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## SUMMARY

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation ("TNDC," the "Sponsor") requests approval (this "Request") for a Reinvestment Waiver (the "Waiver") to the MOHCD CashOut Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing Policy, which is effective as of June 19, 2020 ("Cash-Out Policy," the "Policy"). The Waiver would allow the Sponsor to leverage the refinance of Turk \& Eddy Apartments ("Turk \& Eddy," the "Resource Property") to invest up to $\$ 14.1 \mathrm{MM}$ as a source of construction financing for four high-priority properties ("Receiver Properties") in need of significant rehabilitation, accessibility upgrades, and mandatory seismic upgrades.

The Cash-Out Policy provides for a 50-50 split between the Resource Property owner and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD," the "City") of "Excess Proceeds" from a refinance or syndication of a City-financed project. Excess Proceeds are the funds remaining after paying off senior debt and transaction fees, and funding reserves. Subject to MOHCD's review of supporting underwriting documentation required by the Policy, the Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee ("Loan Committee") "...may recommend to waive or modify any portion of the Cash-Out Policy for the purpose of ensuring project feasibility, maximizing affordability, and minimizing the use of public resources." (See the Attachment J: Cash-Out Policy.)

With the approval of this Waiver, MOHCD will contribute its $50 \%$ share or $\$ 7 \mathrm{MM}$ of Excess Proceeds to fill the gap in financing for essential scope items for Receiver Properties that are unable to generate enough of their own income or financing to pay for critical capital work. The Excess Proceeds will be secured by a Promissory Note ("Note") with a five-year term and Deed of Trust on the Resource Property.

This Request addresses only the Waiver for Phase I of the Sponsor's two-phase Recapitalization and Reinvestment Project ("Reinvestment Project"). The Reinvestment Project encompasses the findings of the Sponsor's comprehensive portfolio-wide analysis. With this analysis, the Sponsor has identified the properties with the most robust capacity to leverage financing and those properties with the most significant immediate unfunded capital needs. MOHCD staff has conducted the diligence to ensure that the Reinvestment Project and the Request comport with the requirements and meets the objectives of the Policy. (See Section 1 and Table 1: Timetable and Milestones for more information about the phases.)

This Waiver precludes the need to initiate additional funding from public resources or add more debt to four Receiver Properties. With the Loan Committee's approval, funds from the Reinvestment Project will extend the useful life of these Properties, three of which are on the National Register of Historic Places (as contributing structures to the Tenderloin Uptown Neighborhood District), and ensure the Properties' long-term sustainability and affordability for the benefit of 432 low-income households.

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

## 1) Uncertainty of CDLAC/TCAC Tax Credit Awards for Ambassador-Ritz and Yosemite-Folsom Dore: The financing strategy for the Receiver Properties

 assumes two scattered sites tax credit syndications - Yosemite Apartments paired with Folsom Dore ( $4 \%$ tax credits) and Ambassador Hotel paired with Ritz Hotel ( $4 \%$ tax credits with $9 \%$ tax credits). Both projects are applying for allocations of tax credit awards and tax-exempt bonds from TCAC and CDLAC, respectively. This is no longer a certainty in today's competitive tax-credit environment. However, the TNDC team has worked diligently over the last several months to craft financing structures that maximize CDLAC and TCAC scoring. TNDC has engaged investors/lenders early to both mitigate risk and to position the syndications as best as possible for competitive pricing and terms. If a syndication does not receive an allocation in this round, TNDC will reapply for the next round. (See Section 3: Scattered Site Syndications, and Table 1: Timetable and Milestones for more information.)2) Rehab construction risk: The construction market is unpredictable and the scope/architectural drawings and construction budgets for the Receiver Properties are not yet in their final state (the CR team has, however, preliminarily approved the scopes and budgets). As a condition of the close of bond financing in June 2021, the Sponsor will provide final costs and scopes of work through general
contractor contracts to ensure the highest possible quality of capital improvements for each property and the efficient use of resources. The syndications and construction projects have been underwritten with appropriate contingencies and escalation to allow for pricing increases. (See Section 4: Construction Scopes, Budgets, and Schedules for details.)

The MOHCD Construction Representative (CR) and Asset Management teams will be reviewing the construction work ongoing to ensure delivery according to contracts and schedules. Further, the Note will be structured to address specific line items in the Receiver Properties' construction contracts and will be reduced with the completion of these portions of the work. This will serve to mitigate the risk that construction will not be completed as agreed. (See Section 1.4: Securing Excess Proceeds for details.)

The Resource Property (Turk \& Eddy) construction was fully scoped as of November 2019. In the intervening months since the accompanying budget was solidified, however, the financial markets have been shifting, making it difficult to assess the gap loan amount. The budget (see Attachment B: Turk \& Eddy proforma), which has been approved by the MOHCD CR team, incorporates escalation and contingencies to mitigate the risk of cost overruns. The Sponsor will provide the construction contract, to be approved by the CR team, concurrent with the execution of the Note and City subordination to the new senior loan (closing scheduled for October 30, 2020). The MOHCD CR and Asset Management teams will approve withdrawals from replacement reserves for this work to ensure delivery of the work. Walker-Dunlop (the Freddie Mac loan servicer) also inspects and approves the seismic upgrade. (See Section 2.4: Turk \& Eddy Physical Needs for details.) The Sponsor will also deliver approved project pay apps/draws and final permits as a condition of the reconveyance of the Note and Deed of Trust.

In the event of increased costs with the final contracts, the Sponsor will not come back to the City for additional financing. Instead, more Excess Proceeds will be applied to Phase I, as necessary, and less to Phase II (see Section 1: Structure of Proposed Transactions for details).

Covid-19 may pose challenges for relocations in projects, which all require occupied rehabilitation. TNDC has provided significantly complete relocation plans with budgets (approved by the CR team), but they were drafted primarily before the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. Since May, TNDC has successfully adopted the Department of Public Health Covid-19 guidelines at the sites and conducted exploratory demolition without incident. The Sponsor is confident that the experienced contractors they have engaged will be able to carry out the occupied rehabs within the health guidelines and without delays that would impact the timelines and budget. In advance of the close of bond financing the Sponsor will provide updated plans with Covid-19 protocols for the MOHCD staff to review. In the event of relocation budget increases, the remainder of funds held in contingency for Phase II will be applied to Phase I. (See Section 4: Construction Scopes, Budgets and Schedules for details.)
3) Financial implications of Covid-19: TNDC and MOHCD teams acknowledge there may be risks to the Reinvestment Project due to Covid-19. However, TNDC anticipates minimal impacts due to the pandemic. TNDC projects that strong scattered sites pairings and conservative underwriting assumptions will mitigate the potential financial and tax credit impacts for the syndications. TNDC is closely following equity pricing and interest rates with California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC), the Reinvestment Project financial consultant, and investor and lender partners. They are currently underwriting Phase I projects at $\$ .95$ LIHTC pricing and $\$ .85$ historic tax credit pricing, which they are confident is realistic based on the current market and assumptions about the economy and interest rates in the context of Covid-19, and also in alignment with TNDC's current portfolio project underwritings. (See Section 3.3 for more details).

Further, the Receiver properties and the syndications project healthy financial positions, regardless of Covid-19, given the secure rental assistance programs attached to the properties and the stable fixed incomes of the residents (see Section 3 for more details).

Financing for Turk \& Eddy is not at risk due to Covid-19 and has been preliminarily secured. Due to $100 \%$ Project Based Section 8 financing and stable rent collections from residents on fixed incomes, the Property is financially secure and able to make debt service and ground lease payments and reserve deposits for the long term, regardless of the pandemic (see Section 2.1 for more details).

Shelter-in-place conditions for residents and Covid-19 related adaptations for crews may also affect construction schedules, with delays potentially increasing costs. The Sponsor, in conjunction with experienced contractors and relocation experts has built mitigations into the plans and timelines. As necessary, the Sponsor will be providing updated plans as a condition of the close of bond financing to ensure timeliness and budget management.
4) Sponsor capacity: The Reinvestment Project is a multi-dimensional, large scale project involving five properties. With a refinance, two syndications yet to be closed, and several lender and jurisdictional approvals pending, this will be one of the most complex projects in the TNDC portfolio. TNDC demonstrates that it has the financial and staff capacity to manage the complexities and potential financial risks. TNDC has a healthy balance sheet position, strong governance, and the ability to leverage its assets and attract investors. The TNDC team has engaged financing consultants, all familiar to MOHCD staff as experts in their respective fields, to support their assumptions and financing plans. The CCSF Human Services Department audit verifies that TNDC has satisfied fiscal and governance compliance (see Attachment K: CCSF Human Services Agency audit letter dated May 23, 2019).

In terms of project management and construction management, TNDC has demonstrated its capacity to manage several large scale occupied rehabs
simultaneously (most recently five RAD projects in 2016-2019). The TNDC team is using consultants they have used in other successful occupied rehab projects. TNDC is devoting expert internal staff and significant portions of their time. These staff are very familiar with the Reinvestment Project and have many years of experience. The MOHCD staff is confident that the Sponsor has allocated the appropriate level of staff to the projects. The CR team will be reviewing the work as it progresses to ensure delivery of the completed scope (see Section 5: Sponsor Capacity for more information; see Attachment G: Sponsor Qualifications and Assignments.)

## 1. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSED TRANSACTIONS

### 1.1. Portfolio-wide Analysis - Reinvestment Project

TNDC has undertaken an analysis of its existing portfolio - informed by seismic assessments, third party capital needs assessments, and physical needs analyses (PNA) - to identify Receiver Properties with the greatest capital needs and to develop financing strategies to address these needs by utilizing Resource Properties with the most capacity to leverage financing. The resulting Reinvestment Project encompasses two phases and ten properties identified to date (see Table 1:
Timetable and Milestones). Phase I, encompassing one Resource and four Receiver Properties, is the subject of this Request.

MOHCD staff plans to return to the Loan Committee in early 2021 with a request for a Waiver for Phase II once due diligence and underwriting for the Resource and Receiver Properties are complete.

### 1.2. Resource Property Refinance and Excess Proceeds

Phase I features Turk \& Eddy as the Resource Property, which is being refinanced with a Freddie Mac loan with a principal amount of approximately $\$ 17,750,000$. After repayment of the commercial loan, financing costs, and capitalizing its replacement reserves, Turk \& Eddy will generate Excess Proceeds of approximately $\$ 14.1 \mathrm{MM}$. These funds will be allocated to fill the gap in financing for capital needs at four Receiver Properties.

### 1.3. Receiver Properties Excess Proceeds Allocations

Four Receiver Properties have been paired in two scattered sites syndications: Yosemite Apartments ("Yosemite")/ Folsom Dore Apartments ("Folsom Dore") and Ambassador Hotel ("Ambassador")/Ritz Hotel ("Ritz"). Of the \$14.1MM in Excess Proceeds, $\$ 10.5 \mathrm{MM}$ will be allocated to Phase I for essential, specifically identified scope items at each Property: \$7MM to Yosemite-Folsom Dore and $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{MM}$ to Ambassador-Ritz. The CR team will approve the specific portions of the work, and the City Attorney will work with MOHCD Asset Management staff to document the specific scope items with the Note. The remainder of $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{MM}$ is
reserved as Phase I contingency and for Phase II gap financing currently projected for rehab work at Plaza Ramona. (See Table 1: Timeline and Milestones, Table 2: Resource Property Refinancing Sources and Uses, and Section 3: Scattered Sites Syndications.)

Table 1: Timetable and Milestones

| Property | Tax Credit application | Closing date | Anticipated construction completion dates | Note maturity date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE I (this Request) |  |  |  |  |
| Turk \& Eddy refinance/rehab -Note \#1 (Resource) | N/A | Freddie Mac <br> October 2020 | June 2021 (permit priority status letter issued by MOHCD August 2020) |  |
| Yosemite + Folsom Dore -rehab/syndication (Receiver) | 4\% LIHTC, Historic <br> Tax Credits, applying Sept 2020; award expected Dec 2020 | Bond financing April 2021 | October 2022 | October 2025 |
| Ambassador + Ritz -rehab/resyndication (Receiver) | Hybrid 4\%/9\% -- 4\% applying Sept 2020; 9\% applied July 2020; Historic Tax Credits; award expected Dec 2020 | Bond financing June 2021 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { December } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | October 2025 |
| PHASE II (subject to subsequent request/Loan Committee approval) |  |  |  |  |
| Antonia Manor Apartments- <br> Note \#2 -resyndication/refinance/ rehab (proposed Resource) | 4\%, Historic Tax <br> Credits, applying May <br> 2021; award <br> expected Sept 2021 | Bond financing December 2021 | June 2023 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { December } \\ & 2026 \end{aligned}$ |
| Plaza Ramona -rehab/syndication/rehab, <br> Phase I + Phase II Excess <br> Proceeds (proposed Receiver) | 4\%, Historic Tax <br> Credits, applying Jan 2021; award June 2022 | Bond financing September 2022 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { December } \\ & 2023 \end{aligned}$ | October 2025 <br> (Note \#1 assuming funds available from Phase I) |
| Sierra Madre -rehab/syndication (proposed Receiver) | 4\%, Historic Tax Credits, applying Jan 2021; award June 2022 | Bond financing September 2022 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { December } \\ & 2023 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { September } \\ & 2027 \text { (Note \#2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Additional Resource Property and Receiver Properties -rehab/syndications |  | TBD | TBD | TBD (Note \#2) |

[^0]
### 1.4. Securing Excess Proceeds

Upon close of Turk \& Eddy's refinance, MOHCD and TNDC will execute a Note in the amount of the Excess Proceeds secured with a Deed of Trust against Turk \& Eddy as the Resource Property. The Note matures five years from the date of execution and establishes a five-year timeline for completion of rehab projects for Receiver Properties (four for Phase I and one for Phase II). The Excess Proceeds will be held in a segregated account ("Reinvestment Account"). The Note shall be reduced proportionately, corresponding to the Sponsor's withdrawals from the Reinvestment Account and completion of identified, pre-approved essential portions of rehabilitation/ improvements at Receiver Properties. These portions will be memorialized by the Letter Agreement accompanying the Note, and completion of said portions will be verified through contractor pay apps and the CR team reviews. The Deed of Trust will then be reconveyed upon completion of the identified work. The City Attorney office has approved this form of security and monitoring and will work with MOHCD staff to draft the Note and Letter Agreement.

If the rehabilitation projects are not completed and funds not drawn down within the five-year period, MOHCD may exercise its authority to designate funds to gap financing for other properties in need of rehab in the Sponsor's portfolio or otherwise recapture the remaining funds to be used for other lending.

## 2. TURK \& EDDY APARTMENTS - RESOURCE PROPERTY

### 2.1. Property description and status

Turk \& Eddy Apartments ("Turk \& Eddy," this "Resource Property") comprises two buildings totaling 82 units for seniors. Turk \& Eddy is fully subsidized with Project Based Section 8. Income levels are restricted to $50 \%$ area median income (AMI). TNDC acquired the Property in 2007. The two buildings, built in 1923 and 1925 respectively, underwent a moderate rehab in 2010.

MOHCD due diligence confirms that Turk \& Eddy is well positioned to serve as a Resource Property. MOHCD Asset Management staff has approved the 2019 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), finding the Property in compliance with the requirements of the City's agreements, including affordability and maximum rent restrictions, reserves, and insurance. Financial management has been consistently excellent with steady income and expenses and positive trends and low vacancy from 2014 through 2019. The Sponsor has made the required ground lease rent payments to the City as well as required deposits to operating and replacement reserves each year. Management fees comply with MOHCD policy. The operating budget provided by TNDC projects healthy financial performance for the next 20 years, complies with our underwriting guidelines for debt service coverage ratio (DSCR) (see Attachment A: $1^{\text {st }}$ year Operating Budget and Attachment B: 20-year cash flow proforma).

### 2.2. MOHCD financing and ground lease

Turk \& Eddy is financed with a Tax Increment loan with current principal balance of $\$ 1,266,302$ and accrued interest of approximately $\$ 2.4 \mathrm{MM}$. Loan payments are through residual receipts, with a $3 \%$ interest rate. The loan matures November 17, 2064. The Borrower is Turk \& Eddy Associates, L.P., an affiliate of TNDC (see Attachment H: Borrower Org Chart). The loan will be amended concurrent with the close of the refinance to integrate the current MOHCD Residual Receipts Policy and extend the term and affordability restrictions.

The Turk \& Eddy Associates, L.P. leases the land from the City. The ground lease has a 55 -year term ground lease that began on November 2009 and is set to expire in 2064. The lease has an option to extend its term to 44 more years. The ground lease requires annual $\$ 15 \mathrm{~K}$ base rent and $\$ 325 \mathrm{~K}$ residual rent (payable to the extent there is surplus cash available and does not accrue). The Sponsor has made annual residual receipts payments and will continue to do so following the refinance.

Turk \& Eddy is being refinanced with a Freddie Mac loan. This loan requires the ground lease to be amended to incorporate certain standard mortgage protections. ${ }^{1}$ The Board of Supervisors approved the resolution to amend (February 4, 2020), and the City and the Sponsor will sign the amendment with the close of the Freddie Mac loan (October 2020) and subordination of the City loan. The amended ground lease incorporates all material terms and conditions of the original lease and provisions that are consistent with current MOHCD policies. As with the original ground lease, payments are made to the extent that surplus cash is available, and unpaid rent does not accrue.

### 2.3. Sources and Uses

This Resource Property is being refinanced with a senior position Freddie Mac loan, with proposed principal of approximately $\$ 17,750,000$, for a term of 30 years at $4 \%$ interest. The new loan is scheduled to close by October 30, 2020. After paying off the existing commercial Citibank loan (with a 7\% interest rate) and capitalizing reserves, the refinance will provide Excess Proceeds of up to $\$ 14.1 \mathrm{MM}$ to be allocated to the Receiver Properties' syndications for gap financing.

Turk \& Eddy will continue to deliver residual rent payments on the ground lease after the refinancing. The 20-year cash flow illustrates positive cash flow with a positive replacement reserve running balance through 2034 when TNDC anticipates resyndicating (see Attachment B: Turk \& Eddy 20-Year Cash Flow).

[^1]This Reinvestment Waiver is not conditioned on repayment of the existing Tax Increment loan (First Amendment 2009). Concurrent with the close of the Freddie Mac refinance, execution of the Note, and MOHCD subordination, the Declaration of Restrictions will be amended to extend affordability and the loan amended to incorporate current MOHCD residual receipts, operating fees, and reserves policies. (Table 2 below summarizes the Turk \& Eddy Sources and Uses.)

Table 2: Turk \& Eddy Sources and Uses

| Permanent Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Freddie Mac Permanent Loan | \$17,750,000 | \$216,463 | 40-year loan; closing pending MOHCD Loan Committee |
| Existing CCSF Tax Increment Loan | \$2,393,704 | \$29,192 | 55 yrs@AFR; to be amended/extended |
| Existing AHP Loan | \$530,000 | \$6,463 | To be restructured |
| Existing HUD-Held Residual Receipts | \$1,400,000 | \$17,073 | Approved by HUD |
| Turk \& Eddy Residual Receipts (existing 2019) | \$253,081 | \$3,086 | Approved by MOHCD for deposit to Replacement Reserves |
| Turk \& Eddy Replacement Reserves (existing) | \$113,620 | \$1,386 | Approved by MOHCD |
| Total | \$22,440,405 | \$273,663 |  |
| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit |  |
| Total Acquisition | \$6,111,865 | \$74,535 |  |
| Existing Perm Loan Payoff and Fees | \$3,188,161 | \$38,880 |  |
| Existing CCSF TI Loan | \$2,393,704 | \$29,192 |  |
| Existing AHP Loan | \$530,000 | \$6,463 |  |
| Reserves | \$55,706 | \$679 |  |
| Developer Fee | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| Construction Costs - Turk \& Eddy | \$2,224,276 | \$27,125 |  |
| Hard Costs -T\&E Seismic/Cap Imprvmts | \$1,902,471 | \$23,201 |  |
| Soft Costs - T\&E Seismic/Cap Imprvmts | \$321,805 | \$3,924 |  |
| Excess Proceeds allocated to Receiver Properties | \$14,048,558 | \$171,324 |  |
| Rehab - Yosemite/Folsom Dore | \$7,000,000 |  |  |
| Rehab - Ambassador/Ritz | \$3,500,000 |  |  |
| Rehab - Phase II | \$3,548,558 |  |  |
| Total | \$22,440,405 | \$273,663 |  |
| Units - Turk \& Eddy | 82 |  |  |

### 2.4. Physical needs

The buildings at Turk \& Eddy are nearly 100 years old. They underwent a partial rehab in 2010 after the Sponsor acquired the Property in 2007. According to the July 2020 PNA, the Property is in need of immediate capital improvements valued at $\$ 819 \mathrm{~K}$. The work entails fire sprinkler and alarm system upgrades for all residential units, heating and domestic hot water systems and plumbing upgrades, roof and window replacement, electrical upgrades, and extensive accessibility upgrades, among other improvements. The Freddie Mac loan also requires that the Property undergo a major seismic upgrade.

The rehab work and the seismic upgrade are fully scoped by architect/engineer and budgeted by a general contractor. The construction budget includes offsite relocation. In December 2019, the CR team reviewed and approved the seismic report/budget and the general contractor's assessment and budget for additional work. (The general contractor is $\mathrm{D} \& H$, the same one that has worked on the recent successful RAD projects.) The CR team found the costs to be comparable to similarly scaled projects in the MOHCD portfolio. As a condition of subordination to senior financing (closing in October 2020), the Sponsor will provide updated materials and a final construction contract which the CR team will review again for feasibility. (See Attachment F: Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments.)

The rehab work is scheduled to start in early 2021 and be complete by the end of that year. Should costs of the essential elements of the rehab go over the expected budget, the Sponsor will utilize more of the contingency funding from the Phase I Excess Proceeds from the Turk \& Eddy refinance and less for Phase II of the Reinvestment Project. With additional cost assessments the work may be spread out over a longer period to utilize the capitalized replacement reserves. In August 2020, the MOHCD CR team issued a letter confirming City Priority Permit Status for the purposes of expedited processing of permits by DBI and other permitting agencies.

### 2.5. Replacement Reserves

Proceeds of the refinance will capitalize the Turk \& Eddy replacement reserves to fund the immediate rehab work in 2020-2021. The Sponsor is allocating the 2019 owner share of residual receipts to make an additional deposit to the replacement reserves for the rehab. An additional source will be the balance ( $\$ 1.4 \mathrm{MM}$ ) of a HUD-required residual reserve account. HUD has already approved the deposit of these funds into the replacement reserves to fund the seismic work. ${ }^{2}$

[^2]The Freddie Mac loan requires a $\$ 36,900$ annual Replacement Reserve deposit. MOHCD staff has approved additional annual deposits of $\$ 53,100$, based on its review of the Property Condition Report/Lender Analysis (Walker-Dunlop, March 2019) and PNA (July 2020), for a total annual deposit of $\$ 90,000$. These deposits ensure a positive replacement reserve balance each year through 2034 (see Attachment B: Turk \& Eddy 20-year cash flow).

The Sponsor will provide MOHCD staff with quarterly updates of the rehab and seismic construction work, and MOHCD asset managers will approve withdrawals from replacement reserves associated with the work stages. The Sponsor will also provide a post-rehab PNA and reserves study to confirm completion of the scope and any remaining work yet to be completed using the replacement reserves. The senior lender is also closely monitoring this work, particularly the seismic upgrade it has required.

## 3. SCATTERED SITES SYNDICATIONS - RECEIVER PROPERTIES

The respective syndications pair Yosemite Apartments with Folsom Dore Apartments and the Ambassador Hotel with the Ritz Hotel. For full Receiver Property descriptions, see Attachment I: Property Descriptions.

### 3.1. Yosemite-Folsom Dore

### 3.1.1. Scattered sites tax credits

Yosemite and Folsom Dore will be combined in a scattered sites 4\% tax credit project to increase the competitiveness for TCAC and CDLAC funding. A scattered sites project also alleviates the CDLAC bond cap constraint Yosemite would have encountered if it had applied as a standalone $4 \%$ project. TNDC will apply for $4 \%$ tax credits and tax-exempt bonds in September 2020. TNDC will also leverage historic tax credits. TNDC anticipates receiving an award from CDLAC/TCAC in December 2020. Bond financing will close by April 2021 assuming an award from the September application.

### 3.1.2. Excess Proceeds for gap financing

The Turk \& Eddy refinancing Excess Proceeds provides approximately $\$ 7 \mathrm{MM}$ as a source for gap for the Yosemite-Folsom Dore syndication and rehabs. The syndication is also funded through $\$ 1.8 \mathrm{MM}$ in excess proceeds from the syndication of O'Farrell Towers (approved by Loan Committee July 19, 2019, for Yosemite pre-development).

Mark-up-to-Market Section 8, with no cap on surplus distributions. HUD has approved the use of the accumulated residual receipts in Turk-Eddy seismic retrofit.

### 3.1.3. Combined Budgets

The combined budget projects a healthy financial performance for the next twenty years, realizing sufficient NOI to adequately fund the respective properties' reserves and generate positive cash flow. The Sponsor has conservatively underwritten the syndication, and the Covid-19 pandemic should have little if any impact on the financial status of these properties. Yosemite generates modest surplus cash each year due to partial Project Based Section 8 and Section 8 vouchers. Folsom Dore generates substantial surplus cash with Project Based Section 8 rental assistance, Shelter+Care subsidies, and households with Section 8 portable vouchers. Residents in both properties primarily earn fixed incomes providing stable rent collections. (See Attachment C: Yosemite-Folsom Dore syndication 20-year proforma and Attachment E: Syndications Sources and Uses: Yosemite-Folsom Dore and Ambassador-Ritz.) Folsom Dore may be able to absorb the debt of a City PASS loan. As a condition for the close of the bond financing, the Sponsor will evaluate the feasibility of utilizing this financing rather than of utilizing the Excess Proceeds from the Turk\&Eddy refinance.

### 3.2. Ambassador-Ritz

### 3.2.1. Scattered sites tax credits

Ambassador-Ritz is a scattered sites syndication utilizing a hybrid tax credit structure, including both $4 \%$ acquisition rehab credits and a $9 \%$ tax credit allocation of the City and County of San Francisco's geographic set aside. TNDC decided to pursue this structure because the $9 \%$ allocation does not fully fund the level of rehabilitation required while a hybrid structure allows the project to leverage additional $4 \%$ tax-credit equity to cover the full cost. TNDC received approval from TCAC staff to move forward with the hybrid structure and applied for $9 \%$ tax credits on July 1, 2020 and will apply for $4 \%$ tax credits in September 2020, with the award anticipated in December 2020. The Sponsor has already engaged US Bank as the intended investor interested in this optimal structure, and retained legal counsel familiar with this financing structure.

### 3.2.2. Air rights subdivision

The hybrid financing structure requires an air rights subdivision for Ambassador in order to split the property into separate parcels, each for the $9 \%$ and $4 \%$ components. The execution of the subdivision is underway, and will be completed as a condition of the close of financing in order to access tax credits. TNDC has conferred with TCAC about the subdivision since it involves division of an existing regulated TCAC property, and the Sponsor has followed their direction on the appropriate physical split strategy. TNDC has engaged a fair housing attorney to ensure the subdivision meets Fair Housing requirements and does not present risks. TNDC has also worked closely with the investor and their tax attorney to develop the physical split strategy to minimize their risk. Finally, TNDC engaged a civil
engineer - Luk and Associates - that has deep experience with air rights parcelization in San Francisco to complete the proposed split documents and application to SF Department of Public Works (DPW)/Bureau of Street Management (BSM). TNDC has been preparing for the application for several months as they are aware that approval can take up to a year (see Pending Approvals).

### 3.2.3. Additional financing

In addition to tax credits, the syndication is funded through historic tax credits and excess proceeds from the syndication of O'Farrell Towers (approved by Loan Committee July 2019). TNDC is also expecting to utilize approximately $\$ 4.43 \mathrm{MM}$ of surplus cash from the Ritz that MOHCD authorized the Sponsor to set aside in a special replacement reserve from years 2018 through 2021. This will require California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) approval, which TNDC expects to obtain based on previous years' approvals (see Pending Approvals). In the event HCD does not approve the release of the surplus cash, TNDC has agreed to utilize its own equity as a financing source.

The Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) Affordable Housing Program (AHP) loan on Ambassador represents a $\$ 1.25 \mathrm{MM}$ permanent source for the syndication. The Sponsor must apply by March 2021 to renew this funding. TNDC is confident of receiving this funding given the target population of formerly homeless people. In the event the application is not successful, TNDC will apply again in March 2022. In the event this fails, the Sponsor will seek MOHCD approval to allocate more of the Turk \& Eddy Excess Proceeds to Ambassador-Ritz with a lower allocation for Phase II (see Pending Approvals). The Turk \& Eddy refinancing Excess Proceeds provides approximately $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{MM}$ as a source for gap financing for the AmbassadorRitz syndication and rehabs (see Attachment E: Sources and Uses.)

### 3.2.4. Combined budgets

The combined budget projects a healthy financial performance for the next 20 years, realizing sufficient NOI to adequately fund reserve accounts and generate positive cash flow. The Sponsor has underwritten the syndication with contingencies and escalations built in, and determined that Covid-19 should have little if any impact on the financial status of these properties. Together the properties generate substantial surplus cash owing to stable rental assistance program subsidies and secure rent collection revenues due to the fixed incomes of the resident populations. (See Attachment D: Ambassador-Ritz syndication 20-year proforma; see Attachment I: Property Descriptions.)

### 3.3. Restructuring existing City debt

Proceeds from the Turk \& Eddy refinance will not be utilized to pay off the existing City debt on Receiver Properties. These existing loans will be recast in the
name of the syndication entities in advance of the financing close. The debt restructuring extends affordability restrictions to 55 years. MOHCD staff has delegated authority to restructure debt so long as there is no forgiveness involved.

With regard to the Ritz, two forgivable loans have accrued and deferred interest in a combined amount that exceeds the value of the property and must be restructured and partially forgiven to facilitate the proposed tax exempt bond and 4\% LIHTC financing. Pending an award of private activity bonds, staff will return to the Loan Committee for approval of debt restructuring in conformance with existing MOHCD policy, and partial forgiveness on the following forgivable loans (see Pending Approvals):

- CDBG/Community Housing Rehabilitation Program (CHRP) -- \$4.4MM in accrued interest proposed to be fully written down, remaining balance to be restructured as payable from residual receipts at a rate of up to $3 \%$ or the AFR.
- CDBG/Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) -- \$20MM-22MM of \$30MM in accrued/deferred interest proposed to be written down, remaining amount restructured as payable from residual receipts at a rate of up to $3 \%$ or the AFR.

The proposed debt restructuring will preserve the City's existing investments in the Property to the maximum extent possible, minimize seller carry back financing, and leverage new debt and equity to recapitalize and secure affordability for the long term. (See Attachment E: Syndication/Receiver Properties Sources and Uses.)

### 3.4. Tax credit pricing

TNDC is closely following equity pricing and interest rates with CHPC and investor and lender partners. They are currently underwriting the syndications at $\$ .95$ LIHTC pricing and $\$ .85$ historic tax credit pricing, which TNDC is confident is realistic pricing, confirmed by CHPC, based on the current market and the internal rate of return requirements quoted by investors when compared to TNDC's current project underwritings.

## 4. CONSTRUCTION SCOPES, BUDGETS AND SCHEDULES

TNDC has designated the portions of Excess Proceeds to respective Receiver Properties based on current due diligence findings and budget projections. With final underwriting for the syndications, the Sponsor will provide final general contractor budgets as a condition for the City's issuance of bond financing.

### 4.1. Scopes and schedule

The construction has been fully scoped by a general contractor for Yosemite and scoped through $75 \%$ construction documents for Ambassador and Ritz; Folsom Dore currently has a concept scope (construction documents due October 2020). The Sponsor has provided 20-year PNAs for each property with replacement
reserve running balances. The MOHCD CR team has reviewed and approved the scopes and budgets at this stage and endorses the approval of the Waiver. The Sponsor has begun pre-development work for Yosemite (funded through the excess proceeds generated by the O'Farrell Towers project, approved by the Loan Committee July 2019, and cited as a source for the syndication.)

As a condition of the close of financing, the Sponsor will provide full scopes and final construction budgets and contracts, final relocations plans, and projected postrehab PNAs for the review and approval of MOHCD CR staff. The summary scopes of work and cost comparisons with similar projects in the MOHCD portfolio are found in Attachment F: Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments. The MOHCD CR team has preliminarily confirmed that the respective Properties' construction costs compare favorably to other seismic upgrades/substantial rehabs of similar scale recently funded in the MOHCD portfolio. ${ }^{3}$

Work is scheduled to begin for Yosemite and Folsom Dore in Q2 2021 and Ambassador and Ritz in Q3 2021 with all construction projects scheduled to be completed by December 2022. The Note matures with a five-year term requiring completion of all rehabs by October 2025. (See Table 1: Timetable and Milestones.)

### 4.2. Allocations of Excess Proceeds

The Excess Proceeds will be allocated to specific line items of the final construction budgets in the amounts of \$7MM for Yosemite-Folsom Dore and \$3.5MM for Ambassador-Ritz. MOHCD staff and the TNDC team will agree to the specific portions of the work with a timeline for completion as a condition of the execution of the Note. Once the specified work is complete, and signed off by the CR team, the Note will be reduced accordingly.

Table 3 below illustrates the Receiver Properties, the rehab needs and costs, and portions of the Excess Proceeds allocated as gap.

[^3]Table 3: Receiver Property Descriptions and Allocated Excess Proceeds

| Receiver <br> Property | Property Description | Needs |  <br> Rehab Costs | Gap/Excess <br> Proceeds <br> Allocated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yosemite <br> Apartments, 480 <br> Eddy Street <br> (syndicated with <br> Folsom Dore) | 32 studio units with one commercial space; built in 1924, on the National Register of Historic Places; 50\% and 80\% AMI; Partial Section 8. TNDC acquired the building in 1983. Incremental capital improvements over 35 years. | Major seismic, substantial rehab, life safety, accessibility upgrades, unit and common area upgrades | \$11,150,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| Folsom Dore <br> Apartments, 1340 <br> Folsom Street <br> (syndicated with Yosemite) | 98-units with 74 restricted for special needs households; partial LOSP subsidy; 50\% and 80\% AMI. Built by Citizens Housing Corp in 2005 in partnership with TNDC, acquired by TNDC in 2009 when TNDC bought out Citizens | Moderate rehab and accessibility and unit upgrades | \$4,000,000 |  |
| Ambassador Hotel, 55 Mason Street (syndicated with Ritz) | 134-unit SRO serving formerly homeless, five commercial spaces. Built in 1922 and on the National Register of Historic Places; 50\% AMI; acquired 1998 by TNDC; substantially rehabbed in 2003. | Major seismic, substantial rehab, life safety, accessibility upgrades, unit and common area upgrades | \$19,300,000 | \$3,500,000 |
| Ritz Hotel, 216 <br> Eddy Street <br> (syndicated with <br> Ambassador) | 89-unit SRO serving formerly homeless, with four commercial spaces; 50\% AMI; 100\% Section 8. Built in 1928 and on the National Register of Historic Places. Acquired by TNDC in 1991 with substantial rehab; additional substantial rehab in 2009. | Major seismic, substantial rehab, life safety, accessibility upgrades, unit and common area upgrades | \$9,840,000 |  |

### 4.3. Relocation

Turk \& Eddy and each of the four Receiver Property rehabs will require temporary resident relocation during construction. TNDC procured a third-party consultant to complete the TCAC-compliant initial relocation plans and budgets. TNDC plans to
utilize its in-house relocation team of three fulltime staff to handle the resident interviews, planning, and execution of the relocation prior to and during construction. Residents will be relocated to off-site units on the private market (in some cases, short-term residency in hotels), off-site units in TNDC's buildings, and/or on-site in vacant units as part of a phased construction plan.

The Sponsor has incorporated robust relocation budgets, which include all planning-related expenses, off-site unit rental costs, moving costs, resident benefits costs, and other related administrative expenses. The MOHCD CR team has preliminarily reviewed and approved these plans and budgets. Though these plans were drafted before the Covid-19 pandemic, since May 2020 TNDC has successfully adopted the Department of Public Health (DPH) Covid-19 guidelines for exploratory demolition without incident. The Sponsor is confident that the experienced contractors they have engaged will be able to carry out the occupied rehabs within the health guidelines and without additional costs or delays that would impact the timeline and budget. In advance of the close of bond financing, the Sponsor will provide updated plans with Covid-19 protocols for the MOHCD staff to review. These must comply with TCAC/CDLAC and DPH requirements. In the event costs of updated plans have risen from the original relocation budgets, the remainder of funds held in contingency for Phase II will be applied to Phase I.

### 4.4. MOHCD Construction Monitoring

The CR team will monitor progress of the full scopes of work for construction at Receiver Properties as part of compliance for the syndications, and in alignment with the PNAs and the construction contracts. (The construction lenders also monitor.) The CR team will also focus its reviews on the specific line items identified in the construction budgets that pertain to the specific allocations of the Excess Proceeds as described by the Note. The City Attorney has approved this mechanism for monitoring the work.

The Sponsor will provide new PNAs at completion of the full scope of these Receiver Property construction projects. The Sponsor will also deliver approved project pay apps/draws as evidence of the completed work and final permits as a condition of the reconveyance of the Note and Deed of Trust.

For Turk \& Eddy, MOHCD Asset Management and CR staff will monitor the withdrawals from replacement reserves as they correspond to portions of the work completed. The Sponsor will provide a post-rehab RULA, and copies of pay apps and signed off permits as evidence of completion. Walker-Dunlop, the servicer of the Freddie Mac loan, will also be closely monitoring the seismic upgrade (which is a condition of the refinance loan) and providing reports to MOHCD.

## 5. SPONSOR CAPACITY

### 5.1. Track record

TNDC has 35 years of experience developing both family and supportive housing in San Francisco. TNDC has 42 developments in its portfolio and 17 are in the pipeline, with 75 to 120 units per project. TNDC has extensive experience with occupied rehab tax credit projects, having completed five RAD projects between 2016 and 2019 and having completed the recent acquisition and occupied rehabilitation of 270 Turk (non-tax credit).

The Phase I Reinvestment Project is similar in size, complexity, and scope to the RAD projects short of the historic preservation element with historic tax credits, the scattered sites nature of the projects, and the subdivision of the Ambassador as a hybrid 4\%/9\%.

For the historic preservation component, TNDC is drawing on their historic preservation experience at the Kelly Cullen Community/YMCA project which utilized historic tax credits. TNDC is using the same historic architect consultant to both guide the preservation scope and to negotiate early with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

### 5.2. Financial

TNDC has a strong balance sheet and consistently utilizes its own working capital line to fund predevelopment activities across its pipeline. TNDC is being particularly creative in its approach to financing the Reinvestment Project, including use of working capital as a predevelopment bridge source, use of other TNDC project resources (e.g. mobilizing the Alexander Residence unrestricted reserve as a permanent funding source for the Ambassador-Ritz), and use of the O'Farrell Towers excess proceeds as a permanent source for both syndications.

TNDC has recognized the limited new funding sources for portfolio recapitalization projects at both the local and state level, so it has sought out funding via leveraging its own portfolio assets and resources. In addition to the use of working capital and other project funding sources (reserves, etc.), TNDC has also successfully leveraged HUD-held residual receipts at the Turk \& Eddy property for its own seismic upgrade, and successfully leveraged use of surplus cash flow as a development source for the Ritz that would otherwise go to HCD. TNDC uses its strong relationships with funding partners such as HUD and HCD to successfully negotiate and leverage these assets and funding sources.

TNDC utilizes a seasoned team of third-party financial consultants to create its financing plans. In this case, TNDC has engaged CHPC and their tax attorney,

Gubb \& Barshay, early to work out the details of the financing structure. The MOHCD staff is familiar with these consultants and recognizes them as experts in their respective fields who will minimize risks.

In addition, the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) Human Services Department audit verifies that TNDC has satisfied fiscal and governance compliance (see Attachment K: CCSF Human Services Agency audit letter dated May 23, 2019).
5.3. Ability to attract investors

TNDC recognizes that Phase I (Ambassador-Ritz hybrid 4\%/9\% scattered sites and Yosemite-Folsom Dore 4\% scattered sites) is not a straightforward deal from a lender and investor standpoint. Therefore, the Sponsor is utilizing its existing stable of lender and investor relationships, which range from both for-profit banks (US Bank, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Silicon Valley Bank, etc.) and syndicators to non-profit syndications and community development lending institutions (LISC, Enterprise, CCRC, etc.). They are onboarding lenders and investors early. TNDC has negotiated with US Bank to be provisionally selected as the tax credit investor and lender on the Ambassador-Ritz project and has worked closely with them to develop the appropriate air rights parcelization in consultation with their tax attorney. These strategies have been imperative to reducing risk for both TNDC and US Bank, ultimately delivering the best pricing and terms for the syndication. TNDC is engaging investors and lenders for the Yosemite-Folsom Dore in similar ways.

### 5.4. Project and Construction Management

MOHCD staff is confident that TNDC has deployed the appropriate level of skilled staff to this multi-property Reinvestment Project spanning five years. Todd LeFurge (Director of Asset Management), Thomas Lauderbach (Associate Director of Housing Development), and Chris Cummings (Associate Director of Housing Development) are leading the Reinvestment Project, each devoting 10\% of their time to it. Five project managers and asset managers have been assigned at $35 \%$ of their time. In total three full-time-equivalent employees are committed to the Reinvestment Project through its duration (see Attachment G: Sponsor Qualifications and Assignments).

All assigned TNDC staff have been intimately familiar with these properties for at least the last eighteen months and have been actively engaged with MOHCD staff in developing the Reinvestment Project plan. All TNDC staff have been integrally involved in multiple acquisitions and occupied rehabs financed through tax credits and City gap financing.

In terms of relocation, TNDC has learned from its RAD experience that an inhouse relocation team is much more effective than third-party consultants, and they
plan to utilize an in-house team to execute these relocation efforts effectively and successfully.

TNDC is also using architects and general contractors for these projects that they have worked with on the RAD projects. They have deep experience with affordable housing rehabilitations that involve occupied buildings and phased resident relocation plans. ${ }^{4}$ TNDC is also utilizing two third-party consultant construction managers, each with 35 years in the field and significant experience with multiple TNDC rehab projects.

## PENDING APPROVALS

City debt restructuring and forgiveness: All subject Receiver Properties have existing debt that must be recast. The loan amendments will incorporate extended affordability and MOHCD current policies. With regard to certain existing City debt on the Ritz, two forgivable loans have accrued and deferred interest in a combined amount that exceeds the value of the property and must be restructured and partially forgiven to facilitate the proposed tax exempt bond and $4 \%$ LIHTC financing. Pending an award of private activity bonds, staff will return to the Loan Committee for approval of debt restructuring in conformance with existing MOHCD policy, and partial forgiveness on the following forgivable loans (see Section 3.3).

The proposed debt restructuring will preserve the City's existing investments in the property to the maximum extent possible, minimize seller carry back financing, and leveraging new debt and equity to recapitalize and secure the project as affordable housing for the long term.

Subdivision approval required for Ambassador: The hybrid financing structure requires approval from SF Department of Public Works (DPW)/Bureau of Street Management (BSM) for an air rights subdivision for Ambassador. The subdivision is required in order to split the property into separate parcels, each for the $9 \%$ and $4 \%$ components. The execution of the subdivision is underway, and this issue will be resolved as a condition of the close of financing in order to access tax credit allocations (see Section 3.2.1 for more details).

Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) Affordable Housing Program (AHP) loans: The Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) Affordable Housing Program (AHP) loan on Ambassador represents a $\$ 1.25 \mathrm{MM}$ permanent source for the syndication. The Sponsor must apply by March 2021 to renew this funding. TNDC is confident of receiving this funding given the target population of formerly homeless people. In the event the application is not successful, TNDC will apply again in March 2022. In the event this fails, the Sponsor will seek MOHCD approval to allocate more of the Turk \& Eddy Excess

[^4]Proceeds to Ambassador-Ritz with a lower allocation of proceeds for Phase II (see Section 3.2.3 for more details).

HCD approval to release retained surplus cash: TNDC is expecting to utilize approximately $\$ 4.43 \mathrm{MM}$ of surplus cash from the Ritz that MOHCD authorized the Sponsor to set aside in a special replacement reserve from years 2018 through 2021. HCD must approve the release of this retained surplus cash as a source for the syndication. TNDC expects to obtain this approval based on previous years' approvals. This will be resolved in advance of close of bond financing. In the unlikely event that TNDC does not receive this approval, TNDC has agreed to utilize its own equity as a financing source.
(See Section 3.2.3 for more details.)

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Loan Committee approve TNDC's request for the $100 \%$ CashOut Reinvestment Waiver for Phase I of the Reinvestment Project. TNDC has done a thorough portfolio analysis, identifying the properties most able to support additional debt and leverage resources to provide funding for those less resourced properties in the portfolio with immediate critical physical needs. The Sponsor and MOHCD staff have conducted extensive diligence to ensure the viability of the project and to mitigate risks, solidify the financing sources, and deliver the seismic upgrades and rehabs on schedule.

The Reinvestment Project and this Waiver:

- Serves to significantly extend the useful life of the properties;
- Allows for the efficient administration and effective use of funds without placing additional burden on MOHCD to tap limited pubic resources to fund essential rehabilitation projects;
- Provides the framework and obligation to restructure the existing City debt while amending agreements to ensure longterm affordability for 432 low-income households.


## RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- In advance of close of bond financing (April 2021 for Yosemite-Folsom Dore and June 2021 for Ambassador-Ritz), Sponsor to provide or obtain:
- Final construction contracts for all Receiver Properties
- Final and MOHCD approved relocation plans with Covid-19 protocols
- Sponsor shall resolve all Pending Approvals in advance of the close of bond financing.
- Sponsor shall evaluate the feasibility of utilizing the City PASS financing for Folsom Dore in lieu of utilizing the Excess Proceeds from the Turk\&Eddy refinance.
- In advance of the execution of the Note, projected for October 30, 2020, Sponsor to provide or obtain:
- Final construction contract for Turk \& Eddy seismic upgrade and substantial rehab
- The Sponsor will also deliver approved project pay apps/draws as evidence of the completed work and final permits as a condition of the reconveyance of the Note and Deed of Trust.


## LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Friday, September 18, 2020 2:58 PM
Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
TNDC Cash Out - Loan Committee

I approve

Eric D. Shaw
Director

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

| From: | Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, September 23, 2020 4:00 PM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Approval of TNDC Reinvestment Waiver |

I approve TNDC request for a Reinvestment Waiver to the current MOHCD Cash-Out Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing fir the Turk \& Eddy Apartments

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) requests approval of a Reinvestment Waiver to the current MOHCD Cash-Out Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing Policy. The Waiver will allow TNDC to leverage the refinance of Turk \& Eddy Apartments and reinvest up to $\$ 14.1 \mathrm{MM}$ as a source of financing for essential rehab, accessibility, and seismic work at four high-priority properties in the TNDC portfolio. In addition, the refinance will provide funding for the significant rehab and seismic upgrade at Turk \& Eddy. With this Waiver, MOHCD will contribute its $50 \%$ share, or $\$ 7 \mathrm{MM}$, of the Excess Proceeds from the refinance cash out to fill the financing gap without the need to initiate new lending. The Waiver ensures the long term physical health of five properties and extends affordability for 432 low-income households.


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

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

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Oerth, Sally (CII) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, September 18, 2020 11:48 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR); Faust, Holly (MYR) |
| Subject: | 9/18/20 Loan Committee: Agenda Item \#3 - TNDC Cash Out Reinvestment Policy Waiver Request |

On behalf of Nadia Sesay, I approve the Cash Out Reinvestment Policy waiver request for the TNDC projects that was presented at the 9/18/20 Loan Committee.

## Sally Oerth

Deputy Director

office of
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT
OCII

## Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

| From: | Van Degna, Anna (CON) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, September 18, 2020 11:48 AM |
| To: | Chavez, Rosanna (MYR) |
| Cc: | Shaw, Eric (MYR) |
| Subject: | Agenda item \#3 |

Approved

## Anna Van Degna

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

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

Date: $\qquad$

[^5]Attachments: A. Turk \& Eddy Apartments $-1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget<br>B. Turk \& Eddy Apartment -- 20 -year proforma<br>C. Yosemite-Folsom Dore syndication - 20-year proforma<br>D. Ambassador-Ritz syndication -- 20-year proforma<br>E. Syndication/Receiver Properties Sources and Uses: Yosemite-Folsom Dore and Ambassador-Ritz<br>F. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments<br>G. Sponsor Qualifications and Assignments<br>H. Borrower Org Chart<br>I. Property Descriptions<br>J. MOHCD Cash-Out Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing<br>Policy (effective June 19, 2020)<br>K. CCSF Human Services Agency audit letter, May 23, 2019

Attachment A: $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget - Turk \& Eddy Apartments


Attachment B: 20-year Operating Proforma - Turk \& Eddy Apartments


| Total \# Units: | 82 |  |  | $\text { Year } 2$$2021$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 3 } \\ 2022 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 4 } \\ 2023 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 5 \\ & 2024 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 6 } \\ 2025 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year 7 } \\ & 2026 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 8 \\ & 2027 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 9 \\ 2028 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 10 \\ 2029 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 1 } \\ 2020 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| income | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \text { annual } \\ \text { increase } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { Comments }}{\text { (related to annual inc assumptions) }}$ | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 2.5\% |  | 288,096 | 295,298 | 302,681 | 310,248 | 318,004 | 325,954 | 334,103 | 342,456 | 351,017 | 359,792 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | mates $2.5 \%$ | 1,909,884 | 1,957,631 | 2,006,572 | 2,056,736 | 2,108,155 | 2,160,858 | 2,214,880 | 2,270,252 | 2,327,008 | 2,385,183 |
| Commercial Space | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Services Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% |  | 1.404 | 1,439 | 1.475 | 1.512 | 1.549 | 1.588 | 1.628 | 1.669 | 1.710 | 1,753 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% |  | 300 | 308 | 315 | 323 | 331 | ${ }^{339}$ | 348 | 357 | 365 | ${ }^{375}$ |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% |  | 3.000 | 3,075 | 3.152 | 3,231 | 3,311 | 3,394 | 3.479 | 3.566 | 3.655 | 3,747 |
| Other Commercial Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  | 2,202,684 | 2,257,751 | 2,314,195 | 2,372,049 | 2,431,351 | 2,492,134 | 2,554,438 | 2,618,299 | 2,683,756 | 2,750,850 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | ${ }^{3 \% \%}$ of GPR | (8,643) | (8,859) | (9,080) | (9,307) | (0,540) | (9,799) | (10,023) | (10,274) | (10,531) | (10,794) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss - Commercial | n/a |  | (57, 297) | (58,729) | (60,197) | (61,702) | (63,245) | (64,826) | (66,446) | (68,108) | (69,810) | (71,556) |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  | 2,136,744 | 2,190,163 | 2,244,917 | 2,301,040 | 2,35,566 | 2,417,530 | 2,47,968 | 2,539,918 | 2,603,415 | 2,668,501 |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD | 82,164 | 85.040 | 88.016 | 91,097 | 94,285 | 97,585 | 101,001 | 104,536 | 108,194 | 111,981 |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 21,900 | 22,677 | 23,460 | 24,281 | 25,131 | 26,010 | 26,921 | 27,863 | 28,838 | 29,847 |
| Salaries/Benefits $\quad$ Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% |  | 140,940 | 145,873 | 150,978 | 156,263 | 161,732 | 167,393 | 173,251 | 179,315 | 185,591 | 192,087 |
| Heatth Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% |  | 68,952 | 71,365 | 73,663 | 76,448 | 79,124 | 81,893 | 84,760 | 87,726 | 90,797 | 93,974 |
| Other Salaries/Benefitis | 3.5\% |  | 21,904 | 22,671 | 23,464 | 24.285 | ${ }^{25,135}$ | 26,005 | 26,926 | ${ }^{27,868}$ | 28,843 | ${ }^{29,853}$ |
| Administrative Rent-ree Unit Sub-total Salaries/Benefits |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}12,000 \\ \hline 257,692\end{array}$ | $\stackrel{12,420}{266,711}$ | $\begin{array}{r}12,855 \\ \hline 276,046\end{array}$ | $\stackrel{13,305}{285,708}$ | 13,770 295,707 | 14,252 306,057 | 14,751 316,769 | $\stackrel{15,267}{127,856}$ | ${ }_{35}^{153,832}$ | ${ }_{\text {16 }}^{16,355}$ |
|  |  |  | 257,692 | 266,711 | 276,046 | 285,708 | 295,707 | 306,057 | 316,769 | 327,856 | 339,331 | 351,208 |



| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% |  | 9,534 | 9,868 | 10,213 | 10,571 | 10,940 | 11,323 | 11,720 | 12,130 | 12,554 | 12,99 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% |  | 27.576 | 28,541 | 20,540 | 30.574 | 31,644 | 32,752 | 33,898 | 35,084 | 36,312 | 37,5 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% |  | 3,000 | 3,105 | 3,214 | 3,326 | 3.443 | 3.563 | 3.688 | 3,817 | 3,950 | 4.089 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  | 40,110 | ${ }^{41,514}$ | 42,967 | 44,471 | 46,027 | ${ }^{47,638}$ | 49,305 | 51,031 | 52,817 | ${ }^{54,666}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property and Lability insuance | 3.5\% |  | 47,472 | 49,134 | 50,853 | 52,633 | 54,475 | 56,382 | 58,355 | 60,398 | 62,512 | 64,699 |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% |  | 20,916 | 21.648 | 22.406 | 23,190 | 24,002 | 24,842 | 25,711 | 26.611 | 27,542 | 28,506 |





\footnotetext{
income

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 1 } \\ 2020 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 2 } \\ 2021 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 3 \\ & 2022 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 4 } \\ 2023 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 5 \\ 2024 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 6 \\ 2025 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 7 \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 8 \\ 2027 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 9 \\ 2028 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 10 \\ 2029 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% annual | $\underset{\text { Comments }}{\substack{\text { Comus } \\ \text { (reate to } \\ \text { annal inc assumptions) }}}$ | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total |


| Total \# Units: | 82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 11 \\ 2030 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 12 \\ 2031 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 13 \\ 2032 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 14 \\ 2033 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 15 \\ 2034 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 16 \\ 2035 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 17 \\ 2036 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 18 \\ 2037 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 19 \\ 2038 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 20 \\ 2039 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | \% annual | $\underset{\text { Comments }}{\substack{\text { Celated to annual inc assumptions) }}}$ | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 2.5\% |  | 368,787 | 378,007 | 387,457 | 397,144 | 407,072 | 417,249 | 427,680 | 438,372 | 449,331 | 460,565 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | escalaes 2.5\% | 2,444,813 | 2,505,933 | 2.568,582 | 2,632,796 | 2,698,616 | 2,766,081 | 2,835,234 | 2,906,114 | 2,978,767 | 3,053,236 |
| Commercial Space | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% |  | - |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Services Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% |  | 1,797 | 1,842 | 1,888 | 1,935 | 1,983 | 2,033 | 2,084 | 2,136 | 2.189 | 2,244 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% |  | 384 | 394 | 403 | 414 | 424 | 434 | 445 | 456 | 468 | 480 |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% |  | 3.840 | 3,936 | 4.035 | 4.136 | 4,239 | 4.345 | 4,454 | 4.565 | 4.679 | 4,796 |
| Other Commercial Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  | 2,819,621 |  | 2,890,112 | 2,962,365 | 3,036,424 | 3,112,334 | 3,190,143 | 3,269,896 | 3,351,644 | 3,43,435 | 3,521,321 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | ${ }^{3 \%}$ of GPR | (11.064) | (11,340) | (11,624) | (11,944) | (12,212) | (12,517) | (12.830) | (13,151) | (13,480) | (13,817) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments | $\stackrel{\text { n/a }}{ }$ |  | (73,344) | (75,178) | (77,057) | (78,984) | (80,958) | (82,982) | (85,057) | (87,183) | (89,363) | (91,597) |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS InCome |  |  | 2,735,213 | 2,803,594 | 2,873,684 | 2,945,526 | 3,019,164 | 3,094,643 | 3,172,009 | 3,251,309 | 3,332,592 | 3,415,907 |
| operating expenses <br> Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AssetManagementree Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30,892 | 31,973 | 33,92] | 34,251 | 35,449 | 36,690 | 37,974 | 39,303 | 40,679 | 42,103 |
|  |  |  | 146,793 | 151,930 | 157,248 | ${ }^{162,752}$ | 168,448 | 174,344 |  | 180,466 | 186,761 | 193,298 | 200,063 |
| Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% |  | 19,602 | 20,288 | 20,988 | 21,733 | 22,493 | 23,281 | 24,095 | 24,939 | 25,812 | 26,715 |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% |  | 198,810 | 205,768 | 212,970 | 220,424 | 228,139 | 236,124 | 244,388 | 252,942 | 261,795 | 270,957 |  |
| Heatth Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% |  | 97,264 | 100,668 | 104,191 | 107,838 | 111,612 | 115,519 | 119,562 | 123,746 | 128,078 | 132,560 |  |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% |  | 30,898 | 31,979 | 33,098 | 34,257 | 35,456 | 36,997 | 37,981 | 3, 3,311 | 40,686 | 42.110 |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% |  | 16,927 | 17,520 | 18,133 | 18,767 | 19,424 | 20,104 | 20.808 | 21,536 | 22,290 | 23.070 |  |
| Sub-total Salaries/Benefits |  |  | 363,500 | 376,223 | 389,390 | 403,019 | 417,125 | 431,724 | 466,834 | 462,474 | 478,660 | 495,413 |  |



| Electricity | 3.5\% |  | 15.505 | 16,048 | ${ }^{16,610}$ | 17.191 | ${ }^{17,793}$ | 18.415 | 19.060 | 19.727 | 20.418 | 21.132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water | 3.5\% |  | 97,348 | 100,755 | 104,282 | 107,932 | 111,709 | 115,619 | 119,666 | 123,854 | 128,189 | ${ }_{132,676}$ |
| Gas | 3.5\% |  | 18,044 | 18,676 | 19,330 | 20,006 | 20,706 | 21,431 | 22,181 | 22,957 | 23,761 | 24,593 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  | 130,898 | 135,49 | 140,221 | 145,129 | 150,208 | 155,466 | 160,907 | 166,539 | 172,368 | 178,400 |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Taxes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{13,4899}$ | 40,260 | ${ }^{14,1,669}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4,12128}$ | ${ }^{44,637}$ | 46,199 | ${ }_{47,716}^{10,32}$ | 4, 4, 490 | ${ }_{51,222}^{1,109}$ | ${ }_{5}^{10,3,015}$ |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% |  | 4,232 | 4,380 | 4.533 | 4,692 | 4.856 | 5.026 | 5,202 | 5,384 | 5.572 | 5,768 |




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

| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  | per MoHCD policy no annual increase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Payments |  | Replacement Reseeve Deposit | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  | Enter comments re: anual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 |  | Enter comments re: anual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (EEnter amt $<=$ Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total payments preceding mohcd |  |  | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 | 53,100 |
| RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS PRECEDIN | монсD |  | 159,007 | 170,219 | 181,141 | 191,744 | 201,999 | 211,877 | 221,346 | 213,531 | 255,646 | 247,076 |
| Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation? Will Project Defer Developer Fee? | Yes No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residual Receipts split for all years. - Lender/Owner | \%/33\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



MOHCD Proforma- 20 Year Cash Flow

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 11 \\ 2030 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 12 \\ 2031 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 13 \\ 2032 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 14 \\ 2033 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 15 \\ 2034 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 16 \\ 2035 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 17 \\ 2036 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 18 \\ 2037 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 19 \\ 2038 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 20 \\ 2039 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% annual increase | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | Total | Total | Total | Total | tal | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total |

Attachment C: Yosemite-Folsom Dore syndication - 20-year proforma


| Total \# Units:  <br> 130  <br> INCOME  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Losp } \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ | Units <br> 110 <br> 85.00\% |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 2$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 3$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inc } \\ & \text { Losp } \end{aligned}$ | $\%$ annual | $\underset{\substack{\text { Comments } \\ \text { (related to annual inc assumptions) }}}{ }$ | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non- } \\ & \text { LOSP } \end{aligned}$ | Total | LOSP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non- } \\ & \text { LOSP } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  |  | 918,036 | 918,036 |  | 940,987 | 940,987 |  | 964,512 | 964,512 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | 2.5\% |  | 201,841 | 1,143,767 | 1,345,608 | 206,887 | 1,172,361 | 1,379,248 | 212,059 | 1,201,670 | 1,413,729 |
| Residential - LoSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 68,302 |  | 68,302 | 72,062 |  | ${ }^{72,062}$ | 76,003 |  | 76,003 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  | 20,000 |  |  | 20,500 |  |  | 21,013 |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supporive Services Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 558 | 3,160 | 3,718 | 572 | 3,239 | 3,811 | 586 | 3,320 | 3,906 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 495 | 2.805 | 3.300 | 507 | 2.875 | 3,383 | 520 | 2,947 | 3.467 |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 1,035 | 5.865 | 6,900 | 1,061 | 6,012 | 7.073 | 1.087 | 6,162 | 7.24 |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | Link from Reserve Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income mandal |  |  | 272,231 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 2,073,633 } & 2,365,864\end{array}$ |  | 281,089 | 2,125,474 | 2,427,063 | 290,255 | 2,178,611 | 2,489,879 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manually per relevant MO policy; annual incrementing usually not appropriate |  | (45,922) | (45,902) |  | (47,049) | (47,049) |  | (48,226) | (48,226) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | (10,022) | (57,188) | $\frac{(67,280)}{(10.000)}$ | (10,344) | ( 58,618$)$ | $\frac{(68,962)}{(10,250)}$ | (10,603) | (60,083) | ${ }_{(70,686}^{(10.506)}$ |
| EFFECTIVE Gross income |  |  |  | 262,139 | 1,970,543 | 2,242,682 | 270,745 | 2,019,807 | 2,30,801 | 279,653 | 2,070,302 | 2,360,460 |


| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD schedule. | 19,395 | 109,905 | 129,300 | 20,074 | 113,752 | 133,826 | 20,776 | 117,733 | 138.509 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 1,522 | 8,624 | 10,146 | 1,575 | 8,926 | 10,501 | 1,630 | 9,238 | 10,869 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 52.022 | 294.794 | 346.816 | 53.843 | 305.111 | 358.955 | 55.728 | 315.790 | 371.518 |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefitis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 17,522 | 99,292 | 116,814 | 18,135 | 102,767 | 120,902 | 18,770 | 106,364 | 125,134 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 69,545 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 394,086 | 463,630 | 71,979 | 407,878 | 479,857 | 74,998 | 422,154 496,65 |  |


| Adverising and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 8.312 | 47,101 | 55,413 | 8,603 | ${ }_{48,750}$ | 57,352 | 8.904 | 50,456 | 59,361 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4.380 | 24,820 | 29,200 | 4,533 | 25,689 | 30,222 | 4.692 | 26,588 | 31,280 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2,697 | 15,282 | 17,979 | 2,791 | ${ }_{15,817}^{15}$ | 18,608 | 2,889 | 16,371 | 19,260 |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2,597 | 14,719 | 17,316 | 2,688 | 15,234 | 17,922 | 2,782 | 15,767 | 18,549 |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,770 | 10,030 | 11,800 | 1,832 | 10,381 | 12,213 | 1,896 | 10,744 | 12,640 |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 3,410\| | 19,321 | 22,731 | ${ }^{3,529}$ | 19,998 | ${ }^{23,527}$ | ${ }^{3,653}$ | 20,698 |  |


| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 8,199 | 46,461 | 54,660 | 8,486 | 48,087 | 56,573 | 8,783 | 49,770 | 58,553 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 23,175 | 131,325 | 154,500 | 23,986 | 135,921 | 159,908 | 24.826 | 140,679 | 165,504 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 8,124 | 46,033 | 54,157 | 8,408 | 47,645 | 56,052 | 8,702 | 49,312 | 58,014 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5,191 | 20,414 | 34,605 | 5.372 | 30,444 | 35,816 | 5.560 | 31,509 | 37,070 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,328 | 7,523 | 8.851 | 1.374 | 7,787 | 9,161 | 1.422 | 8.5059 | 9,481 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 7,419 | 42,039 | 49,458 | 7,678 | 43,511 | 51,189 | 7,947 | 45,034 | 52,981 |


| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 8,959 | 50,766 | 59.725 | 9,272 | 52.543 | 61,815 | 9,597 | 54,382 | 3,979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 7,460 | 42,271 | 4,7,730 | 7,721 | 43,750 | 51.471 | 7.991 | 45,281 | 53,27 |
| Director's \& officers' Liability lisurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance \& Repair Sub-total Insurance |  |  |  | 16,418 | ${ }^{93,037}$ | 109,455 | 16,993 | ${ }^{96,293}$ | ${ }^{13,286}$ | 588 | 99,66 | , 25 |
| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{28,751}$ | ${ }^{162924}$ | ${ }^{191.675}$ | ${ }^{29,758}$ | 168,626 | 198.384 | 30,799 | ${ }^{174.528}$ | 200,327 |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 11,295 | 64,005 | 75,300 | 11,690 | 66,245 | 77,936 | 12,099 | 68,564 | ${ }^{80,663}$ |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 9,994 | 56,630 | 66,624 | 10,343 | 58,612 | 68,956 | 10,705 | 60,664 | 71,369 |
| Security Payrollc ontract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{11,947}$ | 67,701 | 79.648 | 12,365 | 70,070 | 82,436 | 12,798 | 72,523 | 85,32 |




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


| Hard Debt- - Ourth Lender |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service |
|  |

CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)
Comercial Only Cash Flow
Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income)
USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)


Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation
1st Residual Receipts Split - Lender/Deferred Developer Fee
2nd Residual Receits Split - Lender/Owner
MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE

| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |
| :--- |
| Proposed dOHCD Residual 1 Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground |
| Lease |
| NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE |
| HCD Resiual Recipts Amount Due |
| Lender 4 Residual Receints Due |

Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due

## REMAIIDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions

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

Owner Distributionsincentive Man
Other Distritions/sses
Final Baliance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERYE-RUNNING BALANC
Replacement Reserve Starting Balance
Replacement Reserve Depositis

operating reserve - running balance

OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Reserve 1 Starting Balan
Other Reserve 11 Deposits

| Other Reserve 1 1 Withostrawals |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Interest |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |

OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE

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

Yes Year 15 is year indicated below:
Yes
$500 / 5$






| Total \＃Units： | LOSP Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | ${ }_{\text {10 }}^{10}$ |  |  | Year 4 |  |  | Year 5 |  |  | Vear 6 |  |
| INCOME | ，ince | （\％annual |  | Losp | non－Losp | Total | Losp | non－LOSP | Total | Losp | hon－Losp | Total |
| Residentill－Tenant Rents | ${ }_{\text {109\％}}$ | ${ }_{\text {2 }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{988,54}$ | ${ }_{\text {9096 }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {10，}}^{1.01380}$ | Toal |  | 1．038673 | 1.038 .6 |
| Residenial－enant Assisance Peaments（Non－OSP） | n／a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{1.485299}$ |  |  |  |
| Commerial Space | n／a | ${ }^{2.50}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{21.5}$ |  |  | ${ }^{20.076}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {coin }}$ |
| Resieniala Pating | ${ }^{2.250}$ | ${ }^{\text {2，500 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supportive Sevices income | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{2.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| niteest thome．－．roie |  |  |  | 6 | ${ }_{3,083}$ | 4，004 | ${ }_{16}$ | ${ }_{3,488}$ | 4，104 | ${ }_{631}$ | ${ }_{3,57}$ |  |
| Lenand chavenening | ${ }^{2.509}$ | ${ }^{2.550}$ |  | ${ }_{53}$ | S，${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4，095 | ${ }_{566}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{4.643 \\ 3.64}}$ | 50． | ${ }_{\substack{3.174 \\ 3.75}}$ |  |
| Miscelaneous Resididial Income | $\frac{2.5 \%}{\text { na }}$ | ${ }^{2.55 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{1,1.15}$ | 6，36 | ${ }_{7,43}$ | 1．42 | 674 | ${ }^{7}, 0616$ | ${ }_{171} 1$ |  |  |
| withrawal tom Capialized Resereve（deosisto operating account） | n／a | n／a | Link |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross potetitial licome |  |  |  | 299，740 | 2223，076 | $2.554,354$ | 30，955 | 2288，93 | 2．620．54 | ${ }^{319,711}$ | ${ }_{2,366,26}$ | $2.888,49$ |
| Vacancy Loss－Residential－Tenant Rents <br> Vacancy Loss－Residential－Tenant Assistance Payments | ${ }_{\text {n／a }}^{\text {n／a }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Ina }}^{\text {n／a }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{(494831)}$ |  | ${ }^{(50,687}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\frac{5}{64,983}}$ |  |
|  | na |  |  | ${ }^{2888872}$ |  | ${ }_{2,4217200}$ | ${ }_{2989} 215$ | ${ }_{2,175,111}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {31288292 }}$ | ${ }^{2} 229798989$ |  |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％\％ | 1 Is veari be sese acourinig ofl | 21.504 | 21,54 |  | 22236 |  |  | 23.05 | ${ }^{130,533}$ | 153568 |
| Assel Management Fee Sub－toal Management Expenses |  | 3．5\％ | permotcco policy | ${ }^{1.687}$ | ${ }_{\text {，}}^{\text {，} 3 \text { ，622 }}$ | ${ }^{11249} 1$ | ${ }^{1,776{ }^{2} 8}$ | 135095 | ${ }^{111683}$ | ${ }^{1.008}$ | 12075 | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{12050} 1$ |
| Salariestigenefits Sub－oaal Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{3}^{3.55 \%}$ | ${ }_{3.55 \%}^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 57.68 | ${ }^{326893}$ | ${ }^{384521}$ | ${ }_{50,97}$ | ${ }^{338282}$ | ${ }^{39,999}$ | ${ }_{6}^{61,786}$ | ${ }^{350.122}$ | ${ }^{411,99}$ |
| Heath hsumance and other Benefits | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3．5\％ |  | 19,427 | 10.08 | ${ }^{129,514}$ | 20.07 | 113.90 | 1384077 | 20.81 | ${ }^{117,928}$ | ${ }^{138,788}$ |
| Oiner Salaries enenitise | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \% \%}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub－otal Salariestigenefis |  |  |  | ${ }^{7,105}$ | ${ }^{48,930}$ | 54,0 | 7,9804 | 45222 | 532.02 | 597 | 468,50 | 550，67 |
| Adversisinganon Makkeing | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3．5\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Expenses |  | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{9} 226$ | ${ }_{522}$ | ${ }^{614.437}$ | 9.558 | ${ }_{54,050}$ | ${ }_{63,5}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{0.87}$ | ${ }_{55,94}$ | ${ }_{65,8}^{68}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {chem }}^{\text {3．5\％}}$ |  | Le96 |  |  | 502 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Audit Exense |  |  |  | 2.99 | ${ }_{16,94}^{29}$ | ${ }_{10,9}$ | 3.095 | ${ }_{\text {17，537 }}$ | ${ }^{20.0}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {28，}}^{180}$ |  |
| BoorkeepingAccounting Senices | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | 3．5\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.005 |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  | 1， 1.062 | 11.20 | 13093 |  | ${ }_{\text {12，500 }}^{12120}$ |  | 2.02 | ${ }^{11,992}$ |  |
| Sub－toal Administration Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{3,5889}$ | ${ }_{\text {245，}}^{1245}$ | ${ }_{\text {250222 }}^{17229}$ | ${ }^{\frac{3,583}{2,53}}$ | ${ }_{\text {220，} 239}$ | ${ }_{\text {26004 }}^{17,222}$ | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{4,5,514}$ | ${ }^{2259989}$ | ${ }^{263,925}$ |
| Unitites |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electricily | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 9，000 | ${ }_{51,512}^{515}$ | ${ }_{60,603}^{60,}$ | 2，099 | ${ }_{\text {cta }}^{5}$ | ${ }^{62,72}$ | ${ }^{\text {9，738 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {55129 }}$ | ${ }^{64} 9$ |
| Gas | ${ }^{3.506}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{2007}$ | ${ }^{151038}$ | 60095 | 20， 32 | ${ }^{52824}$ | ${ }_{62246}^{624}$ | ${ }_{\text {2，}}^{0.688}$ | ${ }_{\text {ciser }}^{564}$ | ${ }_{64.3}$ |
| Sewer | ${ }^{\text {3．5\％\％}}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes and Licenses Sub－toal Uutities |  |  |  | 43，92 | ${ }^{24,153}$ | ${ }^{291,94}$ | 45,324 | ${ }^{256,388}$ | ${ }^{302,162}$ | ${ }_{66,911}$ | ${ }^{265,327}$ | ${ }^{312,73}$ |
| Real Esate Texes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 998 | 5.56 | 0.0 | ${ }_{1}^{1.033}$ | 5.8 | 6.887 | ${ }^{106}$ | 6.05 | ${ }_{7} 7.28$ |
| Papyol | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.55 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{5,755}$ | ${ }_{32612}$ | 88，36 | 5 | ${ }_{\text {3，7，}}$ | 39，7i1 | ${ }_{6}^{6,165}$ | 34，933 | 4.12 |
| Ster |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {L，} 2,25}^{1.425}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{\text {i，} 513}^{1,24}$ | ${ }_{4}^{48,241}$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{1,8711}}^{\substack{\text { ¢，}}}$ | ${ }_{4}^{49,930}$ | ${ }_{58,74}^{10,0}$ |
| Property and L Labilit musuance | 3．5\％ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 9，933 | ${ }_{56,285}$ | 66.2 | 10.80 | ${ }_{5825}$ | 6．556 | 10.680 | 6029 | ${ }^{7} \mathbf{7}$ ．935 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5029 | 5906 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 3．5\％ | ${ }^{\text {3，5\％}}$ |  | 827 | 46066 |  | 8.50 |  | 5.06 | ， | ， | 5.04 |
| Maintenance e Repair Sub－tail 1 lusuance |  |  |  | 18,23 | 103，152 | ${ }^{121,355}$ | 18，80 | ${ }^{106,762}$ | ${ }^{125,602}$ | 19，500 | 10，998 | 129，998 |
| Parvoll | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }^{318871}$ | 1800686 | ${ }^{212513}$ | ${ }_{32,93}$ | 188959 | ${ }^{219951}$ | ${ }^{34147}$ | ${ }^{1935502}$ | 27.6 |
| Sopriacts | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \% \%}}$ | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3.5 \% \%}}$ |  | ${ }_{12,53}$ | ${ }_{70.983}$ | 83486 | ${ }_{12,961}$ | ${ }_{3,477}$ | ${ }_{86,48}$ | ${ }^{13,45}$ | ${ }_{6018}$ |  |
| Garage and rash Removal |  | ${ }^{\text {3，5\％\％}}$ |  | ${ }^{121080}$ | ${ }^{62787}$ | ${ }^{73,877}$ | 11.68 | ${ }^{64985}$ | ${ }^{76,453}$ | ${ }^{11,869}$ | ${ }^{672} 29$ |  |
| HVAC Reenais sand Maintenance | ${ }_{3.5}^{3.5}$ | ${ }_{\text {c }}{ }_{\text {3．5．5\％}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Venicle and Mainenence Equiment Opeation and Repais | ${ }^{3.56 \%}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stele |  |  |  | ${ }_{68,726}^{1626}$ | ${ }^{\text {33，9488 }}$ | ${ }_{4681274}^{40,}$ | ${ }_{7}^{17,122}$ | ${ }_{\text {cos，} 0,79}$ | 474，210 | ${ }_{7,621}^{14,07}$ | ${ }_{477,178}$ | ${ }_{490,085}^{4909}$ |
| Supporive sevices | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ |  | 4.075 | 23089 | 27.64 | 4227 | 23.897 | ${ }^{28.144}$ | ${ }_{4}^{436}$ | 24.73 | 20.988 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES PUPA（w／o Reserves／GL Base Rent／Bond Fees） |  |  |  | 266,01 | 1，224，341 | 1，800 | 278.416 |  |  | ${ }^{28,161}$ | 1，623，912 | 1，288，966 |
| Reserves／Ground Lease Base Rent／Bond Fees <br> Ground Lease Base Rent |  |  |  | dreee amas | melolocels．min | 退 | Irameatand |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bond Monitiorif Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Resene eeposit |  |  |  | 12.880 | ${ }^{7.570}$ | 84.200 | 12.880 | ${ }_{71,50}$ | ${ }^{84200}$ | ${ }^{12,680}$ | ${ }^{7,5150}$ | 84，200 |
| Oiner Requied Reseses 1 Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required Reserve Deposit／s，Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtoal ResesvesIGround Lease Base Rentifond Fees |  |  |  | 12，630 | 71,570 | ${ }_{84200}$ | 12，30 | 71，50 | ${ }^{84} 200$ | 2630 | 21.50 | 84,200 |
|  |  |  |  | 282,631 | ${ }^{911}$ | 84，472 | 21，066 | c99263 | ， 481 | 300，791 | 204，420 | $2.012,696$ |
| Net operating Income（mCome minus op expenses） |  |  |  | 7,241 | ${ }_{526,148}$ | 437，29 | 7,369 | 52，488 | ${ }^{537,083}$ | 7，502 | ${ }_{52,006}$ | 538，399 |
| DEBT SERVICEMUST PAY PAYMENTS＂＇hard debtr＇amotized loa |  |  |  | doteerealuss |  |  | I／atereman dia | Rogngaem |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Etereme | 3300 | 377000 | 377，000 | 3300 |  |  | 3300 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Sen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard oent－Furut Lender |  |  | Enese commens ese mmadin iceese eac． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total hard debt service |  |  |  | 3，300 | 395，700 | 39，000 | 3，300 | ${ }^{395,70}$ | ${ }^{39,000}$ | 3，300 | ${ }^{395,700}$ | 399，00 |
| CASH FLow（NOI minus debt service） |  |  |  | 3，991 | 133048 | ${ }^{133,29}$ | 4,068 | 130，188 | 138，03 | 4,202 | ${ }^{129,306}$ | 137，39 |
| Cmmercial ony Cash fow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}^{4,571}$ | ${ }_{\substack{133784 \\ 1382}}$ | 138，29 | ${ }_{\text {chem }}^{\text {c，690 }}$ | ${ }^{1332884}$ | ${ }_{13,093}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { ¢，789 } \\ \hline, 785}}$ |  | ${ }^{137,39}$ |
| USES Of CASH FLow ELLow（This row als shows Sccr．）， |  |  | oscr： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.34 |
| USES TAAT PRECEEE MOHCD DEBT SEEVYCE N WATEREALL |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  | minaces |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{3.500}$ | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | ${ }_{3}^{3787}$ | $\xrightarrow{21.456}$ | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { con }}}_{\text {25．122 }}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3890}$ | ${ }^{22003} 4$ | ${ }_{\text {259920 }}^{\text {2000 }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4.059}$ | ${ }_{\text {22866 }}^{4280}$ | $\underset{\substack{2.5001 \\ 5000}}{ }$ |
|  |  |  | peemorco poiver noamuai ictase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ener commens ee emuminereaseece |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEING MOHCD |  |  |  | 4.517 | $\underline{25,566}$ |  |  | ${ }^{26,333}$ | 30，991 |  | ${ }^{27,116}$ | 32，001 |
| RESIIUAL RECEEPTS（CASHH FLow minus Payments Preceom | G mohci |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(0)}$ |  | 107，01 |  |  | 105，998 |
| Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation？ Will Project Defer Developer Fee？ |  |  | Vear 15 sisear inderaed beome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Resctuar Recepos Solit Begic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Detere | Develope |  | se for data entry above．Do notitik）： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCD Resilual recelip debi service |  | Deent Loans | deiered Deveoper Feee Eanea |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCD Resisual Receiels Amoun Due |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment <br> Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground |  |  | （e） |  |  | 年108．16 |  |  | $\underline{\text { 107091 }}$ |  |  | 105988 <br> 10598 <br> 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 为 |  |  | Sornanom |  |  | － |  |  | ： |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REMAINDER（Should be zero unless there are distributions below） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner Distributionslicentive Management Fee |  |  | － |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{(1070091}^{(107091}$ |  |  |  |
| Replacement reserve runnng balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Starting Balance Replacement Reserve Deposits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement Reserve Withdrawals（ideally tied to CNA） Replacement Reserve Interest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR Running Ealance |  |  | Preamaunit |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {421，000 }}^{3}$ |  |  | 50，200 |
| OPERATING RESERVE．RUNNING BLLANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Starting Balance <br> Operating Reserve Deposits |  |  | － |  |  | ： |  |  | $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| Operating Reserve Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OR Running Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| other regured reserve 1－runnig balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Resene 1 Stating Balance |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  | － |  |  |  |
| Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Resenve 1 Interest ${ }_{\text {other Required }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER RESERVE 2 －RUNNING BALANCE <br> Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance <br> Other Reserve 2 Deposits |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | $\square:$ |  |  | $\div$ |


| Income | Total \# Units: 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Year }}{ }_{3}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{\text {Year } 5}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Year } \\ 5}}$ |  |  |
|  |  | linc | ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{\substack{\% \\ \text { incruase }}}$ |  | Losp | non-Losp | Total | Losp | non-LOSP | Total | Losp | non-Losp | Total |
| Ocher eresere 2 Windrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Total \# Units:Losp <br> Units <br> Non-LO <br> Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ <br> Total \# Units: 130 <br> INCOME | $\begin{array}{ll} 20 \\ 1500 \% \end{array}{ }^{110} 8$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 10$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 11 \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 12 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inc } \\ & \text { Losp } \end{aligned}$ | \% annual increase | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  |  | 1.146,501 | 1,146,501 |  | 1,175,164 | 1,175,164 |  | 1,204,543 | 1,204,543 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP) | n/a | 2.5\% |  | 252,072 | 1,428,408 | ${ }_{\text {1,680,480 }}$ | 258,374 | 1,464,118 | 1.722,492 | 264,833 | 1,500,721 | 1,76,554 |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 109,311 |  | 109,311 | 114,992 |  | 114,992 | 120,934 |  | 120,934 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  | 24,977 |  |  | 25,602 |  |  | 26,242 |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supporive Sevices Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 696 | 3,947 | 4.643 | 714 | 4.045 | 4.759 | 732 | 4.147 | 4.8 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 618 | 3.503 | 4.121 | 634 | 3.591 | 4,224 | 649 | 3.680 | 4.330 |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 1,293 | 7.325 | 8.617 | 1,325 | 7,508 | ${ }^{8.833}$ | 1.358 | 7.695 | 9,053 |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Link from Reserve Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 363,990 | 2,589,684 | 2,988,51 | 376,038 | 2,654,426 | 3,056,066 | 388,506 | 2,720,786 | 3,135,534 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | Enter formulas manualy per eleverant MOH |  | (57,325) | (57,325) |  | (58,758) | (58,758) |  | (60,227) | (60,227) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss - Commercia | n/a | n/a | - | (12,604) | (71,420) | $\frac{(84,024)}{(12,489)}$ | (12,919 | $(73,206)$ | $\frac{(86,125)}{(12,801)}$ | (13,242) | $(75,036)$ | $\frac{(88,278)}{(13,121)}$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | 351,386 | 2,460,938 | 2,824,813 | 363,120 | 2,522,462 | 2,898,382 | 375,264 | 2,585,523 | 2,973,908 |
| operating expenses Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to schedule. | 26,433 | 149,789 | 176,223 | 27,359 | 155,032 | 182,390 | 28,316 | 160,458 | 188,774 |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 2.074 | 11,754 | 13,228 | 2,147 | 12,165 | 14,312 | 2,222 | 12,591 | 14,813 |
| Salaries/Benefits Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{28,508}$ | 161,543 | 190,051 | 29,505 | 167,197 | 196,702 | ${ }^{30,538}$ | 173,049 | 203,587 |
| Office Salaries | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 70,901 | 401,773 | 472,675 | 73,383 | ${ }^{415,835}$ | 489,218 | 75,951 | 430,390 | 500,341 |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{23,881}$ | 135,325 | 159,205 | 24,717 | 140,061 | 164,778 | 25,582 | 144,963 | 170,545 |
| Other Salaries/Benefitis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Advertising and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 11,328 | 64,194 | 75,522 | 1,725 | 6.441 | 8,166 | 135 | 8,766 | 80,901 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5,969 | 33,827 | 39,797 | 6,178 | 35.011 | 41,189 | 6,395 | 36,236 | 42.631 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 3,676 | 20,828 | 24,504 | 3.804 | 21.557 | 25,361 | 3,937 | 22,311 | 26,249 |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 3,540 | 20.060 | 23,600 | 3,664 | 20,762 | 24,426 | 3,792 | 21,489 | 25,281 |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.412 | 13,670 | 16,082 | 2,497 | 14,148 | 16,645 | 2.584 | 14,643 | 17,228 |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4.647 | 26,333 | 30,980 | 4.810 | 27,255 | 32,064 | 4,978 | 28,209 | 33,187 |
| Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{31,573}$ | 178,912 | 210,485 | 32,678 | 185,174 | 217,851 | 33,821 | 191,655 | 225,476 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 11,174 | 63,322 | 74,496 | 11,565 | 6,538 | 77,103 | 11,970 | 67,832 | 79,802 |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 31.585 | 178,982 | 210,568 | 32,691 | 185,247 | 217,938 | 33,835 | 191,731 | 225,565 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 11,072 | 62,739 | 73,810 | 11,459 | 64,935 | 76,394 | 11,860 | 67,207 | 79,068 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 53,831 | 305,043 | 358,874 | ${ }_{55,715}$ | 315,719 | 371,435 | 57,665 | 326,770 | 384,435 |
| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,227 | 6,953 | ${ }_{8,180}$ | 1.270 | 7,196 | ${ }_{8,466}$ | 1,314 | 7.448 | 8.763 |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 7.074 | 40,089 | 47,163 | 7.322 | 41,492 | 48,814 | 7.578 | 42,944 | 50,522 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1.809 | 10,254 | 12.063 | 1.873 | 10,612 | 12,485 | 1.938 | 10,984 | 12,922 |
| Sub-total Taxes and License |  |  |  | 10,111 | 57,295 | 67,406 | 10,465 | 59,301 | 69,765 | 10,831 | 61,376 | 72,207 |




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

 | Hard Debt-Fourth Lender |
| :--- |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service | CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) Comercial Only Cash Flow

Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)

|  | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1230 | 71570 | 820 | 1230 | 71570 | 820 | 1230 | 570 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  | - | - | , | - | $\cdots$ | - |  |
|  | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 |
|  | 343,301 | 1,945,374 | 2,297,194 | 354,875 | 2,010,957 | 2,374,648 | 366,853 | 2,078,836 | 2,454,814 |


| Ener comments ere anual increase, etc. |  | 377,000 | 377,000 |  | 377,000 | 377,000 |  | 377,000 | 377,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enter comments e: anual incease, elc: | 3,300 | 18,700 | 22,000 | 3,300 | 18,700 | 22,000 | 3,300 | 18,700 | 22,000 |
| Ener comments e: annual incease, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ener comments eie: annual increas, etc. |  |  | . | . | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3,300 | 399,700 | 399,000 | 3,300 | 399,700 | 399,000 | 3,300 | 395,700 | 399,000 |
|  | 4,785 | 119,864 | 128,619 | 4,945 | 115,804 | 124,734 | 5,111 | 110,987 | 120,0 |
|  | 596 |  |  | 598 | 3,387 |  | 599 | 3,397 | 3,996 |
|  | 5,380 | 123,239 | 128,619 | 5,543 | 119,191 | 124,734 | 5,710 | 114,384 | 120,094 |


| "Below-the-line"Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partership Management Fee (see policy for linits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 4.630 | 26,239 | ${ }^{30,870}$ | 4,793 | 27,158 | 31,950 | 4.960 | 28,108 | 33.068 |
| Investor Serrice Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy no annual increase | 750 | 4,250 | 5,000 | 750 | 4,250 | 5.000 | 750 | 4,250 | 5.000 |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amorizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enter comments re: anual increase, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmit - Lender 2 |  |  | ter comments e: annual incease, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt < = Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total Pa |  |  |  | 5,380 | 489 | 870 | 5,543 | 31,408 | 36,950 | 5,710 | 32,358 | 38,068 |
|  | мон |  |  | ${ }^{(0)}$ | 92,750 | 92,750 | ${ }^{(0)}$ | 87,784 | 87,784 |  | 82,026 |  |

Yes Year 15 is year indicated below:
Yes
Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
1st Residual Receipts Spit - LenderlDeferred Developer Fee
$50 \% / 50 \% /$
$67 \% / 33 \%$
MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

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

NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

| Lender 4 Residual Receipts DDe |
| :--- |
| Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |



Fee At ( (fse for data entry above. Do not link.):
Dist. Soft tive Deferred Developer Fee Earned

| Dist. Soft hive Deferred Developer Fee Earned |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100.00\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 92,750 | 87884 |
|  |  | ${ }_{92,750}$ | $\frac{8,7,784}{}$ |
|  | Proposed Total MOHCD Amt Due less Loan Repaymen |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 0.00\% | No HCD Financing | $\cdots$ | - |
| 0.00\% |  |  |  |

## REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions

| below) |
| :--- |
| Owner Distributions/l/ccentive Management Fee |
| Otter Distributions/lses |




| Total \# Units: | Losp | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-LOSPP } \\ \text { Units } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 130 | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & { }_{15.00 \%} \end{aligned}$ | 110 <br> 85.00\% |  |  | $\text { Year } 13$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\text { Year } 15$ |  |
| income | inc <br> Losp | \% annual increase | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP | Total | LOSP | non-LOSP |  |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |  |  | 1,234,656 | 1,234,656 |  | 1,265,523 | 1,265,523 |  | 1,297,161 | 1,297,161 |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LoSP) | n/a | 2.5\% |  | 271,454 | 1,538,239 | 1,809,693 | 278,240 | 1,576,695 | 1,854,935 | 285,196 | 1,616,113 | 1,901,309 |
| Residential - LOSP Tenant Assistance Payments | n/a | n/a |  | 127,145 |  | 127,145 | 133,639 |  | 133,639 | 140,425 |  | 140,425 |
| Commercial Space | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  | 26,988 |  |  | 27,570 |  |  | 28,259 |
| Residential Parking | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Rent Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supporive Senices Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income - Project Operations | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laundry and Vending | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 750 | 4,250 | 5,000 | 769 | 4,357 | 5,125 | 788 | 4,465 | 5,253 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 666 | 3,772 | 4.438 | 682 | 3,867 | 4.549 | 699 | 3.963 | 4.663 |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  | 1,392 | 7,888 | 9,280 | ${ }_{1,427}$ | 8.085 | 9.512 | 1.462 | 8,287 | 9,750 |
| Other Commercial Income | n/a | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) | n/a | n/a | Link from R applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Potential Income |  |  |  | 401,407 | 2,788,806 | 3,217,111 | 414,757 | 2,85,5,56 | 3,300,853 | 428,571 | 2,929,989 | 3,386,820 |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents | n/a | n/a | , |  | (61,733) | (61,733) |  | (63,276) | (63,276) |  | (64,858) | (64,858) |
|  | n/a | n/a | - paicy anual incementing usully not | (13,573) | (76,92) | ${ }_{(900485)}^{(13.449)}$ | (13,91) | (78,835) | $\frac{(922777)}{(13,785)}$ | (14,260) | (80,806) | ${ }_{(054,065)}^{(14,230)}$ |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  |  | ${ }^{387,834}$ | 2,650,161 | 3,051,444 | 400 | 2.716 | ,045 | ${ }^{414,311}$ | 2,844326 | 2767 |


| Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 1st Year to be set according to HUD | 29,307 | 166,074 | 195,381 | 30,333 | 171,887 | 202,220 | 31,395 | 177,903 | 209,297 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management Fee | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 2,300 | 13,032 | 15,331 | 2,380 | 13,488 | 15.868 | 2.463 | 13,960 | 16,423 |
| Salaries/Benefits 3 Sub-total Management Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 461,044 | 542,05 | 84,208 | 47,181 | 561,309 |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefitis | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 26,477 | 150,037 | 176,514 | 27,404 | 155,288 | 182,692 | 28,363 | 160,723 | 189,086 |
| Other Salaries/Benefits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Salaries/Benefits |  |  |  | 105,087 | 595,490 | 700,577 | 108,765 | 616,332 | 725,097 | 112,571 | 637,904 | 750,475 |


| Advertising and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 12,560 | 71,173 | 83,733 | 13,000 | 73,664 | 86,663 | 13,455 | 76,242 | 89,697 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 6,618 | 37,505 | 44,123 | 6,850 | 38,817 | 45,668 | 7,090 | 40,176 | 47,266 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4.075 | 23,092 | 27,168 | 4.218 | 23,901 | 28,118 | 4,365 | 24,737 | 29,103 |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 3,925 | 22,241 | 26,166 | 4.062 | 23,019 | 27,081 | 4,204 | 23,825 | 28,029 |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.675 | 15,156 | 17,831 | 2,768 | 15.686 | 18,455 | 2.865 | 16,236 | 19,101 |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5,152 | 29,196 | 34,348 | 5,333 | 30,218 | 35,550 | 5.519 | 31,275 | 36,795 |
| Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | 35,005 | 198,363 | 233,368 | 36,230 | 205,305 | ${ }^{241,536}$ | 37,498 | 212,491 | 249,990 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  | 82,595 | 12,823 | 72,663 | 85,486 | 13,272 | 75,206 | 88,478 |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 35,019 | 198,441 | 233,460 | 36,245 | 205,387 | 241,631 | 37,513 | 212,575 | 250,088 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 12,275 | 6,560 | 81,835 | 12,705 | 71,994 | 84,699 | 13,150 | 74,514 | 87,664 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 59,684 | 338,207 | 397,890 | 61,772 | 350,044 | 411,816 | 63,934 | 362,295 | 426,230 |
| Taxes and Licenses | 350 | 35\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | ${ }^{3.50}$ |  | ${ }_{1}^{1,360}$ | ${ }^{71,047}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 52,069 } \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ | ${ }_{8}^{1,418}$ | ${ }_{4}^{76,003}$ | ${ }_{54,3121}$ | ${ }_{8.402}^{1,47}$ | ${ }_{472613}^{8,268}$ | 56,755 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2,006 | 11,368 | 13,374 | 2,076 | ${ }^{41,766}$ | 13,883 | $\stackrel{8,149}{2,149}$ | 12,178 | 14,327 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 11,210 | 6,524 | 74,734 | 11,603 | ${ }_{6,748}$ | 77,350 | 12,009 | 68,049 | 80,0 |


| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 13,537 | 76,711 | 90,249 | 14,011 | 79,396 | 93,407 | 14,501 | 82,175 | 96,677 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 11.272 | 63.874 | 75.145 | 11,666 | 66,109 | 77,776 | 12,075 | 68,423 | 80,498 |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| surance |  |  |  | 24,809 | 140,585 | 165,394 | 25,677 | 145,505 | 171,183 | 26,576 | 150,598 | 177,174 |
| Maintenance \& Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 43,445 | 246,189 | 289,634 | 44.966 | 254,806 | 299,771 | ${ }^{46,539}$ | 263,724 | 310,26 |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 17,068 | 96,716 | 113,783 | 17,665 | 100,101 | 117,766 | 18,283 | 103,605 | 121,888 |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 15,101 | 85.572 | 100,673 | 15,630 | 88,567 | 104,197 | 16,177 | ${ }^{91,667}$ | 107,844 |
| Security Payrolll Contract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 18,053 | 102,301 | 120,354 | 18,685 | 105,881 | 124,566 | 19,339 | 109,587 | 128,926 |


| Supportive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5,553 | 31,468 | 37,021 | 5,748 | 32,569 | 38,317 | 5,949 | 33,709 | 39,6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  |  |  | 9,444 |  |  | 9,775 |  |  | 10,117 |
| total operating expenses <br> PUPA (w/o Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond Fees) |  |  |  | 366,621 | 2,077,520 | 2,453,586 | 379,43 | 2,150,233 | 2,539,461 | 392,734 | 2,225,492 | 2,688,342 |


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

 | Hard Debt- - 0 ourth Lender |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service |
|  | CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)

## Commercial Only Cass Flow Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) AVAA ABL CASH FLOW

 USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.)|  | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12630 | 71570 | 84200 | 12.630 | 71570 | 84200 | 12630 | 71570 | 84200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | . |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |
|  | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 |
|  | 379,251 | 2,14,990 | 2,537,786 | 392,083 | 2,221,803 | 2,623,661 | 405,364 | 2,297,062 | 2,712,542 |



| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) |  | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for linits) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 5.134 | 29,92 | 34,226 | 5.314 | 30,110 | 35,424 | 5,500 | 6 | 36,663 |
| Investor Serrice Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  |  | per MOHCD policy n a annual increase | 750 | 4,250 | 5,000 | 750 | 4,250 | 5,000 | 750 | 4,250 |  |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  |  | Enter comments se: anuua increase, etc. |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmmt - Lender 2 |  |  | Enter comments se: anuua increase, etc. | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt < = Max Fee from row 131) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  |  | 5,884 | 33,342 | 39,226 | 6,064 | 34,360 | 40,424 | 6,250 | 35,414 | 41,663 |
| SIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOw minus Payments | мон |  |  |  | 75,433 | 75,433 |  | 67,961 | 67,961 |  | 59,561 |  |

Does Project have a MOMCD Residual Receipt Obbligation?
Will Project Defere Developer Fee?
1st Residual Receitst Spplit - Lender/Deferred Developer Fee
2nd Residual Receipts Split - Lender/Owner
MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

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

NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due
Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due
Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due


REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions

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

Other Distributions/USes
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANC
Replacement Reserve Starting Balance
Replacement Reserve Deposits
Replacement Reserve We Withrasawals (ideally tied to CNA)
Replacement Reserve Interest

operating reserve - running balance

| OPERATING RESERVE-RUNNING |
| :--- |
| Operating Reserve Statiting Balance |
| Operating Resevve Deposits |
| Operaitig Reserve Withdrawals |
| Operating Reserve Interest |

OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE

| Other Reserve 1 Starting Balan |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Deposits |


| Other Resesve 1 Withtrawawals |
| :--- |
| Other Reserve 1 Interest |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance |

OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE
Other Reserve 2 Statring Balance




| Adverisising and Marketing | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 13,925 | 78,911 | ${ }^{92,836}$ | ,413 | 11.673 | 96,085 | 14,917 | 84,531 | 99,448 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 7,338 | 41,582 | 48,920 | 7.595 | 43.038 | 50.632 | 7.861 | 44,544 | 52,405 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4.518 | 25,603 | 30,121 | 4.676 | 26,499 | 31,175 | 4.840 | 27,427 | 32,26 |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 4,352 | 24,659 | 29,010 | 4,504 | 25.522 | 30,026 | 4,661 | 26,415 | 31.07 |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.965 | 16,804 | 19,769 | 3,069 | 17,322 | 20.461 | 3,177 | 18,001 | 21,17 |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5,712 | 32,370 | 38,082 | 5,912 | 33,503 | 39,415 | 6.119 | 34,676 | 40,795 |
| Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  |  | ${ }^{38,811}$ | 219,928 | 258,739 | 40,169 | ${ }^{227,626}$ | 267,795 | ${ }^{41,575}$ | ${ }^{235,593}$ | 277,16 |
| Electricity | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 13,736 | 77,838 | 91,575 | 14,217 | 80,563 | 94,780 | 14.715 | 83,382 | 98,097 |
| Water | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 38,826 | 220,015 | 258,841 | 40,185 | ${ }^{227,716}$ | 267,901 | ${ }^{41,592}$ | ${ }^{235,686}$ | 277,277 |
| Gas | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 13,610 | 77,122 | 90,732 | 14,086 | 79,821 | 93,907 | 14,579 | 82,615 | 97,19 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  |  | 66,172 | 374,976 | 441,148 | ${ }^{68,488}$ | 38,100 | 456,588 | 70,885 | 401,683 | 472,569 |
| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 1,508 | 8.547 | 10,055 | ${ }_{1.561}$ | ${ }_{8,846}$ | 10,407 | 1.616 | 9,156 | 10,772 |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 8.696 | 49,279 | 57,975 | 9,001 | 51,004 | 60,005 | 9,316 | 52,789 | 62,105 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.224 | 12,604 | 14.829 | 2302 | 13.045 | 15.348 | 2,383 | 13.502 | 15,8, |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  | 12,429 | 70,430 | 82,859 | 12,864 | 72,896 | 85,759 | 13,314 | 75,447 | 88,761 |


| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 15,009 | 85,051 | 100,060 | 15.534 | 88,028 | 103,562 | 16,078 | 109 | 107,187 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 12,497 | 70,818 | 83,315 | 12,935 | 73,296 | 86,231 | 13,387 | 75.862 | 89,249 |
| Director's \& officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payroll | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 48.168 | 272,954 | 321,122 | 49,854 | 282,508 | 332, 362 | ${ }^{51,599}$ | 292,395 | 343,994 |
| Supplies | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracts | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 18,923 | 107,231 | 126,154 | 19.585 | 110,984 | 130.569 | 20,271 | 114,868 | 135,139 |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 16,743 | 94,876 | 111.618 | 17,329 | 98,196 | 115,525 | 17,935 | 101,633 | 119,568 |
| Security Payrollc ontract | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 20.016 | 113,422 | 13, 238 | 20,716 | 117,392 | 138,109 | 21,441 | 121,501 | 142,942 |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expe |  |  |  | 103,850 | 588,483 | 692,333 | 107,485 | 609,080 | 716,565 | 1,247 | 630,398 | 1,644 |


| Supportive Services | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 6,157 | 34,889 | 41,046 | 6,372 | ${ }^{36,110}$ | 42,483 | 6,595 | 37,374 | 43,970 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  |  |  | 10,471 |  |  | 10,837 |  |  | 11,217 |
| total operating expenses |  |  |  | 406,479 | 2,303,384 | 2,720,334 | 420,706 | 2,384,002 | 2,815,546 | 435,431 | 2,467,442 | 2,914,090 |



Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fe PUPA (w/ Reserves/GL Base RentBond Fees)
NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES) DEBT SERVICEMUUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized Ioans)

 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Hard Debt- Fourth Lender } \\ \text { Commercial Hard Debt Service } \\ \end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE)

## Commercial Only Cash Flow Allocation of Commercial Surplus to LOPS/non-LOSP (residual income) AVAl ABL CASH FLOW

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

|  |  | . |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | 12,630 | 71,570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | 71.570 | 84,200 | 12,630 | ${ }^{71,570}$ |  |
|  | 419,109 | 2,374,954 | 2,804,534 | 433,336 | 2,455,572 | 2,899,746 | 448,061 | 2,539,012 | 2,998,290 |
|  | 2,698 | 478,980 | 485,690 | 2,699 | 469,710 | 476,416 | 2,700 | 459,402 | 466,101 |




Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
1st Residual Receipts Spitit- Lender/Deferred Developer Fee

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

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

NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

| Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due |
| :--- |
| Lender 5 Residual Receits |



Fee Amt (Use for data entry above. Do not link.
Dist. Soft tivie Deferred Developer Fee Eain

## REMAINDER (Should be zero

\section*{| below) |
| :--- |
| Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee |}

Other Distributions/Uses
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE
REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANC
Replacement Resevive tataning Ealance
Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to $C N A$ )
operating reserve - Running balance


| Dist. Soft tive Deferred Developer Fee Earned |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 100.00\% |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Proposed Total MOHCD Amt Due less Loan |
|  |  |
| 0.00\% | No HCD Financing |
| 0.00\% |  |
| 0.00\% |  |


|  | $\square$ <br> $(86,690$ <br> $(90)$ | $\quad-\quad$ <br> $(77,416)$ | $\underset{\text { ¢ }}{\square} \boldsymbol{6 7 , 1 0 1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,263,000 | 1,347,200 | 1,431,400 |
|  | 84,200 | 84,200 | 84,200 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,347,200 | 1,431,400 | 1,515,600 |
| RR Balance/Unit | \$10,363 | \$11,011 | \$11,658 |
| 喪 | . | - | $\square$ |
| - | - | - |  |
| $\square$ | - | $\square$ | - |
| OR Balance as a\% of Prior $Y$ r Op Exps + Debt Service | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | $0.0 \%$ |
|  | . | . |  |
|  | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\square$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Year } 16 \\ 15}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Year } 17 \\ 16}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{17}^{\text {Year } 18}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - inc | \% annual increase | (reated to amuman inc assumptios) | Losp | non-LOSP | Total | Losp | non-LOSP | Total | SP | non-LOSP | Total |
| Other Reserve 2 Withdrawals Other Reserve 2 Intere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




# Attachment D: Ambassador-Ritz syndication -- 20-year proforma 


Total \# Units:


| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% |  | 10,263 | 10,622 | 10,994 | 11,379 | 11,777 | 12,189 | 12,616 | 13,057 | 13,514 | 13,987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% |  | 83,218 | 86,131 | 89,145 | 92,265 | 95,495 | ${ }^{98,837}$ | 102,296 | 105,877 | 109,582 | 113,418 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% |  | 1.800 | 1.863 | 1,928 | 1,996 | 2,066 | 2,138 | 2,213 | 2,290 | 2,370 | 2.453 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 59.9 |  | 64,19 | 60,42 | 60,50 | 7,15 | 7,64 | 7,22 | 7,003 | 81,654 |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Fidelity Bond Insurance |  |  |  | , | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% |  | 37,180 | 38.481 | 39,828 | 41,222 | 42,665 | 44,158 | 45,704 | 47,303 | 48,959 | 50,673 |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Supportive Services | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  | 3,933 | 4.071 | 4,213 | 4,361 | 4.513 | 4.671 | 4.835 | 5,004 | 179 |
| operating Ex |  |  | 2,170,610 | 2,246,5 | 2,325, | 2,406, | 2,490,825 | 2,578,0 | 2,668,234 | 2,761,62 | 2,858,27 | 2,958,3 |




| USES Of CASH FLow below (This row also shows DSCR.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFAL |  |  |  | Hidde | nns are in be | entoala col | To update | values | w cells, man | te each ce |  |  |
| "Below-the-ine" Asset Mgt fee (uncommmon in new projects, see policy) |  | per MOHCD poicy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits) | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy | 22,650 | 23,43 | 24,263 | 25.112 | 25,991 | 26,901 | 27.843 | 28.817 | ${ }^{29,826}$ | 30,870 |
| Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits) |  | per MOHCD policy n . | 5,000 | 5.000 | 5.000 | 5.000 | 5.000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5.000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Other Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amoriziing Loan Pmnt - Lender 1 |  | ter comments e: anual increase, el |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-amortizing Loan Pmnt - Lender 2 |  | Enter comments se: annual increase, el |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt <= Max Fee from row 131) |  |  | 99,611 | 97,988 | 95,151 | 92,558 | ${ }^{89,705}$ | 86,581 | B3,171 | 79,460 | 75,434 | 71.076 |
| TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD |  |  | 127,261 | 125,941 | 124,414 | 122,670 | 120,696 | 118,482 | 116,014 | 113,277 | 110,260 | 106,94 |
| RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH flow minus Payments Precedin | NG монсD) |  | 4,093 | 99,116 | 33,678 | 3,747 | 141,290 | 144,271 | 146,553 | 148,399 | 149,4 | 149,817 |
| Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation? | Yes | Year 15 is year indicated below: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Will Project Defer Developer Fee? | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 st Residual Receipts Split - Lender/Deferred Developer Fee | 50\%/50\% | 2nd Residual Receipits Split Regins: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd Residual Receipts Spit - Lender/Owner | 67\%/33\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Defe | Fee Amt | efor data entry above. Do not ink.): | 111,852 | 113,307 | 114,414 | 115,152 | 115,498 | 115,426 | 114,912 | 113,930 |  | 110,446 |
| MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE | Dist. Soft | gtive Deferred Developer Fee Earned | 99,61 | 197,109 | 292,260 | 384,818 | 474,523 | 561,104 | 644,275 | 723,73 | 799,1 |  |
| MOhCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE | Debt Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MOHCD Residual Receipits Amount Due | 100.00\% | Allocaton per pro rata share ofal sot debt | 124,093 | 129116 | 133678 | 137747 | 141290 | 144271 | 146.653 | 14839 |  |  |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment |  |  | 124,093 | 129,116 | 133.678 | 137,747 | 141,290 | 144,271 | 146,653 | 148.399 | 149,467 | 149,817 |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground |  | Proposed Total MOHCD Amt Due less Loan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease |  | Repayment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due | 0.00\% | No HCD Financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RIMADR(Sh)

below)
Other Distributions/Uses
Final Balance (should be zero)

| REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANCE |
| :--- |
| Replacement Reserve Stating Balance <br> Replacement Reserve Deposits <br> Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) <br> Replacement Reserve Interest <br> RR Running Balance |


\section*{OPERATING RESERVE-RUNNING BALANC <br> | Operating Resesve Starting Bulance |
| :--- |
| Operating Reserve Deposits | <br> Operating Resesve Wepithitrawals <br> Operating Reserve Interest}

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

|  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | - | 129,116 | 133,678 | 1377,747 | 141,200 | 144,271 | 146,653 | 148,399 | 149,467 | 149,817 |
|  | - | $(129,116)$ | $(133,678)$ | $(137,747)$ | $(141,290)$ | $(144,271)$ | $(146,653)$ | $(148,399)$ | $(149,467)$ | $(149,817)$ |






| Adverising and Marketing | 3.5\% |  | 3,714 | 3,844 | 3,979 | 4.118 | 4,262 | 4,411 | 4.566 | 4.725 | 4.891 | 5.062 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Expenses | 3.5\% |  | 123,511 | 127,833 | 132,308 | 136,938 | 141,731 | 146,692 | 151,826 | 157,140 | 162,640 | 168,332 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% |  | 53,405 | 55,274 | 57,209 | 59,211 | 61,284 | 63.429 | 65.649 | 67,946 | 70,325 | 72,786 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% |  | ${ }_{65,957}$ | 68,265 | 70,655 | ${ }^{73,127}$ | 75,687 | 78,336 | 81,078 | 83,915 | 86,852 | 89,892 |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% |  | 8.464 | 8.760 | ${ }^{9,066}$ | 9,384 | 9,712 | 10,052 | 10,404 | 10,768 | 11,145 | ${ }_{11,535}$ |
| Miscellaneous | 3.5\% |  | 11.544 | 11,948 | 12,367 | 12,799 | 13,247 | 13,711 | 14,191 | 14,688 | 15,202 | 15,734 |
| Sub-total Administration Expenses |  |  | 266,595 | 275,926 | 285,583 | 299,578 | 305,924 | 316,631 | 327,713 | 339,183 | 351,054 | 363,341 |
| Electricity | 3.5\% |  | 109.563 | 113,397 | ${ }^{117,366}$ | 121.474 | ${ }^{125,726}$ | 130,126 | 134,680 | 139,394 | 144,273 | ${ }^{149,323}$ |
| Water | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 171,412 | 177,411 | 183,621 | 1910,047 | 196,699 | 203,583 | $\stackrel{1340,009}{ }$ | $\frac{1318,084}{}$ | ${ }^{2425,717}$ | ${ }^{233,617}$ |
| Gas | 3.5\% |  | 57,445 | 59,456 | ${ }^{61,537}$ | 63.691 | 65.920 | 68.227 | 70,615 | 73,086 | 75,644 | 78,292 |
| Sewer | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  | 338,420 | 350,264 | 362,524 | 375,212 | 388,344 | 401,936 | 416,004 | 430,564 | 445,634 | 461,231 |


| Real Estate Taxes | 3.5\% |  | 14,477 | 14,984 | 15,508 | 16,051 | 16,613 | 17,194 | 17,796 | 18,419 | 19,063 | 19,731 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payroll Taxes | 3.5\% |  | 117,387 | 121.496 | 125,748 | 130,149 | 134,705 | 139,419 | 144,299 | 149,349 | 154,577 | 159,987 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% |  | 2,539 | 2,628 | 2.720 | 2,815 | 2,914 | 3,016 | 3.121 | 3.230 | 3,343 | 3,461 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  | 134,403 | 139,107 | 143,976 | 149,015 | 154,231 | 159,629 | 165,216 | 170,998 | 176,983 | 83,178 |
| Property and Liability Insurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.55\% |  | 84,512 | 87,470 | 90,531 | 93,00 | 96,979 | 100,373 | 103,887 | 107,523 | 111,286 | 115,181 |


| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% |  | 84,512 | 87,470 | 90,531 | 93,700 | 96,979 | 100,373 | 103,887 | 107,523 | 111,286 | 115,18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% |  | 52,446 | 54,282 | 56,182 | 8,148 | 60,183 | 2,289 | 4,470 | 66,726 | 69,061 | 71,4 |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Payroll | 3.5\% |  | 400,737 | 414,763 | 429,279 | 444,304 | 459,855 | 475,950 | 492,608 | 509.849 | 527,694 | 546 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supplies | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracts | 3.5\% |  | 132,819 | 137,468 | 142,279 | 147,259 | 152.413 | 157.747 | 163.269 | 168.983 | 174,897 | 181,019 |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% |  | ${ }^{81,286}$ | 84,131 | 87,075 | ${ }_{90,123}$ | 93,277 | 96,542 | 99,921 | 103,418 | 107,038 | 110,78 |
| Security Payroll Contract | 3.5\% |  | 20,843 | 21.573 | 22,328 | 23,109 | 23,918 | 24,755 | 25,621 | 26,518 | 27,446 | 28. |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% |  | 29,821 | 30,865 | 31,946 | 33,064 | 34,221 | 35.419 | 36,658 | 37,941 | 39,269 | 40,64 |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses | 3.5\% |  | 547 | 9.561 | 546 | 803 | 66,03 | 348 | 0,740 | 216 | 778 | 78,4 |


TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES
PUPA (W/O Reserves/GL Base RentBond Fees

| rves/Ground Lease |
| :---: |
| Ground Lease Base Rent |
| Bond Monitoring Fee |
| Replacement Reserve Deposit |
| Operating Reserve Deposit |
| Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit |
| Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit |
| Required Reserve Deposits, Commercial |


|  | iple cels. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | . |  |  |  |  | . | . | . |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 |
|  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 |
|  | 3,154,860 | 3,262,025 | 3,372,941 | 3,487,739 | 3,60,655 | 3,729,529 | 3,85,807 | 3,988,541 | 4,124,885 | 4,266,001 |
|  | 924,723 | 919,548 | ${ }^{933,171}$ | 905,526 | 896,542 | 886,145 | 874,258 | 860,801 | 845,691 | 828,840 |
| iple eels. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enter comments re: annual increase, etc. | - ${ }^{\text {prone,000 }}$ | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 |
| Enter comments se: annual increase, etc. | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Ener comments e: anuual incerase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,00 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 | 672,000 |
|  | 252,723 | 247,548 | 241,171 | 233,526 | 224,542 | 214,145 | 202,258 | 188,801 | 173,691 | 156,840 |
| DSCR | 1.38 | 1.37 | 1.36 | 1.35 | 1.33 | 1.32 | 1.3 | 1.28 | 1.26 | 1.23 |



Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation?
Will Proiect Defer Developer Fee?
Will Project Defer Developer Fee?
1st Residual Receipts Spit - LenderlDeferred Developer Fee


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

| Proposed $M$ MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground |

NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEEPTS DEBT SERVICE
HCD ReSdiual Receipts Amount Due

| HCD Residual Recepipis Amount |
| :--- |
| Lender 4 Residaal Receits |
| Lender 5 Residual |


REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions
below)
Other Distributions/Uses
Final Balance (should be zero)
REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUNNING BALANCE

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

RR Running Balance

OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE


|  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 149,402 | 148,177 | 146,095 | 143,104 | 139,153 | 171,198 | 157,983 | 143,152 | 126,69 | 108,295 |
|  | $(149,402)$ | $(148,177)$ | $(146,095)$ | $(143,104)$ | $(139,153)$ | $(177,198)$ | $(157,983)$ | $(143,152)$ | $(126,619)$ | $(108,295)$ |


|  | 930,000 | 1,023,000 | 111,000 | 1,209,000 | 1,302,000 | 1,395,000 | ,488,000 | 1581,000 | 1,674,000 | 1767,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 93,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR Balar | $\begin{aligned} & 1,023,000 \\ & \substack{55,500} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,116,0001 \\ & \$ 66,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,209,000 \\ \hline 6500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,302,000 \\ & \substack{17,000} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,395,000 \\ & 57,500 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,488,000 \\ \$ 8000 \end{array}$ | $1,581,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,674,000 \\ & \hline 990000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,767,000, \\ & \substack{99,500} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,860,000 \\ & \text { sino.000 } \end{aligned}$ |

 |  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\cdot$ | - |  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Attachment E: Syndication/Receiver Properties Sources and Uses
Yosemite-Folsom Dore

| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms (new term | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD - GAP - CASH OUT | \$7,000,000 | 5-year prom note | This Request |
| 4\% Tax Credit Equity | \$22,319,551 |  | Project is being run as scattered site 4\% |
| Historic Tax Credit Equity | \$4,139,129 |  |  |
| HCD Loan - Folsom Dore MHP | \$6,868,656 | 55 yrs @ AFR | To be restructured via HCD LPR process |
| CCSF - Folsom-Dore HOME Loan | \$8,435,636 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing to be restructured at syndication closing |
| CCSF - Yosemite CDBG CHRP | \$479,501 | Matured -- 55 yrs | Existing to be restructured at syndication closing |
| CCSF - Yosemite CDBG | \$85,937 | Matured -- 55 yrs | Existing to be restructured at syndication closing |
| CCSF - Yosemite CDBG/ARRA | \$291,112 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing to be restructured at syndication closing |
| CCSF - O'Farrell Towers Proceeds | \$1,800,000 | 55 yrs @ 3\% | Committed to project at 2019 MOHCD Loan |
| General Partner Equity | \$3,500,000 |  | Not Committed |
| Seller Carryback Loan* | \$16,289,158 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Not Committed |
| Project Reserves | \$982,499 |  | Committed |
| Permanent commercial loan | \$5,052,260 |  |  |
| Total | \$77,243,439 |  |  |
| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| Acquisition | \$33,223,750 | \$255,567 | \$343 |
| Hard Costs | \$22,918,073 | \$176,293 | \$237 |
| Soft Costs | \$14,484,117 | \$111,416 | \$150 |
| Reserves | \$617,499 | \$4,750 | \$6 |
| Developer Fee | \$6,000,000 | \$46,154 | \$62 |
| Total | \$77,243,439 | \$594,180 | \$798 |
| *Includes deferred interest |  |  |  |

Ambassador-Ritz

| Permanent Sources | Amount | Terms (new) | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD - GAP - CASH OUT | \$3,439,827 | 5-year prom note (Se | This Request |
| CCSF - Ambassador Loan/1996 GO Bond | \$2,948,887 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing; Restructure |
| HCD - Ritz CHRP-R | \$4,828,735 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing; Restructure via HCD LPR |
| CCSF - Ritz CDBG/CHRP | \$9,532,958 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing; Restructure via MOHCD Loan Committee |
| CCSF - Ritz HOME | \$1,179,510 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing; Restructure |
| CCSF - Ritz CDBG Acquisition | \$1,487,577 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing; Restructure, write down accrued interest |
| CCSF - Ritz CDBG/UDAG | \$9,771,950 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing; Restructure, write down accrued interest |
| TNDC Loan (Existing to be recast) | \$294,359 | 55 yrs @ AFR |  |
| MOHCD - Accrued \& Deferred Interest on Existing MOHCD Loans | \$0 | 55 yrs @ AFR |  |
| O'Farrell Tower syndication proceeds | \$442,706 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Existing |
| Alexander Residence Outside Reserve | \$981,808 |  | Existing |
| Tax Credit Equity 4\% | \$31,004,618 | \$1.00 per Credit | Not Committed |
| Historic Tax Credit Equity | \$7,042,276 | \$.85 per Credit |  |
| Cash to Seller from 9\% tax credit equity | \$2,226,566 | 55 yrs @ AFR | Not Committed |
| Sponsor 50\% Test Loan | \$0 |  | Not Committed |
| Project Reserves | \$835,804 |  | Committed |
| Retained Surplus Cash HCD (Ritz) | \$4,428,075 |  | Partially committed; request annually to HCD via AMR |
| GP contribution/Deferred Developer Fee | \$4,462,500 |  |  |
| Federal Home Loan Bank - AHP | \$1,250,000 |  | Ambassador |
| Permanent commercial Ioan | \$10,000,000 | 15 Year Term | Committed |
| Total | \$96,158,156 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| Acquisition | \$30,841,633 | \$164,929 | \$613 |
| Hard Costs | \$41,100,938 | \$219,791 | \$817 |
| Soft Costs | \$15,927,395 | \$85,173 | \$317 |
| Reserves | \$725,690 | \$3,881 | \$14 |
| Developer Fee | \$7,562,500 | \$40,441 | \$150 |
| Total | \$96,158,156 | \$514,215 | \$1,911 |
| *Includes deferred interest |  |  |  |

Attachment F. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments



## Attachment G: Sponsor Qualifications and Assignments

TNDC has 35 years of experience developing both family and supportive housing in San Francisco. TNDC has 42 projects in its portfolio, with an additional 17 projects in the pipeline including recapitalization. The average units per project ranges from 75 to 120 .

## Staffing structure

Todd LeFurge (Director of Asset Management), Thomas Lauderbach (Associate Director of Housing Development), and Chris Cummings (Associate Director of Housing Development) are leading the Reinvestment Project, devoting a combined $10 \%$ of their time to it. Five project/asset managers have been assigned at a combined $35 \%$ of their time (see Attachment G: Project Team Qualifications and Assignments).

All assigned TNDC staff have been intimately familiar with these properties for at least the last eighteen months and have been actively engaged with MOHCD staff in developing the Reinvestment Project plan. All TNDC staff have been integrally involved in multiple acquisitions rehabs financed through tax credits and City gap financing.

TNDC is also utilizing two third-party consultant construction managers. Each has 35 years of experience and has worked on multiple TNDC rehab projects.

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

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

## Staff qualifications

## Todd LeFurge

Director of Asset Management
Recapitalization Projects: Oversight of Recapitalization Plan/Staff (Resource Properties)

Todd LeFurge joined TNDC in March 2001. Todd has been directly involved in helping to shape TNDC's portfolio and position TNDC's projects well for recapitalization and long-term financial health. Since joining TNDC, Todd has developed asset management plans, structured and executed Year 15 tax credit partner exits, structured refinancings, and contributed tremendously to strategic planning around portfolio recapitalization.

Todd is leading the effort on the resource components of the Recapitalization Plan and contributing to the financing structures of the receiver properties. Todd supervises the two Asset Management department staff members, Svetlana Karasyova and Rachel Macaraeg. Svetlana and Rachel are each leading the refinancings of Folsom-Dore and Turk \& Eddy, respectively.

## Thomas Lauderbach

## Associate Director of Housing Development

Recapitalization Projects: Oversight of Recapitalization Plan/Staff (Receiver Properties)
Tom Lauderbach joined TNDC in March 2014 as a Senior Project Manager and was subsequently promoted to Associate Director of Housing Development. At TNDC, Tom helped structure and plan for TNDC's RAD portfolio of projects and he directly managed several of the projects, including 430 Turk Street.
Tom currently provides oversight and management across TNDC's Housing
Development department for both new construction and rehabilitation projects, and does not directly manage any development projects. Tom directly supervises six employees in the department.

## Chris Cummings

Associate Director of Housing Development
Recapitalization Projects: Oversight of Recapitalization Plan/Staff (Resource/Receiver Properties)

Chris Cummings joined TNDC in October of 2013 as a Project Manager. During his time as a Project Manager, Chris managed TNDC's 1036 Mission new construction project from entitlements through perm conversion, as well as the 939 \& 951 Eddy RAD project through design, construction, and perm conversion, and the Candlestick 10A project through entitlements and design. Chris also helped to develop TNDC's Portfolio Recapitalization Plan in 2018 and as Associated Director of Housing Development he provides oversight of implementation of the projects within the Housing Development department as well as new acquisition opportunities.
Chris currently supervises three employees within the department, and is closing out the 1036 Mission project as well.

## Gabriel Speyer

Senior Project Manager
Recapitalization Projects: Plaza \& Ramona Apartments (Phase II project)

Gabe Speyer joined TNDC in 2016 after having worked in Community Development finance with Bank of America. Since joining TNDC, Gabe has served as Project Manager for TNDC's 430 Turk and 350 Ellis RAD projects both of which he carried through construction to perm conversion. Gabe has also worked on predevelopment of TNDC's 681 Florida project (due to close in 2020), and Parcel U which is currently in the design and financing stages.
Gabe will provide project management of the Plaza \& Ramona resyndication project in addition to completing design and assembling financing for Parcel $U$ and completing a rehab of 270 Turk Street, a recent TNDC acquisition. Gabe also supervises two department staff members.

## Emily Van Loon

Project Manager
Recapitalization Projects: Ambassador Hotel \& Yosemite (Phase I projects)
Emily Van Loon joined TNDC in 2016 and immediately took over project management of TNDC's Rosa Parks RAD project that was just commencing construction. She led the project through construction completion to perm conversion. Emily also assisted with TNDC's O'Farrell Towers rehabilitation project.

Emily is serving as Project Manager for the Ambassador 4\%/9\% hybrid resyndication project and the Yosemite component of the combined Yosemite-Ritz scattered site project with assistance from Assistant Project Manager Tim Ponti. Emily has been instrumental in developing a cost effective design strategy, including complex seismic upgrades, and in formalizing the financing structures for these projects. Emily and Tim will each spend $25 \%$ of their time on the Project, and Chris will dedicate $15 \%$ to providing oversight.

## Nick Wilder

Project Manager
Recapitalization Projects: Ritz Hotel (Phase I project)
Nick Wilder joined TNDC in 2016 as an Assistant Project Manager, and assisted with the closing of and construction of 1036 Mission. Additionally, he assisted with final design, bidding, and closing of TNDC's Eddy \& Taylor project and eventually rose to Project Manager, leading the construction and close-out of financing. Currently, Nick is working on predevelopment for the 180 Jones project, a new construction mid-rise in the Tenderloin.
Nick is serving as Project Manager for the Ritz Hotel component of the Yosemite-Ritz scattered site project, which is currently in schematic design.

## Reinvestment Project Staff assignments

| PHASE I <br> PROPERTIES | SUPERVISION |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { MANAGEMENT } \end{aligned}$ |  | PROJECT MGMT ASSIST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Director of Asset <br> Management | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Time } \end{aligned}$ | Asset Manager | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Time } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Time } \end{aligned}$ |
| Turk \& Eddy Apartments | Todd LeFurge | 5\% | Rachel Macaraeg | 20\% | N/A |  |
| Folsom Dore Apartments | Todd LeFurge | 10\% | Svetlana Karasyova | 20\% | N/A |  |
|  | Associate Director of HD | \% <br> Time | Project Manager | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Time } \end{aligned}$ | Assistant Project Mangr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Time } \end{aligned}$ |
| Turk \& Eddy Apartments | Thomas Lauderbach | 5\% | Nicole Guzman | 50\% | N/A |  |
| Yosemite \& Folsom Dore (Yosemite Component) | Chris Cummings | 15\% | Emily Van Loon | 35\% | Timothy Ponti | 20\% |
| Yosemite \& Folsom Dore (Folsom Dore Component) | Chris Cummings | 10\% | Jackson <br> Rabinowitsh | 35\% | Lex Gelb | 20\% |
| Ambassador Hotel - Ritz Hotel (Ambassador Component) | Chris Cummings | 15\% | Emily Van Loon | 35\% | Timothy Ponti | 20\% |
| Ambassador <br> Hotel - Ritz <br> Hotel (Ritz <br> Component) | Thomas Lauderbach | 15\% | Nicole Guzman | 35\% | Mike Rogers (Consultant to TNDC) | 20\% |



## Attachment I: Property Descriptions

## Turk \& Eddy Apartments - Resource Property

## Property Description

Turk \& Eddy Apartments ("Turk \& Eddy") comprises two buildings totaling 82 units located on adjacent blocks and consisting of $100 \%$ Project Based Section 8 senior housing. The income levels are restricted to $50 \%$ area median income (AMI). TNDC acquired the properties in 2007. Turk Apartments is a six-story building with 27 units ( 22 Studios and five 1-Bedrooms) built in 1923. Eddy Apartments is a seven-story building with 55 Studio units built in 1925. The buildings underwent a rehab in 2010.

Turk \& Eddy Associates L.P. is the Owner. The Limited Partnership consists of a limited partner, with TNDC holding 70\% interest, and a general partner, Turk \& Eddy GP LLC, holding $30 \%$ interest. Turk Street Inc., an affiliate of TNDC, is the sole member of Turk \& Eddy GP LLC.

## Property status

MOHCD Asset Management staff has reviewed and approved the Turk \& Eddy 2019 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The property is in compliance with the requirements of the City's agreements, including affordability and maximum rent restriction requirements, reserves, and insurance. The property is fully subsidized through Project Based Section 8 and enjoys positive cash flow each year. Financial management has been consistently excellent with steady income and expenses and positive trends from 20142019. The vacancy rate has been below $1 \%$ year over those years. The Sponsor has made ground lease rent payments each year, and has been compliant with replacement reserve deposits.

Under the Freddie Mac loan, the operating budget provided by TNDC projects healthy financial performance for the next 20 years, with an average debt service coverage ratio of 1.22 over 20 years, and sufficient net operating income to adequately fund reserve accounts and to generate positive cash flow. Turk \& Eddy will continue to deliver residual rent payments on the ground lease after the refinancing.

## Fiscal

## Loan and Ground Lease

Turk \& Eddy is financed with a Tax Increment Loan, executed November 11, 2009, with an original loan amount of $\$ 8,770,890$, and current balance of $\$ 1,266,302$. Loan payments are through residual receipts, with a $3 \%$ interest rate. The outstanding balance with accrued interest is approximately $\$ 2.4$ million. The Loan matures November 17, 2064, and will not be paid off with the refinance and the cash out. The debt will be restructured and affordability extended as a condition of the Excess Proceeds allocations, Promissory Note, and subordination of City financing to the new senior loan.

Turk \& Eddy has a 55 -year term ground lease from the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the County and City of San Francisco, which was signed on November 17, 2009, with a 55 year term with expiration at 2064 (with an option to extend to 44 more years), annual $\$ 15 \mathrm{~K}$ base rent and $\$ 325 \mathrm{~K}$ residual rent to the extent of available residual receipts, and no accrued ground lease rent.

The Freddie Mac loan requires the ground lease to be amended. In February 2020, the Board of Supervisors approved the resolution to amend and City and the Sponsor will sign the amendment with the close of the loan in September 2020 (see "Refinancing" below). All material terms and conditions of the original Ground Lease remain in force and incorporates the MOHCD residual receipts policy.

## Refinancing

The Sponsor is refinancing Turk \& Eddy with a Freddie Mac loan for approximately $\$ 17,750,000$, administered through Walker \& Dunlop, for a term of 30 years and amortization period of 40 years with an interest rate of $4 \%$. The loan is scheduled to close by October 2020. Any remaining balance is due at loan maturity 2050.

Proceeds will pay off the Citibank loan (with an interest rate of 7.6\%) and transaction fees (approximately $\$ 3.1 \mathrm{M}$ ), support the Property's capital needs, and provide Excess Proceeds for Receiver Properties. MOHCD will remain in a subordinate position to this loan.

## Physical needs and Replacement Reserves

The Freddie Mac loan requires that the Property undergo a major seismic upgrade, budgeted at $\$ 1.3 \mathrm{MM}$. In addition, according to the July 2020 RULA provided by the Sponsor, the Property will undergo an immediate major rehab valued at $\$ 840 \mathrm{~K}$. As discussed above the, the general contractor budgets and scopes have been reviewed and approved by the MOHCD Construction Representative team. The rehab work and seismic upgrade will be funded with proceeds from the refinance (to capitalize the replacement reserve), a one-time additional reserve deposit (from the owner's share of 2019 residual receipts), and the funds held in a HUD reserve account (which HUD has released).

The Freddie Mac loan requires a $\$ 36,900$ annual Replacement Reserve deposit. MOHCD staff has approved additional annual deposits of $\$ 53,100$, based on the CNA and running replacement reserve of the RULA, from the operating account for a total annual deposit of $\$ 90,000$ (see Attachment B: 20-year cash flow). These deposits ensure a positive running replacement reserve balance through Year 15/2034, when the Sponsor proposes to resyndicate the Property.

## Yosemite Apartments -- Receiver Property syndicated with Folsom Dore

## Property description

Yosemite is a 32 -unit building six-story building located at 480 Eddy Street in the Tenderloin. The building is comprised of 31 Studios, one 1-Bedroom (the manager's unit), and one commercial space. This is one of TNDC's original acquisitions in 1983. Constructed in 1924, the building is on the National Register of Historic Places, as contributing to the Uptown Tenderloin Historic District. Eight Section 8 units are currently restricted to $50 \%$ AMI and 30 units are restricted at $80 \%$ AMI.

## Property status

The MOHCD Asset Management staff has reviewed and approved the 2019 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The property is in compliance with the requirements of the City's agreements, including affordability and maximum rent restriction requirements. Of the 32 units, eight are subsidized with Project Based Section 8; three households have Section 8 vouchers. The Property enjoys small positive cash flow each year. Financial management has been consistently excellent with steady income and expenses and positive trends from 2014-2019 with a small positive cash flow each year. The Property's reserve accounts are not regulated and the Sponsor has made only nominal deposits. There are no residual receipts payment obligations on the City's soft debt.

## Physical needs

Since acquisition, TNDC has only performed limited building upgrades. The Property contains many of the original building components and has many significant capital needs, including major seismic/structural strengthening, life safety, and accessibility upgrades.

The TNDC team is in the final stages of conducting due diligence on the building, including narrowing in the scope of the seismic upgrade, and has scheduled a preapplication meeting with Planning to discuss the design and proposed rehabilitation scope. The rehabilitation scope and budget have been reviewed and approved by MOHCD's Construction Representative team. The Sponsor has provided an updated RULA in conjunction with the $75 \%$ rehab construction documents, and the CR has reviewed and approved the RULA with the caveat that a final RULA is required with final construction docs and construction contract.

The table below illustrates the current City financing. All current debt will be restructured with the close of financing in June 2021.

| Loan <br> Type/Program | Loan Date | Original Loan <br> Amount | Int. <br> Rate | Maturity <br> Date | Repayment <br> Terms | Outstanding <br> Loan |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Amount |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| CDBG - CHRP | lo/18/1983 <br> (amended 1985) | $\$ 479,501$ | $6 \%$ | $12 / 1 / 2005$ | Deferred <br> payment | $\$ 479,501$ |
| CDBG | $7 / 5 / 1989$ | $\$ 85,937$ | $6 \%$ | $7 / 5 / 1999$ | Deferred <br> payment | $\$ 85,937$ |
| CDBG/ARRA <br> Grant | $8 / 31 / 2011$ | $\$ 291,112$ | $0 \%$ | $8 / 31 / 2016$ | Grant | $\$ 291,112$ |

## Folsom Dore - Receiver Property to be syndicated with Yosemite

## Property Description

Folsom Dore Apartments ("Folsom Dore", the "Property"), at 1340 Folsom Street, is a 98 -unit project owned by Folsom/Dore Associates L.P., a California Limited Partnership, and an affiliate of TNDC. Seventy-four (74) units are restricted for special needs households, and 76 units receive an operating subsidy. The property was originally built by Citizens Housing Corporation in 2005 to house low-income individuals with special needs and then acquired by TNDC in 2009. The property has a LOSP contract that subsidizes 20 units; 22 units receive Shelter Plus Care subsidy; 26 units receive projectbased Section 8; and eight units are currently occupied by households with Section 8 vouchers. Affordability is restricted at $50 \%$ AMI and $80 \%$ AMI.

The Property was originally financed with Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs) and Multi-Family Housing Revenue (tax-exempt) Bonds issued by the City in 2002. Folsom Dore's 15-year tax credit period ended in 2019, and the Apollo-RBC limited partners exited the partnership in 2016. With Taylor Family Housing, Inc. as limited partner and Turk Street, Inc. as general partner, the post-exit Folsom/Dore Associates, L.P. consists of TNDC affiliates.

## Property Status

MOHCD Asset Management staff has reviewed and approved the 2019 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for the Property. It is in compliance with the requirements of the City's HOME and Bond regulatory agreements, including affordability and maximum rent restriction requirements, reserves, and insurance.

The Property demonstrated positive financial performance from 2014-2019, with an average annual increase in total revenue of $8.4 \%$ (due mostly to increases in rental assistance payments) and in operating costs of $3.3 \%$. After meeting its debt service obligations and reserve requirements, Folsom Dore has generated positive cash flow since 2016. In 2019, the property made a residual HOME loan payment of $\$ 97 \mathrm{~K}$.

In conjunction with the subordination for a recent bridge loan (with Local Initiatives Support Corporation ("LISC"), TNDC submitted a Remaining Useful Life Analysis (RULA) including an annual reserve analysis, which was used to inform the annual replacement reserve deposit reflected in the 20-year cash flow also submitted with the 2019 application. Additionally, TNDC provided an updated Capital Needs Assessment (CNA). The RULA demonstrates a positive running balance for 15 years.

The 20-year cash flow projects a healthy financial performance for the next 20 years, with a debt service coverage ratio ranging from 2.13 to 2.54 during the first two years and from 1.15 to 1.75 for the remaining 18 years. The budgets also project sufficient net operating income to adequately fund the reserves.

After meeting its debt obligations and reserve requirements, Folsom Dore has generated positive cash flow since 2016. In 2019, the property made a residual HOME loan payment of $\$ 97 \mathrm{~K}$.

## Physical needs

The Property is relatively new and has not yet undergone a substantial rehab. The Project team has identified approximately $\$ 4 \mathrm{MM}$ in capital needs which will be funded through the proceeds of the syndication. The rehabilitation scope and budget has been reviewed and approved by MOHCD's Construction Representative team.

## Fiscal

The table below illustrates the current City financing. All current debt will be restructured with the close of financing in June 2021.

| Loan <br> Type/Program | Loan Date | Original Loan <br> Amount | Int. <br> Rate | Maturity <br> Date | Repayment <br> Terms | Outstanding <br> Loan <br> Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| General Funds - <br> LOSP - HSH (20 <br> units) | $12 / 16 / 11$ | $\$ 2,483,701$ | $0 \%$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Grant | $\$ 1,421,400$ |
|  | $7 / 2 / 2002-$ <br> Amend <br> $04 / 19 / 04$ | $\$ 8,755,884$ | $0 \%$ | $7 / 2 / 2077$ | Residual <br> Receipts | $\$ 8,435,636$ |
| HOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Other financing

MHP Loan: In addition to City financing, the Property is financed with an MHP loan with a balance of $\$ 5.2 \mathrm{MM}, 3 \%$ interest rate, and maturity at March 2061.

LISC Bridge Loan: Folsom Dore original permanent financing included tax-exempt bonds with a maturity date of 2036. The bond financing structure included a Letter of Credit (LOC) by Citibank, N.A. with an expiration date of March 19, 2020. In addition, Folsom Dore had an interest swap agreement with Citibank that was scheduled to expire
on August 1, 2020. As a preparatory step for the 2021 syndication, on December 2, 2019, TNDC executed a bridge loan with LISC to pay off the balance of the tax-exempt bond loan of approximately $\$ 2.8$ million, the value of the swap, the transactional costs, and the City's Annual Administrative Bond Prepayment Fee. The bridge loan will be paid off with the close of the Yosemite-Folsom Dore scattered site syndication.

## Ambassador Hotel -- Receiver Property to be syndicated with Ritz

## Property description

The Ambassador is a 134-unit Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotel located at 55 Mason Street in the Tenderloin. The building is also comprised of five occupied ground floor commercial spaces. This L-shaped six-story building from 1911 is on the National Register of Historic Places. It was substantially rehabbed in 2003.

The Ambassador houses low-income individuals through a combination of Shelter Plus Care program vouchers, other Coordinated Entry referrals, and Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, for a population earning less than 50\% AMI. TNDC acquired the Ambassador in 1998, and it received a 1999 Prop A loan from MOHCD. Since acquisition, TNDC performed one major rehabilitation in 2002 leveraging 9\% Low Income Housing Tax Credits.
Property status

MOHCD Asset Management staff has reviewed and approved the 2019 AMR for the Ambassador and has found it in compliance with the requirements of the City's Taxable GO Bond, CDBG, HOPWA and other loan agreements, including affordability and maximum rent restriction requirements, project reserves, and insurance. (The Borrower for the HOPWA loan is the parent organization and not the Ambassador partnership.)

## Physical needs

The Ambassador is now facing significant capital needs, including the need for seismic/structural strengthening, life safety, accessibility, and quality-of life upgrades. The Project Team is in the final stages of conducting due diligence on the building including narrowing in the scope of the seismic upgrade, and has met with Planning regarding the proposed rehabilitation.

## Fiscal

The property has been underperforming with negative cash flow in 2018 and 2019. The negative cash flow will be eliminated when Ambassador and Ritz are syndicated as one entity with Ritz cross-subsidizing Ambassador. The table below illustrates the current City financing. All current debt will be restructured with the close of financing in June 2021.

| Loan <br> Type/Program | Loan Date | Original <br> Loan <br> Amount | Int. <br> Rate | Maturity <br> Date | Repayment <br> Terms | Outstanding <br> Loan <br> Amount |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1996 GO Bond | $10 / 23 / 2001$ | $\$ 587,606$ | $0 \%$ | $10 / 23 / 2051$ | Grant | $\$ 587,606$ |
| 1996 GO Bond | $3 / 31 / 1999$ | $\$ 1,682,830$ | $3 \%$ | $3 / 31 / 2049$ | Deferred Pymt | $\$ 2,948,887$ |
| CDBG/Site <br> acq. | $3 / 31 / 1999$ | $\$ 1,900,421$ | $3 \%$ | $3 / 31 / 2049$ | Deferred Pymt | $\$ 2,508,185$ |
| HOPWA | $2 / 23 / 1999$ | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $6 \%$ | $2 / 23 / 2049$ | Deferred Pymt | $\$ 2,000,000$ |

The Ambassador-Ritz syndication will also use as a source the $\$ 442 \mathrm{~K}$ proceeds from the O'Farrell Tower syndication and $\$ 981 \mathrm{~K}$ from the Alexander Residence outside reserve.

## Ritz Hotel - Receiver Property to be syndicated with Ambassador

## Property description

The Ritz Hotel (the "Ritz") is an 89 -unit Single Room Occupancy Hotel (SRO) building located at 216 Eddy Street in the Tenderloin. The owner is The Tenderloin Hotels, a California limited partnership; the general partner is North of Market Development Corporations, a California nonprofit corporation; the sole limited partner is San Francisco Residential Hotels, L.P., a California Limited Partner. Eighty-eight (88) units are restricted at $50 \%$ AMI (with one manager's unit). The building also has four occupied commercial spaces.
TNDC acquired the Ritz in 1991 utilizing a CDBG loan. At that time, TNDC conducted a comprehensive rehabilitation of the building using $9 \%$ tax credits, an HCD Community Housing Rehabilitation Program (CHRP-R) loan, and an additional MOHCD loan for $\$ 401,381$. In 2009, TNDC entered into another loan agreement for $\$ 1,179,510$ to conduct full elevator upgrade and structural/seismic reinforcement.

## Property status

MOHCD Asset Management staff has reviewed and approved the 2019 AMR for the Ritz Hotel. The Ritz is in compliance with the requirements of the City's HOME and other loan agreements, including affordability and maximum rent restriction requirements, project reserves, and insurance. It has consistently made residual receipts payments to the City and required deposits to reserves.

## Physical needs

Recent assessments of the Ritz's physical condition indicate that it has several immediate rehab needs including several building code and disability access upgrades and life and safety and seismic upgrades and deferred maintenance items. The Sponsor has provided a Physical Needs Assessment (PNA) from a third-party consultant to refine the rehabilitation scope of work and determine associated costs as well as general contractor scopes and budgets. The MOHCD Construction Rep team has reviewed and approved the scope and budget for the substantial rehab and post-rehab RULA.

## Fiscal

Due to the Ritz's RAD Moderate Rehab conversion in 2017, after several years of operating deficits, in 2018 the Property finally demonstrated positive financial performance positive cash flow. This resulted in an improvement in the five-year (20142019) average annual increase in total revenue of $20.1 \%$ and an increase of operating costs of only $5.6 \%$. The Property is subsidized with $100 \%$ project based Section 8 . There is no ground lease.

The table below illustrates the current City financing for the Ritz. All current debt will be restructured with the close of financing in June 2021.

| Loan <br> Type/Program | Loan Date | Original <br> Loan <br> Amount | Int. <br> Rate | Maturity <br> Date | Repayment <br> Terms | Outstanding <br> Loan <br> Amount |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CDBG | $8 / 31 / 11$ | $\$ 620,603$ | $0 \%$ | $8 / 31 / 2016$ | Grant | $\$ 326,306$ |
| CDBG/Site Acq. | $10 / 29 / 91$ | $\$ 1,487,577$ | $10 \%$ | $10 / 30 / 2041$ | Forgivable <br> Loan | $\$ 1,487,577$ |
| CDBG/UDAG | $10 / 29 / 91$ | $\$ 1,025,010$ | $12 \%$ | $10 / 30 / 2041$ | Forgivable <br> Loan | $\$ 1,025,010$ |
| CDBG/CHRP | $10 / 29 / 91$ | $\$ 636,381$ | $10 \%$ | $10 / 30 / 2041$ | Residual <br> Receipts | $\$ 636,381$ |
| HOME | $7 / 24 / 09$ | $\$ 1,179,510$ | $0 \%$ | $7 / 24 / 2064$ | Residual <br> Receipts | $\$ 1,179,510$ |

TNDC requested that MOHCD allow the surplus cash flow generated in 2018 (\$598, 639 ) and $\$ 1.04$ million from 2019 to be set aside in a special replacement reserve account for use as a complementary source during the resyndication/rehabilitation contemplated in the Reinvestment Project. Both MOHCD and HCD have approved this request. The resyndication sources include $\$ 4.42 \mathrm{MM}$ in retained surplus cash accumulated through 2021. TNDC is aware that the annual set aside requires HCD approval.

Attachment J. MOHCD Cash-Out Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing Policy (effective June 19, 2020)

# MOHCD CASH OUT ACQUISITION/REHABILITATION, RESYNDICATION, AND REFINANCING POLICY <br> Update: June 19, 2020 

## I. BACKGROUND:

This MOHCD Cash Out Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing Policy (this "Policy") governs the conditions under which a sponsor may take cash out from a MOHCDregulated affordable housing development ("Projects") through an acquisition/rehabilitation, resyndication, or refinancing that is subject to MOHCD's consent under a City and County of San Francisco ("City") ground lease, financial agreement, and/or other subsidy agreement (collectively, "City Documents").

Between 2017-2020, the City, through MOHCD, will have contributed approximately \$1.2 billion in subsidies to build or preserve over 6,000 affordable housing units. MOHCD's substantial subsidies (including "soft" predevelopment and gap loans at zero or below market interest rates repaid through surplus cash, grants, operating subsidies, land write-down, below market ground lease rent, forgiveness of residual rent, forgiveness of loans, subordination, and others) strengthen the social, physical, and economic infrastructure of San Francisco's low-income neighborhoods and communities in need. Working with community-based organizations and affordable housing developers (collectively, "Sponsor"), MOHCD's contribution of public resources has created an affordable housing portfolio ("MOHCD Portfolio") exceeding 22,000 units.

In general, MOHCD allows a Sponsor to secure new loans for financing or refinancing the acquisition/rehabilitation of a Project, but only if MOHCD determines in its sole discretion that such financing/refinancing is necessary to ensure the viability of the Project. Under City Documents, a Sponsor must obtain MOHCD's prior written consent for such new financing/refinancing, encumbrance of a leasehold estate, subordination of MOHCD's existing liens, and/or prepayment of existing debt. Therefore, to ensure the financial viability and sustainability of a Project, a Sponsor is generally not permitted to obtain a loan in an amount that exceeds the amount necessary to acquire/rehabilitate a Project, which is commonly known as a "Cash Out."

But for the City's substantial contributions of public resources, and ongoing stewardship, the MOHCD Portfolio would not exist today, nor would individual projects within the MOHCD Portfolio support a cash out through an acquisition/rehabilitation, resyndication, or refinancing. In light of the City's substantial prior subsidies and funding, and to support the preservation of properties in the MOHCD Portfolio, effective June 7, 2019 ("Effective Date"), MOHCD approved the Policy to establish criteria for a Sponsor to obtain MOHCD's consent to waive the prohibition on a cash out. This Policy updates and replaces the Policy adopted on June 7, 2019 in its entirety.

## II. POLICY ON CASH OUT (UPDATED):

This Policy applies to Projects subject to a City Ground Lease, or where the City has provided funding (i.e. Loans, Grants, LOSP, or other funding) of at least $\$ 50,000$ per restricted unit. This
includes Projects where MOHCD has been assigned such agreements, as the successor housing agency, from the former Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco.

If a Sponsor is obtaining a new loan for conducting an acquisition/rehabilitation, resyndication, or refinancing, and desires withdrawal of Cash Out from the loan proceeds (equity or acquisition Excess Proceeds as defined below), MOHCD will waive the prohibition of such Cash Out under the following conditions:
(i) Sponsor complies with the general conditions set forth in Section IV below.
(ii) Excess Proceeds is subject to a 50-50 split between the Sponsor and MOHCD to be paid on a pari passu basis. MOHCD's share of Excess Proceeds (MOHCD Payment as defined below) shall partially recapture the City's previous subsidy to the Project.
"Excess Proceeds" is defined as the remaining funds available after paying off and/or funding, as applicable, the senior financing, all MOHCD financing and ground rent, buying out the limited partner, rehabilitation/improvements, seller carry-back loan (if any), reserves, and other costs (such as transaction costs) approved by MOHCD. MOHCD will not restrict the Sponsor's use of its share of Excess Proceeds approved pursuant to this Policy. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Policy does not modify any restrictions imposed by other government funding that govern a Sponsor's use of project income, program income, or cash out equity or acquisition proceeds, or in any way modify a Sponsor's obligation to comply with such restrictions. A Sponsor is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with any other government requirements and this Policy.
"MOHCD Payment" is defined as MOHCD's share of Excess Proceeds pursuant to this Policy. Such amount shall be paid at the close of escrow and documented through a consent agreement.

MOHCD's share of Excess Proceeds will be restricted to affordable housing purposes, utilized to provide critical funding to support the City's existing investments in affordable housing, and ensure the long-term viability of San Francisco's affordable housing stock. The MOHCD Payment shall be deployed across MOHCD's existing and successor financing programs that prioritize the preservation of the City's existing affordable housing portfolio (e.g. Existing NonProfit Owned Rental Housing Capital Repairs).

## III. GOVERNING DOCUMENTS, POLICY AND REGULATIONS:

Cash out withdrawals of equity or acquisition proceeds from properties in MOHCD's Portfolio are highly regulated through various mechanisms, including, but not limited to:

- Transaction Documents:
o Long-term affordability covenants which keep project income low and reduce available equity
o Long-term asset management requirements requiring regular reinvestment into the physical needs of the properties
o Loan Agreement provisions regarding property transfer rights
o Secured Promissory Note provisions regarding prepayment privileges
o Contracts providing rental assistance
o Restrictions related to other funding sources (e.g. HCD, CDBG Program Income)
- Policy \& Regulations:
o Cash Out Acquisition/Rehabilitation, Resyndication, and Refinancing Policy
o Subordination Policy
o Ground Lease Policy
o Residual Receipts Policy
o Operating Fee Policy
o Developer Fee Policy for Tax Credit Projects
o Multifamily Securities Program Manual
o Other third-party restrictions (e.g. HCD, CDLAC \& CTCAC Regulations)


## IV. GENERAL CONDITIONS:

MOHCD consent to waive the prohibition on Cash Out is subject to the Sponsor complying with the following general conditions:
i. Long-term extension of the compliance term and affordability restrictions for a minimum of 55 years.
ii. Demonstration to MOHCD's reasonable satisfaction that the proposed financing does not threaten the viability of the Project through the extended compliance term.
iii. Demonstration of compliance with asset management requirements, including either completion of all capital repair needs or a capital repair expenditure plan that meets the building's physical needs.
iv. Fully funded operating and replacement reserves.
v. Full repayment of MOHCD financing (including principal and accrued interest), as applicable.
vi. Full repayment of MOHCD accrued ground rent, as applicable; and
vii. No event of default exists under the City Documents.

## V. WAIVERS:

Subject to MOHCD's review of supporting documentation, the Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee ("Loan Committee") may recommend to waive or modify any portion of the Policy for the purpose of ensuring project feasibility, maximizing affordability, and minimizing the use of public resources.

A Sponsor may also request an alternative to the 50-50 split of Excess Proceeds as follows:

## A. Proportionality Waiver

MOHCD may consider a waiver to a 50-50 split of Excess Proceeds if the Sponsor can demonstrate that the Sponsor's equity investment (including cash contributions and parent company loans, "Sponsor Funding") in the Project is greater than $50 \%$ of the sum of $i$ ) total equity (excluding tax credit investment), and ii) subsidy contributed by the City (collectively, "Total Funding"). In the event the Sponsor has invested more than 50\% of the Total Funding,
the Sponsor may retain the percentage of the Excess Proceeds in proportion to the Sponsor's Funding, as illustrated below. Approval of the Proportionality Waiver is subject to MOHCD verification of the original development budget and additional documentation (e.g. final underwriting, audited financial statements, bank statements, loan documents, etc.) related to Sponsor Funding.

50-50 Split with Sponsor Funding equal to less than 50\% of Total Funding

| Sponsor <br> Funding | MOHCD <br> subsidy | Total <br> Funding | Sponsor <br> Funding <br> $\%$ | MOHCD <br> Excess <br> Proceeds | Sponsor <br> Share of <br> Excess <br> Proceeds | Excess <br> Proceeds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 7,000,000$ | $\$ 10,000,000$ | $30 \%$ | $\$ 6,000,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ |

Proportional Waiver for Sponsor Funding equal to greater than 50\% of Total Funding

| Sponsor <br> Funding | MOHCD <br> subsidy | Total <br> Funding | Sponsor <br> Funding <br> $\%$ | MOHCD <br> Excess <br> Proceeds | Sponsor <br> Share of <br> Excess <br> Proceeds | Share of <br> Excess <br> Proceeds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 7,000,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 10,000,000$ | $70 \%$ | $\$ 6,000,000$ | $\$ 1,800,000$ | $\$ 4,200,000$ |

## B. Reinvestment Waiver

MOHCD may also consider waivers, subject to MOHCD's review of supporting documentation (described in EXHIBIT A), and approval of the Loan Committee, that result in an increased net public benefit (example in table below) to MOHCD's Portfolio, whereby a Sponsor commits to reinvest all Excess Proceeds into MOHCD-regulated properties within the Sponsor's affordable housing portfolio. Such requests must demonstrate that the proposed uses are strategically optimal investments, and be justified by recent Capital Needs Assessments ("CNA") approved by MOHCD, feasible underwriting, Sponsor capacity, and long-term cash flow projections.

Additional conditions and requirements for Reinvestment Waiver requests:
i. Waiver requests approved by the Loan Committee may require additional City approvals.
ii. Projects generating Excess Proceeds ("Resource Properties") and Projects where Excess Proceeds are reinvested ("Receiver Properties") must be specified. The proposed reinvestment plan, and any changes related to such Resource Properties or Receiver Properties is subject to MOHCD's approval.
iii. Excess Proceeds may only be used at MOHCD approved Receiver Properties for actual rehab expenses (as opposed to refinancing, for example), with a minimum threshold cost of $\$ 50,000$ per unit. Eligible uses include hard costs, and certain soft costs, as applicable.
iv. Sponsor must report the use of all Excess Proceeds to MOHCD annually, and MOHCD shall have the authority to monitor the use of Excess Proceeds on a more frequent basis.
v. Sponsor must execute a Promissory Note, or Notes, payable in five (5) years to MOHCD for 100\% of the Excess Proceeds to be reinvested in Receiver Properties; each Promissory Note must be secured with a deed of trust against the Resource Property. The outstanding balance of the Promissory Note shall be reduced proportionately to the completion of the rehabilitation/improvements, and the deed of trust will be reconveyed after all the rehabilitation/improvements have been completed.
vi. Rehabilitation/Improvements funded by Excess Proceeds must be completed within five (5) years of the execution of the Promissory Note, or unused Excess Proceeds will be due and payable upon maturity of the Note.
vii. Sponsor's Reinvestment Waiver request must include all the materials listed in EXHIBIT A.

| EXAMPLE REINVESTMENT WAIVER |  | 50/50 Split |  | Waiver |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources |  |  |  |  |
| New Senior Loan |  | 7,000,000 |  | 7,000,000 |
| Total Sources |  | 7,000,000 |  | 7,000,000 |
| Uses |  |  |  |  |
| Rehab |  | 1,200,000 |  | 1,200,000 |
| Repay Existing Senior Debt |  | 1,450,000 |  | 1,450,000 |
| Paydown MOHCD Accrued Ground Lease Rent |  | 1,965,000 |  | 1,965,000 |
| Payoff MOHCD debt |  | 875,000 |  | 875,000 |
| Excess Proceeds |  | 1,510,000 |  | 1,510,000 |
| Total Uses |  | 7,000,000 |  | 7,000,000 |
| MOHCD share of Excess Proceeds | 50\% | 755,000 | 0\% | - |
| Sponsor share of Excess Proceeds | 50\% | 755,000 | 100\% | 1,510,000 |
| Paydown MOHCD Accrued Ground Lease Rent |  | 1,965,000 |  | 1,965,000 |
| Payoff MOHCD debt |  | 875,000 |  | 875,000 |
| MOHCD Share of Excess Proceeds |  | 755,000 |  | - |
| Total due to MOHCD |  | 3,595,000 |  | 2,840,000 |
| Amount of Promissory Note to MOHCD |  | - |  | 1,510,000 |
| Net public benefit to MOHCD Portfolio |  | 3,595,000 |  | 4,350,000 |

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVE DATE:

This Policy applies to any development in MOHCD's Portfolio that is seeking a Cash Out on or after the Effective Date.

## EXHIBIT A

## Additional Materials Related to Reinvestment Waiver Requests

- Detailed recapitalization project narrative/proposal
- Portfolio-wide preservation strategy with rationale for the Resource Properties and Receiver Properties selected for the waiver request
- Proposal Review Request Form for each property
- Resource Properties-to-Receiver Properties flow chart
- Third-party CNAs for each property
- Preliminary title reports for each property
- MOHCD Proformas for each property - including 20-year cash flow analyses before and after use of Excess Proceeds
- Sources and uses chart including MOHCD debt/obligations on each property
- Refinancing debt and equity term sheets or letters of intent, as applicable
- Seismic report and rehab budgets for each property, as appropriate
- Project schedule for each property as well as for the overall multi-project plan
- Sponsor and staff capacity/assignments for each aspect of the proposed project(s)

MOHCD reserves the right to request additional materials as needed to evaluate waiver requests.

Attachment K. CCSF Human Services Agency audit letter to Sponsor, May 23, 2019

City and County of San Francisco


London Breed, Mayor

# Department of Human Services 

Department of Aging and Adult Services
Office of Early Care and Education
Trent Rhorer, Executive Director

May 23, 2019

Don Falk
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Fiscal Monitoring of HSA Grants for Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp for FY18-19

| Department/Program | Contract Name/Description <br> HSA |
| :--- | :--- |
| 320-330 Clementina-RAD Seniors |  |
| HSA | 430 Turk-RAD Seniors |
| HSA | 939-951 Eddy - RAD Seniors |
| HSA | 1251 Turk Rosa Parks - RAD Seniors |

Dear Mr. Falk:
This letter conveys the results of the Citywide fiscal and compliance desk audit monitoring conducted on 05/03/2019.

The fiscal monitoring included the review of the following documents:

1. Agency-wide budget and cost allocation plan
2. Board minutes
3. Recent 990 form
4. Recent DE 9, DE 9C, and 941 reports
5. Most recent audited financial statements
6. Financial reports, balance sheets, and profit loss statements
7. Supporting documentation for invoices for two current year billing months
A. For 430 Turk RAD:

- NCPHS-Office Supplies - \$690.02
- Utilities - $\$ 474.60$
B. For the 939 Eddy RAD:
- NCPHS - Rent \$28.22

The compliance monitoring included the review of the following documents:

1. Board roster, bylaws, meeting minutes

We are pleased to report that there were no findings identified in our fiscal and compliance monitoring.

Monitoring staff also reviewed governance practices (based on Section 3 of the Standard Monitoring Form: Board of Director Best Practices). While governance best practice results are not classified as "findings" for the purposes of this Monitoring Report Letter, they are important indicators of healthy nonprofit agencies. We are pleased to report that your agency is also in conformance with all governance best practices.

Please extend our appreciation to your staff for their preparation in advance of the monitoring and assistance during the process. We thank you for your work in serving the San Francisco community.

Sincerely,


[^6]
[^0]:    * Plaza Ramona is slated to receive Excess Proceeds from both Phase I and Phase II Resource Properties.

    MOHCD staff will monitor each portion allotted to Plaza Ramona from respective phase promissory notes.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Turk \& Eddy ground lease amendment incorporates lender protections, including prohibiting the City from encumbering its fee interest; permitting Freddie Mac one transfer post-foreclosure without the City's consent provided the transfer is to a borrower controlled by a California non-profit and they elect to keep the income restrictions in place; and limits the liability of a foreclosing lender and releases the lender from any acts or omissions of the borrower pre-foreclosure.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Prior to July 1, 2019 the Turk\&Eddy Section 8 contract was an Option 4 Limited Distribution contract with surplus distributions limited to $\$ 97,000$. GP Asset Management fee, GP Incentive Management fee, City ground rent and soft debt residual receipt payments were limited in total to that $\$ 97 \mathrm{k}$. HUD required surplus cash deposits over that limited amount to be deposited into a HUD-controlled Residual Receipt account with the funds restricted to the property. The account accumulated approximately $\$ 1.4 \mathrm{MM}$. July, 12019 was the effective date of contract conversion to an Option 1

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ The CR team evaluation is based on comparisons to recent RAD projects and also takes into consideration that the TNDC properties have been better maintained than the SFHA properties.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ The Sponsor is following the City's Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) requirements for procurement for the tax credit projects; for the Resource Property, the Sponsor has issued an RFP to specifically solicit locally-based (LBE) and small business (SBE) firms.

[^5]:    Anna Van Degna, Director
    Controller's Office of Public Finance

[^6]:    cc: Paul Carney - TNDC-Fiscal Officer
    Lisa Blakely - TNDC- Board President
    Ofelia Trevino - HSA Program Manager

