0.255}}$ | ${ }^{712}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3.084}$ | ${ }_{\text {3, } 3.85}^{508}$ | ${ }_{788} 7$ | ${ }^{3.129}$ | ${ }_{\text {3, }}^{5.980}$ | ${ }_{826}^{826}$ | ${ }^{3,3,36}$ |  |
| Otictee | ${ }_{3}{ }^{5}$ |  |  | 4, 3.35 | 10.216 | ${ }_{40,88}$ |  | 10.54 | ${ }^{42226}$ |  | 0,944 | ${ }_{4}^{43,76}$ |  |
| Legal Expense-Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 3,73 | 636 | 2.545 | 3,181 | 658 | 2.63 | 3.292 | 681 | ${ }^{2,726}$ | 3.407 |
| Audit kenene | ${ }^{3,58}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{8.699}$ | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{1.799}$ | (1.106 | ${ }^{8.9 .969}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {9, }}^{\substack{\text { 9,30 }}}$ |  |  |  |
| Eaideopons | ${ }^{\text {3,5.5\% }}$ | ${ }_{\text {3,5\%\% }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{16,382}$ | 65,909 | ${ }^{81,762}$ | ${ }^{16,225}$ | 6,699 | ${ }^{84,23}$ | ${ }^{17,57}$ | ${ }^{70,688}$ | ${ }_{87,85}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{3.5 \% \%}$ | ${ }^{35 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {cke }}^{58.974}$ | ${ }_{\text {12, }}^{12083}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{6 \\ 6.0 .038}}^{6,58}$ | ${ }^{12.2655}$ | ${ }_{\text {56, } 539} 0$ |  |  |  |  |
| Gas |  |  |  | ${ }^{52760}$ | 10,23 |  |  |  |  |  | 11,00 |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {Sever }}^{\text {Seas }}$ | , ${ }_{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {20,4,465 }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{1027275}$ |  | ${ }^{912,2_{2}, 255}$ | ${ }_{\substack{19,580}}^{43,89}$ | ${ }^{175,599}$ |  | 20.688 |  | ${ }^{103723}$ |
| Taxes and Licenses $\quad$ Sub-totalu uilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{219,4,46}$ | 45,425 | ${ }^{183,701}$ |  |
|  | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{3,688 \\ 3,68}}^{\text {3, }}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3,279}}$ |  | ${ }_{16,397}^{16,97}$ | ${ }_{3,394}^{304}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{13,188}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{3,39}$ |  | ${ }_{13,57}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{122,926}$ | ${ }^{25,46}$ | ${ }^{101782}$ | ${ }^{127,228}$ | ${ }^{26,336}$ | ${ }^{105.355}$ | ${ }^{1316}$ | ${ }^{27,259}$ | 10093 | 136,29. |
| Weoters comenesation | ${ }^{3.5 \% \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direecor's 8 officest Labilly nusuance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | ${ }^{122,26}$ |  | ${ }^{25,46}$ | 100,782 | 127,28 | 26,336 | ${ }^{105,345}$ | ${ }^{131,681}$ | ${ }^{27,258}$ | 109,032 | 138,200 |
| Maintenance \& Repair Sub-total nsurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }^{383671}$ | ${ }_{\text {158467 }}^{123}$ | ${ }^{1919,834}$ | ${ }^{39,770}$ | ${ }^{1588839}$ | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{198.548}$ | 4 | ${ }_{\text {164,398 }}^{168}$ | ${ }^{2054988}$ |
| Sopilisas |  |  |  | - 15.38 |  | - | ${ }^{12.22035}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {25, } 5 \text { 53 }}$ |  |  |
| bage and Trash Removal | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{86,56}$ | ${ }^{17,913}$ | ${ }^{71,6}$ | 89.65 | 18.590 | ${ }^{74,46}$ |  | ${ }^{19,89}$ | ${ }^{76,75}$ |  |
| Securit Peyoluc ontrac | ${ }^{3,56}$ | ${ }^{35 \%}$ |  | 20.502 | 6.07 | 24.428 | ${ }^{30,53}$ | 6.32 | 2520 | 31.003 | 6.542 | 26.68 | ${ }_{32710}$ |
| Venico and Manimenance EEuipment Oepation and Repairs | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55^{5}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{4,7,755}}^{9,75}$ |  | ${ }_{4}^{2382273}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 9,7837 } \\ 9,700}}$ |  | ${ }_{4}^{248,657}$ | ${ }_{\text {50, } 189}^{\text {182 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {200, } 20.78}^{20}$ | ${ }_{\substack{25,520 \\ 50590}}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Somperive Senices | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1,707,721 |  |  | 138.63 | \%3.75 |  | ${ }^{1384} 47$ | 18, ${ }^{\text {a }}$, |  | 14334 | 崖, |
| Total operating Expe |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{326,736}$ | 1,4a0, | 1,76,491 | 338,71 | 1,991,182 | 1,82, 3, 3 | 350,007 | 1.54,337 | ${ }^{1,893,381}$ |
| PUPA (w/o Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond Fees) Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\square$ | 15.000 | 3.00 | 12.000 | 15.000 | 3.00 | 12000 | 15.000 | 3.00 | 12000 | 15,000 |
|  |  |  |  | 50.500 | ${ }^{10,00}$ | 20,900 | 50.50 | 10,20 | 40.40 | ${ }_{50,50}$ | 10,00 | ${ }^{40,40}$ | 60.50 |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required Reserve Deposit/s, Commercial <br> Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{65,500}{1,773,221} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 13,100 \\ & \hline 339,836 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 52,400 \\ & \hline 1,93,156 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 65,500 } \\ 1,832,991 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 13,100 \\ 35,271 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {c, }}^{6.58,500}$ | ${ }^{13,200}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 52,400 } \\ 1,559,733 \end{array}$ |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES ( $\mathbf{w} /$ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) <br> PUPA (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond Fees) <br> NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{32}, 366$ | 16,800 | 280,799 | 297509 | 16,800 | 4.629 | 291,429 | 16,800 | 266783 | ${ }^{29,693}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 16.800 | $\frac{65280}{67200}$ |  | 16.800 | $\frac{65,80}{6,7200}$ |  | 16,800 | $\frac{65580}{6,200}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { c6, } 8.000}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercill Hard Deot Senice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CASH FLow (NOI minus debt sevice) |  |  |  | ${ }^{1999280}$ | 16,800 | ${ }^{1324880}$ | ${ }^{199,280}$ | ${ }^{16,800}$ | ${ }^{1324880}$ | ${ }^{149,280}$ | 16,800 | 132,880 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(0)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) AVAILABLE CASH FLOW |  |  |  | 6,66 | (1) | ${ }_{128,2929}$ | 148229 |  | 120219 | 142,149 |  | ${ }^{135.433}$ |  |  |
| USES Of CASH F Low below (This row also shows Dickr) |  |  | oscre: | 203 |  |  | 1.99 |  |  | 1.95 |  |  | 1.91 |  |
| USES THA PRECEEE MOHCCDEETSEEVVCCEN W WATERFALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selen | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \% \%}}$ | 边 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Morco poier no ammalincose |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENSTS PRECEEDING MOHCD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RESIIUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PaYMENTS PRECEDING | G монCD) |  |  | ${ }^{153,686}$ | ${ }^{(0)}$ | 14822 | ${ }^{148,29}$ |  | ${ }^{122,149}$ | 142,149 |  | ${ }^{135,413}$ | 135,413 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residual Receipis spitito or al years. - Lenderolower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mohco resilual recelits deb service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Lease |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due <br> Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{3}{3+064}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{32667}{ }$ |  |  | 3,19 |  |
| Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts dent Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31,19 |  |
| REMANDER (Should bee zero uness sthere are distributions belw) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49,40 |  |  | 47,383 |  |  |  |  |
| Oill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.138 |  |
| Final Balance (should be zero) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REPLACEMENT RESERVEV - -UuNNMG BLLANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Starting Balance Replacement Reserve Deposits |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{355.500 \\ 50.500}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{44.5500 \\ 50.500}}$ |  |
| Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) <br> Replacement Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR Running Balance |  |  | RR Baanceunt | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{35,500 \\ 83,500}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 404,000 \\ & \$ 4,000 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4,4,500 \\ & \$ 4,500 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance |  |  | - |  |  |  | . |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Deposits <br> Operating Reserve Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other reaured reserve 1-RUNNNG BaLance |  | OR Eatar |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 50\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance Other Reserve 1 Deposits |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | . |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other reserve 2 - -uvnnng balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance Other Reserve 2 Deposits |  |  |  |  |  |  | $:$ |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | $:$ |  |
| Oter |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |





| Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advertising and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5,254 | 1,088 | 4,350 | 5,438 | ${ }_{1.126}$ | 4.503 | 5.628 | ${ }^{1,165}$ | 4,660 | 5.825 |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 69,620 | ${ }^{14,411}$ | 57,645 | ${ }^{72,056}$ | 14,916 | 59.663 | ${ }^{74,578}$ | ${ }_{15,438}$ | 61,751 | 77,188 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4,335 | 897 | 3,589 | 4.487 | 929 | 3,715 | ${ }_{4.644}$ | 961 | 3,845 | 4.806 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{12,259}$ |  | 10,151 | ${ }^{12,688}$ | 2.626 | 10.506 | 13,132 | 2.718 | 10.874 |  |
| BookkeepingAAccounting Services | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3.5\% |  | 19,965 | 4.133 | ${ }_{16,531}$ | 20.664 | 4.277 | 17,110 | 21,387 | 4.427 | 17,709 | ${ }_{22,136}$ |
| Bad Debls | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | 111,433 | 23,067 | ${ }^{92,266}$ | 115,333 | ${ }^{23,874}$ | ${ }^{95,496}$ | 119,370 | ${ }^{24,710}$ | ${ }^{98,838}$ | ${ }^{123,548}$ |
| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 88,188 | 17,20] | 68,880 | ${ }^{86,100}$ | 17,823 | ${ }^{71,290}$ | ${ }^{89,113}$ | ${ }^{18.446}$ | ${ }^{73,786}$ |  |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{74,431}$ | 15.407 | ${ }^{61,629}$ | ${ }^{77,036}$ | 15,947 | 63.786 | 79,733 | 16,505 | 66,019 | ${ }_{82,523} 8$ |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{131,349}$ | 27,189 | 108,757 | 135,947 | 28.141 | 112.564 | 140,705 | 29.126 | 116,504 | 145.629 |
| Ses andicenses Sotal Utilities |  |  |  | 288,969 | 59,817 | ${ }^{239,266}$ | 299,083 | ${ }^{61,910}$ | 247,640 | 309,551 | 64,077 | 256,308 | 320,385 |
| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | . | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 21,592 | 4.469 | ${ }^{17,878}$ | 22,34 | 4.626 | 18,504 | 23,129 | 4.788 | 19,151 | 23,939 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 21,592 | 4,469 | 17,878 | 22,347 | ${ }^{4,626}$ | 18,504 | ${ }^{23,129}$ | 4,788 | 19,151 | ${ }^{23,939}$ |
| Property and Liability nsura |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{179468}$ | 37.150 | 148.599 | ${ }^{185749}$ | 38.450 | ${ }^{153,800}$ |  |
| Fideitity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | +3, | 55,94 | 145,54 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192,250 |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director's \& Officers' L Liabilit Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Insurance |  |  |  | , 399 | 35,94 | 143,574 | 179,468 | 150 | 148,599 | 5,749 | 38,450 | 153,800 | 2,250 |
| Maintenance \& Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 22,195 | 4.594 | 18,377 | 22,972 | 4,755 | 19,021 | 23,776 | 4,922 | 19,686 | 24,608 |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 163, ${ }^{2} 862$ | 33,919 | ${ }^{135,677}$ | $\stackrel{169,597}{ }$ | 35.107 | 140.426 | 175,533 | ${ }_{36,335}$ | 145,341 | ${ }_{181,676}$ |
| Garage a and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 122,067 | ${ }^{25,268}$ | 101,072 | 126.340 | ${ }^{26,152}$ | 104,609 | 130,762 | 27,068 | 108,271 | ${ }^{135,338}$ |
| Securit Payrollco ontact | $\frac{3.5 \%}{3.5 \%}$ | - $3.5 \%$ |  | 41.616 | 8.614 | 34,458 | 43.072 | ${ }^{8.996}$ | ${ }^{35.664}$ | 44.580 | 9.228 | 36,912 | ${ }^{46,140}$ |
| VVaticle enapars Maindenancene Equipment Operation and Repairs | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \%}}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 32,469 | 6,721 | 26,884 | 33,605 | 6,956 | 27,825 | 34,781 | 7,200 | 28,799 | 35,999 |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expen |  |  |  | 643,659 | 133,237 | 532,950 | 66,187 | 137,901 | 551,63 | 689,504 | 142,727 | 570,909 | 713,636 |




|  | 15,000 | 3,000 | 12,000 | 15.000 | 3.000 | 12,000 | 15,000 | 3.000 | 12,000 | 15,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 50,500 | 10,100 | 40,400 | 50.500 | 10,100 | 40,400 | 50.500 | 10,100 | 40,400 | 50,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - | . | . | - | . |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6,500 | 13,100 | 52,400 | 65,500 | 13,100 | 52,400 | 65,500 | 13,100 | 52,400 | 65,500 |
|  | 2,47,400 2,499 | 13,100 47,993 | 2,084,728 | ${ }_{2,558,721}^{65,50}$ | 490,124 | ${ }_{\text {2,155,859 }}$ | 2,45,983 | ${ }_{506,820}^{13}$ | 2,229,480 | 2,736,300 |
|  | 216,112 | 16,800 | 185,969 | 202,769 | 16,800 | 171,605 | 188,405 | 16,800 | 156,170 | 172,970 |
| Enter commentis se: annual incease e etc. | 65,280] |  | 65,280 | 65,280] |  | 65,280 | 66,280 |  | 65,280 | 65,280 |
| Enter comments re: annual increase, etc. | 84,000 | 16,800 | 67,200 | 84,000 | 16,800 | 67,200 | 84,000 | 16,800 | 67,200 | 84,000 |
| Enter comments re: anuual increase, etc. | . |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 149,280 | 16,800 | 132,480 | 149,280 | 16,800 | 132,480 | 149,280 | 16,800 | 132,480 | 149,280 |
|  | 66,832 |  | 53,489 | 53,489 | 0 | 39,125 | 39,125 | . | 23,690 | 23,690 |
| DSCR | 66,832 $1.45$ | . | $\frac{\square}{53,489}$ | 53,489 <br> 1.36 | $0$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{3,125}$ | ${ }^{39,125}$ | $\ldots$ | 23,690 | 23,690 1.16 |


|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | Peer Mohici policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | Per MOHCO poliey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investor Serice Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee")( (see policy for inimits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy no anual increase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizizng Loan Pmnt-Lender 1 |  |  | Enter comments se: annual incease, elt. |  | . | - |  | . | . |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 <br> (Enter row 131) |  |  | Enter comments se: annual incease, ete. |  | - | - |  | . | - |  | . | . |  |
| Total payments preceding mohcd |  |  |  |  |  | . |  | . |  |  |  | . |  | Does Proiect have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obiligation

Will Proiect Defer Den Wiil Project Defer Developer Fee?
Residual Receipts spilit oral years. - Lender/Owner



[^1]


[^0]:    

[^1]:    OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE

    | Other Reseve 1 |
    | :--- |
    | Opeposits |
    | Other Reserve 1 Withdrawall |

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

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

    Other Reserve 2 Interest Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance

