## 1979 Mission Street

Family \& Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH")
Predevelopment Loan Requests
$\mathbf{\$ 6 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ Total Funding Amount

| Evaluation of Request for: | Predevelopment Loan |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | \$3,500,000 - Family |
|  | \$2,500,000 - PSH |
| Loan Committee Date: | May 17, 2024 |
| Prepared By: | Matt Graves, Senior Project Manager (Family Project) |
| Asset Manager: | Jenny Collins, Project Manager (PSH Project) |
| Construction Representative: | Mike McLoone |
|  | Harry Wong |
| Sources and Amounts of New Funds Recommended: | \$3.5M Affordable Housing Inclusionary Funds (AHF) for Family Project |
|  | \$2.5M Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Asset Fund (LMIHAF) for PSH Project |
| APPLICABLE RFQ: | 1979 Mission RFQ, Issued August 3, 2023 https://www.sf.gov/information/2023-rfq-1979-mission-street |
| Applicant/Sponsor(s) Name: | Mission Housing Development <br> Corporation ("Mission" or "MHDC") <br> Mission Economic Development Agency ("MEDA") |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Sponsor Information:

Project Name: 1979 Mission

Project Address (w/ 1979 Mission (at $16^{\text {th }}$
cross St$)$ : cross St ):

St), 94103

Sponsor(s): Mission Housing ("MHDC" or "Mission Housing") and Mission Economic Development Agency ("MEDA") 1979 Mission Street Family Associates LP and 1979 Mission Street PSH Associates LP

## Project Summary:

MOHCD acquired the 1.32-acre lot and the existing improvements at 1979 Mission Street (the "Property" or the "Site") from Maximus BP-1979 Mission Street LLC on March 2, 2022, through a land dedication arrangement. On August 3, 2023, MOHCD issued a Request for Qualifications (the "RFQ") for a multiphase, multi-building development at 1979 Mission Street. MOHCD received one response from the joint venture team of Mission and MEDA (together, the "Sponsor or "Sponsors"). Pursuant to a letter dated November 29, 2023, the City's selection panel recommended the Mission and MEDA team for development of the Property.

The Property sits adjacent to the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street northeast BART Plaza and includes 2 commercial buildings, including a vacant former Walgreens, comprising 32,000 square feet and a parking lot. It is currently two separate parcels that will require a lot line adjustment to accommodate the proposed housing developments. All current improvements will be demolished prior to construction of the new housing. HSH currently operates a tiny homes village on the parking lot and will vacate prior to construction start.

As required by the RFQ, 1979 Mission will be developed into at least two $100 \%$ affordable housing developments; one multi-family development (the "Family Project") and one Permanent Supportive Housing development (the "PSH Project") for individuals experiencing homelessness. The Family Project will front both $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Mission Street, will most likely be two buildings, and will be 1- to 3-bedroom units restricted to $30 \%-80 \%$ MOHCD AMIs. The Family Project is intended to be, at minimum, approximately 250 units. Due to CDLAC and TCAC financing requirements, the Family Project may be split in two buildings. The PSH Project will consist of approximately 120 units of $100 \%$ Permanent Supportive Housing comprised of studios and 1-bedrooms. The PSH Project and the Family Project may be referred to herein, collectively, as the "Projects", or the "Project." The RFQ notes the possibility of commercial space for the Family Project. This will be determined throughout the entitlement process with SF Planning, as it may not be required as a condition of approval of entitlements. The PSH Project will not include commercial space and neither Project will include parking.

The Project will also entail the redevelopment of both the southwest and northeast BART plazas at $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Mission Street, adjacent to the Site, though BART will be responsible for the construction of the new plazas themselves. MOHCD's role with the plaza redevelopments will be limited to assisting in infrastructure financing applications, not in redevelopment activities themselves. The RFQ requires that the Sponsors maximize the number of affordable units, which involves the consideration of the airspace above the BART plaza. Per the RFQ, the Sponsor needs to complete a structural feasibility study to access structural requirements and the possibility for building over BART assets' airspace which will be due to MOHCD and BART by December 17, 2024, or as extended by MOHCD in its sole discretion.

Of the $\$ 6,000,000$ requested, the PSH loan will be $\$ 2.5 \mathrm{M}$; the Family Project loan will include an additional $\$ 500,000$ for structural investigations and other feasibility studies related to the BART plaza and the subterranean conditions for this work, for a total predevelopment award of $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{M}$. Each Project will have a separate predevelopment loan.

The Sponsors will return with further details to the design of the buildings and the BART plaza to Loan Committee at the time of Preliminary Gap financing for each Project before state financing applications are submitted. MEDA will return with further details on the Family Project and MHDC will return with further details on the PSH Project. The Family Project and the PSH Project are likely to follow different timelines given the BART analysis needed for the Family Project.

## Project Description:

| Construction Type: | TBD | Project Type: | New Construction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Stories: | TBD | Lot Size (acres and sf): | 1.32 acres/57,325 sf |
| Number of Units (Per RFQ, site has capacity for 450 units): | $\begin{aligned} & 250 \text { (Family) } \\ & 150 \text { (PSH) } \end{aligned}$ | Architect: | TBD (RFQ submitted to CMD) |
| Total Residential Area: | TBD | General Contractor: | TBD |
| Total Commercial Area: | TBD | Property Manager: | Caritas |
| Total Building Area: | TBD | Supervisor and District: | Supervisor Ronen, D9 |
| Landowner: | MOHCD | MOHCD Acquisition Cost: | \$0 |
| Total Development Cost: | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 261,765,993 \text { (Family) } \\ & \$ 143,795,447 \text { (PSH) } \end{aligned}$ | MOHCD Acquisition Cost per/unit: | \$0 |
| Total Development Cost (TDC) w/o land: | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 261,765,993 \text { (Family) } \\ & \$ 143,795,447 \text { (PSH) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| TDC/unit w/o land: | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,047,063 \text { (Family) } \\ & \$ 958,636 \text { (PSH) } \end{aligned}$ | MOHCD Gap Amount: | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 75,000,000 \text { (Family) } \\ & \$ 30,000,000 \text { (PSH) } \end{aligned}$ |
| MOHCD Predevelopment Loan Amount: | \$6,000,000 | Total MOHCD Subsidy est/per unit | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 300,000 / \text { unit (Family) } \\ & \$ 200,000 / \text { unit (PSH) } \end{aligned}$ |
| HOME Funds? | No | Parking | None |

## PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

- Sponsor Capacity: The Sponsors of the Project are MHDC and MEDA. The two entities signed an MOU on September 15, 2023, and applied to the RFQ as a joint venture (JV) entity. Previously, both Mission and MEDA have predominantly been property managers, service providers, and conducted rehabilitations. Both entities have been JV partners on multiple recent developments. MEDA has not completed a new construction project as a sole developer, and MHDC last completed a new construction project with Related California as the co-developer in 2023, the Balboa Park Upper Yard project. The complexity of the Site will require sophisticated project management and will necessitate that the Sponsors coordinate effectively with BART, each other, and MOHCD. See Section 1.3.6 for additional details.
- Infrastructure Coordination: BART owns the land located at the southwest and northeast corners of Mission Street and 16th Street. BART tracks run below Mission Street and the "BART Zone of Influence" of the subterranean tracks extends approximately 50 feet into the Site along its frontage on Mission Street. As part of the redevelopment of the Site, BART would like to provide updates to the plaza. The Sponsor will need to coordinate with BART on not only plaza redesigns, but structural and foundation details. The Sponsors will seek
direction from design professionals and BART staff regarding the specific design implications, in order to support housing in the BART air rights parcel. The review of this work and interconnectedness of the Project and the BART parcel will take a high level of coordination and expertise. See Section 4.8 for additional details.
- Expiring DDA/QCT Status: The Sponsor was successful in maintaining an expiring Qualified Census Tract ("QCT") status for the Projects by submitting placeholder CDLAC applications at the end of 2023. The Application maintains the 2023 QCT designation; however, the Projects must close construction financing and issue all bonds within 730 days of December 14, 2023, in order to maintain this status and receive the $130 \%$ TCAC basis boost. The Projects are unlikely to meet this deadline due to the timeframe to apply for entitlements and financing, so the Sponsor will not be in a position to preserve the QCT designation past 2025. It is MOHCD's hope that the Project site will be located in a QCT or Difficult to Develop Area (DDA) in 2025, thereby allowing the Projects to receive the benefit of the basis boost after all.
- Current Tenants and Relocation: MOHCD acquired the Site with 2 active commercial tenants in place. The leases for the commercial tenants expired in 1997 and 2002 but are currently under month-month terms with no extension or renewal rights per the terms of the estoppels signed by the tenants when MOHCD acquired the Site. MOHCD and the Sponsor are looking into relocation benefits required for commercial tenants on government-owned property. The Sponsor will obtain a relocation consultant to review and if necessary, will develop a relocation plan due to MOHCD for approval before the end of 2024. See Section 4.12 for additional details.
- Predevelopment Funding: The predevelopment loan amounts may be insufficient to cover the full cost of predevelopment activities. The Sponsors will need to secure additional predevelopment loans for both the PSH Project and the Family Project to cover predevelopment expenses not covered by MOHCD. See Section 6 .
- Funding Uncertainty. MOHCD does not currently have funds available to develop the Projects beyond the predevelopment stage. Moving the Projects forward will likely require new sources of MOHCD affordable housing funds.


## SOURCES AND USES SUMMARY

## FAMILY PROJECT SOURCES AND USES

The Sources and Uses below reflect the budgeted model from the Sponsors as demonstration of overall feasibility.

| Predevelopment <br> Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD | $\$ 3,500,000$ | $\$ 14,000$ | 3 years $/ 3 \%$ <br> simple <br> interest | This <br> Request |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 , 0 0 0}$ |  |  |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD | $\$ 75,000,000$ | $\$ 300,000$ | $55 \mathrm{yr} / 3 \% \mathrm{RR}$ | Not <br> Committed |
| Permanent Loan | $\$ 38,509,896$ | $\$ 154,039$ | $15 \mathrm{yrs} . ; 7.4 \%$ | Not <br> Committed |
| AHSC | $\$ 6,347,425$ | $\$ 25,389$ | TBD | Not <br> Committed |
| IIG | $\$ 14,229,300$ | $\$ 56,917$ | TBD | Not <br> Committed |
| Deferred Interest- <br> MOHCD | $\$ 605,646$ | $\$ 2,423$ | TBD | Not <br> Committed |
| Deferred Dev Fee | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | TBD | Not <br> Committed |
| Investor Equity | $\$ 97,073,626$ | $\$ 388,294$ | $\$ 0.90$ | Not <br> Committed |
| GP Equity |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\$ 261,765,993$ | $\$ 1,045,863$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | 0 |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 226,145,356$ | $\$ 818,113$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 30,501,767$ | $\$ 94,790$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |
| Reserves | $\$ 1,263,770$ | $\$ 6,317$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 3,855,100$ | $\$ 35,272$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 6 1 , 7 6 5 , 9 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 4 , 4 9 3}$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROJECT SOURCES AND USES

| Predevelopment <br> Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| MOHCD | $\$ 2,500,000$ | $\$ 16,667$ | 3 years $/ 3 \%$ <br> simple <br> interest | This <br> Request |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 6 , 6 6 7}$ |  |  |


| Permanent Sources | Amount | Per Unit | Terms | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD | $\$ 30,000,000$ | $\$ 200,000$ | TBD | Not Com |
| Tax Credit Equity | $\$ 75,807,147$ | $\$ 505,381$ | $\$ 0.92$ | Not Com |
| MHP | $\$ 35,000,000$ | $\$ 233,333$ | TBD | Not Com |
| Deferred Developer Fee | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | TBD | Not Com |
| GP Capital | $\$ 1,500,000$ | $\$ 10,000$ | TBD | Not Com |
| AHP | $\$ 1,488,300$ | $\$ 9,922$ |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 3 , 7 9 5 , 4 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 8 , 6 3 6}$ |  |  |


| Permanent Uses | Amount | Per Unit | Per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | 0 |
| Hard Costs | $\$ 117,197,733$ | $\$ 781,318$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |
| Soft Costs | $\$ 21,689,392$ | $\$ 144,596$ | TBD - SF <br> not provided |
| Reserves | $\$ 718,322$ | $\$ 4,789$ | TBD - SF <br> not provided |
| Developer Fee | $\$ 4,190,000$ | $\$ 27,933$ | TBD - SF <br> not provided |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 3 , 7 9 5 , 4 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 8 , 6 3 6}$ | TBD - SF not <br> provided |

## 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Project History Leading to This Request. MOHCD acquired the Property from Maximus BP-1979 Mission Street LLC (Maximus) on March 2, 2022, for \$0 through a land dedication arrangement whereby an affiliate of Maximus dedicated the land and current improvements of 1979 Mission Street to MOHCD to satisfy the affordability requirement for the market rate project to be developed at 10 South Van Ness Avenue. The Property sits adjacent to the 16th Street Northeast BART Plaza and consists of a vacant former Walgreens store at 1979 Mission Street and a parking lot behind the Walgreens along Capp Street, as well as five commercial spaces along 16th Street, 2 of which are currently occupied and discussed in Section 4.12.

On August 3, 2023, MOHCD issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for 1979 Mission, MOHCD received one response from the joint venture team of Mission and MEDA. Pursuant to a letter dated November 29, 2023, the City's selection panel recommended the Mission/MEDA team for development of the Site. It is envisioned to be $100 \%$ affordable, separated into two components: a "Family Project" restricted to $1-3$ bedrooms, at $30 \%-80 \%$ AMIs to be constructed where the former Walgreens currently sits, and a "PSH Project" for $100 \%$ Permanent Supportive Housing units for individuals with studios and one-bedrooms at $30 \%$ $60 \%$ AMI to be constructed on the parking lot along Capp Street, which is currently being operated by HSH as a tiny-homes village for and individuals experiencing homelessness. There is no requirement for parking at the Projects. The RFQ states that the Family Project must include ground floor commercial spaces that act as neighborhood serving resources and address resource gaps, through programs determined through a comprehensive community outreach process. Currently MEDA is assuming two commercial spaces for the Family Project at $10,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ each for a total of 20,000 square feet of commercial space; however, it is still being determined by MOHCD via SF Planning Department if commercial space will be required for the Family Project.

A review of the Preliminary Title Report was done by the development team, and no concerns have been raised. Appraisals for both projects were performed in December 2023 with an appraised value of $\$ 23,650,000$ for the family parcel based on 250 units, and an appraised value for the permanent supportive housing project of $\$ 12,250,000$ based on 140 units.

### 1.2 Applicable NOFA/RFQ/RFP. (See Attachment E for Threshold Eligibility

 Requirements and Ranking Criteria). The August 2023 RFQ described above set forth general expectations for the Projects, such as using MOHCD dollars cost effectively, moving quickly through the development process, and aligning with the City's policies of anti-displacement, among other MOHCD goals for affordable housing projects. The MHDC and MEDA team met the minimum threshold eligibility requirements and were the only respondent to the RFQ. Per the award letter dated November 29, 2023, the City's selection recommended the MEDA and MHDC team to exclusively negotiate a ground lease and predevelopment loan for development of the Site. To this end, the Sponsor iscurrently working with MOHCD on the following tasks set forth under the award letter:

- Apply to CDLAC by December 15, 2023, to maintain the Site's 2023 QCT Status for a $30 \%$ equity boost, per CDLAC memo dated November 17, 2023, "2023 Expiring Difficult Development Area and Qualified Census Tract Status";
- Status: Complete
- Prepare/revise proformas, financial assumptions, and development program to reflect a two-phase project with one building as $100 \%$ PSH and the other building as $100 \%$ family housing (no Coordinated Entry referrals).
- Status: On going. The Sponsors will return with update budgets once design teams are on board and entitlements are underway. The numbers represented here are preliminary.
- Coordinate all initial community and public communication on the project with MOHCD;
- Status: In process. MOHCD has received comments on the communications plan and will provide the milestone schedule to the plan in order to finalize by May 20. The website for the Project is 1979missionsf.com. There is a community event being held on May 9 to celebrate the RFQ award. The event will be held at the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street BART Plaza.
- Coordinate with MOHCD's construction representation and project delivery teams on the additional engineering and design capacity needed for the complexities of design and construction related to the site's proximity to BART.
- Status: In process. Sponsor has completed the CMD process for the Architect and has chosen Mithun and Herman Coliver Locus Architecture as the Architect for the Projects. Additional engineering and design capacity needed for the Family Project due to proximity to BART will be determined by studies being conducted by BART and by the Sponsor currently, with reports expected in December 2024. Additionally, the development team will work with BART to develop the urban design vision for the existing BART plaza, including station access points. The Sponsor and their team will consider needs for activation, safety and maintenance and will need to work with BART, City agencies, and community members. In addition, as per the terms of the RFQ, the Sponsor will evaluate development over the adjacent northeast BART Plaza parcel in order maximize each affordable housing building, in conjunction with improvements to both the BART plazas.


### 1.3 Borrower/Grantee Profile. (See Attachment B for Borrower Org Chart; See Attachment C for Developer Resume and Attachment D for Asset Management Analysis).

1.3.1 Borrower. The borrower entities for pre-development and construction/ permanent-gap financing will be 1979 Mission Street Family Associates LP and 1979 Mission Street PSH Associates LP. The Sponsors will establish the

## Limited Partnerships before the predevelopment loans are executed by MOHCD.

1.3.2 Joint Venture Partnership The joint venture partnership is established to build the capacity of the two Community-Based Developers in the Mission District, both of which are non-profit, BIPOC Developers as defined by HCD. The sponsors executed a Memorandum of Understanding - 1979 Mission Street Development on September 15, 2023, outlining each party's ownership, roles and responsibilities, and developer fee split.

MEDA and Mission Housing will share joint responsibilities during the predevelopment, construction, and permanent conversion phases of the project. Mission Housing is the lead developer of the PSH Project and MEDA is the lead developer of the Family Project. As per the MOU, the developer fee will be split $50 \% / 50 \%$ for both projects. MEDA and Mission will need to amend the MOU to set forth which party is responsible for asset and property management duties for the Projects.

Please See Attachment E for additional scoring information.

### 1.3.3 Demographics of Board of Directors, Staff and People Served.

## MEDA

- Board: MEDA's nine members Board of Directors are 75\% Latinx. The Board is chaired by Rafael Yaquian, a partner at Goldfarb \& Lipman LLP.
- Staff:
- Organization: Luis Granados (Chief Executive Officer) leads MEDA with its Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer, all three BIPOC and two of them women. 75\% of the 12-person Management team are people of color and $60 \%$ identify as Latinx. MEDA's current staff is 74\% Latinx; $15 \%$ white; 7\% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1\% black; 3\% Mixed/Other

| Demographic | Percentage of <br> Team |
| :--- | :--- |
| BIPOC | $75 \%$ |
| Latinx | $60 \%$ |
| White | $15 \%$ |
| Asian/Pacific <br> Islander | $7 \%$ |
| Mixed/Other | $3 \%$ |
| Black | $1 \%$ |

- Development Team: The team of 17 including the Community Real Estate Officer are $95 \%$ people of color, and over $2 / 3$ Latinx, $1 \%$ black and over 50\% women.


## MHDC

- Mission Housing's board, staff and executive leadership seek to reflect the residents and communities they serve.
- Board: Mission Housing's board consists of majority BIPOC members and is chaired by Irving Gonzales.
- Staff:
- Organization: Mission Housing's staff breaks down as follows: Female:

52\%; Male: 48\%; Asian: 24\%; Black/African American: 21\%;
Hispanic/Latino: 31\% and White: $24 \%$. Senior Management has a $75 \%$ BIPOC representation rate and both the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Financial Officer are BIPOC.

- Development Team: The team of 4 (including the Director of Housing Development \& Construction) are 50\% people of color.
1.3.4 Racial Equity Vision. The RFQ expects applicants to assist the City to redress past and present inequities by maximizing the number of priority placements (COP, etc), maximize the City's requirements for promotion of SBE/LBE organizations, respond to requests for demographic data and build local developmental capacity. The Sponsor states, "We understand these communities, including the Latinx, non-English speakers, Black, and LGBTQIA+ communities are impacted by intersecting identities and oppressions. This understanding will carry out intentional and thoughtful community engagement that ensures that each of these communities has the resources and access needed to achieve stable and inclusive housing opportunities. These strategies include working with our network of partners and community organizations to amplify outreach and to connect with as many different communities as possible. Additionally, our organizations are committed to training and to equipping our respective staffs with the knowledge and tools they need around leading with an anti-racist, antioppression, trauma-informed care to provide intentional inclusion of all communities. We also understand that language justice and access is essential to ensuring that communities are able participate in decision-making and planning processes.


### 1.3.5 Relevant Experience. The Mission Coalition Organization, formed in 1968,

 brought together more than 100 different organizations to address concerns of Mission District residents and businesses. Through MCO's organizing efforts, the Mission District was declared a Model Cities area for community development, enabling the neighborhood to develop a solid program of better housing, social services, education, health care, and economic development. One product of the coalition was the creation of Mission Housing Development Corporation. Since 1976, MHDC has developed 35 projects totaling over 1600 units of affordable housing serving over 3,000 low-income residents including families, seniors, and persons with special needs. MHDC's developments include 14 new construction projects, 17 acquisition and rehabprojects, and 12 scattered site developments. MHDC has also assisted local non-profit social service providers to develop 6 additional sites with 88 units of affordable housing for persons with special needs. MHDC provides ongoing support services for all of its residents through its Resident Services Programs Department, which ensures that residents have access to a wide range of community services and resources. MHDC's experience as developer, owner, property manager, and services provider of its properties continue to allow MHDC to successfully house its residents and create innovative partnerships with other community-based institutions to enriched residents' living environments while strengthening the existing fabric of the Mission District neighborhood and other neighborhoods in the City of San Francisco.

MEDA's Community Real Estate (CRE) program was launched in summer 2014 as an urgent response to stem the displacement happening to low-income and working-class families in the Mission District. San Francisco's Mission District has always been a supportive place for low-income and immigrant Latinos, but it's now one of the least affordable neighborhoods in the country. MEDA is using their experience to keep Latinos and working families in the Mission District and help them thrive. MEDA's CRE program develops real estate from site identification to asset management, with the Mission District in San Francisco as their primary geography. Through the development and asset management process, this program:

- Establishes the vision for the Mission District.
- Incorporates green and financially sustainable elements of long-term operations.
- Integrates asset building programs into its properties to ensure pathways to family economic success.

From 2020 to 2022, as a non-controlling general partner, MEDA was part of the team that completed four-tax credit new construction developments listed below.

| Project Name | Project <br> Type | Construction <br> Type | Placed In <br> Service |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Casa Adelante -1296 <br> Shotwell | Senior | Type I/III | 2020 |
| Casa Adelante -2060 <br> Folsom | Family | Type I/III | 2021 |
| Casa Adelante $-2828 ~ 166^{\text {th }}$ <br> Street (Formerly known as <br> 1990 Folsom) | Family | Type I/III | 2022 |
| Casa Adelante -681 <br> Florida | Family | Type I/III | 2022 |

1.3.6 Project Management Experience and Capacity. The development team is being co-led by Kevin Kitchingham, Mission Housing's Director of Housing Development \& Construction Management, and Karoleen Feng, MEDA's Chief Real Estate Officer, who together bring more than 40 years of San Francisco-based affordable housing experience. Additional project staff from both organizations provide a depth of experience alongside a wide breadth of backgrounds to successfully deliver affordable housing.

- 1979 Mission Family Housing Project: MEDA will be lead on the Family Project.
- Organization Rep/Project Direction: Karoleen Feng, Chief Community Real Estate Officer (MEDA) 10\%
- Warren Ritter Associate Director, Production (MEDA) 25\%
- Project Manager: Jose Garcia, Associate Director, Preservation (MEDA) 30\%
- Project Assistant: Victoria Vera, Project Assistant (MEDA) 50\%
- 1979 Mission Permanent Supportive Housing Project: MHDC will be lead on the PSH project.
- Organization Rep/Project Direction: Kevin Kitchingham, Director of Housing Development \& Construction (MHDC) 15\%
- Project Manager: Carlos Melgoza, Project Developer (MHDC) 35\%
- Leo Stroe Associate Project Developer (MHDC) 40\%

Both Sponsors have limited experience leading development teams on new construction projects. Both of these Projects are nuanced and will require detailed work and organization. Due to this and the experience level of the Sponsors, MOHCD is requiring that if the Sponsors are unable to meet the following milestones per the Attachment A of this document, the Sponsor will engage a $3^{\text {rd }}$ party consultant to lead the Project Management. Consultant fees will be paid from the Sponsor's developer fee and will not be added to the development budgets. See Section 9 Loan Conditions.

| Milestones | Family | Date Due |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Milestone 1 | Exploratory Study | December 17, 2024, or <br> as extended by <br> MOHCD in its sole <br> discretion |
| Milestone 2 | Detailed Proposal for <br> Project Scope | February 28, 2025 |
| Milestone 3 | Entitlement approval | November 2025 |
| Milestone 4 | HCD Applications <br> Submitted | August 2026 |
| Milestones | PSH | Date Due |
| Milestone 1 | Concept and budget <br> of building | July 30, 2024 |


| Milestone 2 | Draft lot-line <br> adjustment | July 30, 2024 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Milestone 3 | Detailed Proposal for <br> Project Scope | July 30, 2024 |
| Milestone 4 | Entitlement approval | June 2025 |
| Milestone 5 | HCD MHP <br> Application <br> Submitted | March 2025 |

Current MOHCD Projects Underway by MEDA and MHDC:
Below is a list of projects that Sponsors currently have underway with MOHCD. MEDA has a comparatively more limited staff capacity for new development activities, and as such tend to be better complemented by JV structures, where the co-Sponsor can provide additional support on the financing and construction management side.

Both MEDA and Mission Housing benefit from experience working with City agencies and have substantial physical assets in the same district where the Project is proposed.

| Sponsor/Address of <br> Project/Status | MOHCD Project Manager Report |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MOHCD Construction <br> Rep Report |  |  |
| Honda/Predevelopment | Predevelopment stage, having just <br> acquired the Project site through a <br> MOHCD loan and taken on an <br> architect. Only one draw to date. No <br> issues thus far with capacity, due <br> diligence or cost control. In some <br> limited instances concern that Mission <br> Housing may assume lower costs than <br> likely to be faced for certain predev <br> uses/activities. | MHDC team had an issue <br> on keeping CMD in the <br> loop for procurement. They <br> have solved that. But <br> forgot to keep CR in the <br> loop on procurement and <br> project updates. |
| MEDA/ 2205 Mission <br> St/Predevelopment | MEDA held regular check-in meetings <br> with MOHCD, and presented <br> construction, financing, and other <br> updates. Generally, the organization <br> provided comprehensive updates, <br> however, the MEDA team had <br> challenges disclosing issues that had <br> high risks to the project. | Report Forthcoming |
| MEDA (w/YCD)/ <br> Potrero <br> Yard/Predevelopment | Report Forthcoming |  |
| MEDA (w/CCDC)/ <br> 1515 S. Van <br> Ness/Predevelopment | Predevelopment on a City owned Site. <br> Completed Prelim Gap and <br> successfully obtained an MHP Award. | CR concurs with PM's <br> comments that MEDA has <br> limited staff capacity. After |


|  | Draws have been relatively smooth. <br> Only area of modest challenge has <br> been delays on receiving commercial <br> plan given dynamics between the two <br> Sponsors AND the demands of many <br> neighborhood stakeholders. | the MEDA staff assigned to <br> 1515 SVN left, MEDA <br> hired Zen Development for <br> ongoing consultation. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

### 1.3.7 Past Performance.

1.3.7.1 City audits/performance plans. MOHCD staff report that MEDA is currently performing well with the homeownership pre- and post-purchase counseling, rental housing counseling, financial capabilities, and the Mission District projects that the City funds through the Public Services portfolio.
Staff also report, "Both organizations are still under fiscal monitoring and compliance review, so no new updates for FY 23-24 yet. For Mission Housing Development Corporation, their fiscal monitoring has been fine and audits okay with no findings, other than an audit finding for the South Park Scattered Sites for 2022. MEDA's finance team experienced turnover in 2021 and had difficulties rehiring during and after the pandemic. In the 2022 audit, MEDA was cleared of two weaknesses identified in their 2021 audit. The CPA auditor identified a material weakness in MEDA's internal controls of financial reports, mostly around closing out their accounting records/general ledger in a timely manner, causing delays in their audit and making a lot of adjustments with the CPA auditor. As of $9 / 16 / 23$, MEDA's previous CFO left the organization, and Pamela Benoit began as CFO. In reviewing MEDA's response to the CPA Auditor, MEDA has increased staffing including adding a new role in their grant management.
"MEDA's Citywide monitoring is still in-progress. OEWD is currently leading the process and with the CFO change, this might take longer. However, with the completion of the 2022 audit weakness, it is clear that there will be some learning transition period with the new CFO and financial team at MEDA."
1.3.7.2 Marketing/lease-up/operations. MHDC has most recently marketed and leased-up Kapuso at the Upper Yard located at 2340 San Jose Ave. MHDC hired Caritas Management to complete the Marketing Plan and leaseup activities for the 91 Tax Credit units. Initially, during the Marketing Plan review period and the 21-day marketing period the MHDC project management team was very involved. Staff created an effective and professional marketing video and did on-the-ground marketing to run concurrently with the MOHCD marketing requirements (print publications, social media posts, outreach flyer distribution to organizations that serve targeted groups, etc.). Although Staff failed to place the DAHLIA banner on the building, their marketing was successful with 8,474 total applications, including 11 Certificate of Preference Holders, 25 Displaced Tenant Certificate holders, 1,555 Neighborhood Preference households, and 7,458

Live or Work in San Francisco families. According to MOHCD staff, overall, it was a very successful marketing outcome.

Lease-up began on March 23, 2023, with Caritas Management taking the lead as a MHDC contractor. From the onset, concern was voiced that MHDC needed additional staff to handle a lease-up of this size. Caritas Management requested ten staff to work on the lease-up. MHDC was able to staff four of the ten positions. Caritas Management met with the lease-up team weekly until they were $100 \%$ leased on December 29, 2023. The staff was knowledgeable and prepared; however, they were understaffed for the majority of the lease-up. MOHCD's HBMR team and the front desk received calls and emails that applicants and their housing counselors were not able to get into contact with leasing agents. The MOHCD development team met with Related and Caritas to voice their staffing concerns, but MHDC did not show up to the meeting on October 16, 2023. There was a lack of support from MHDC for Caritas, being MHDC's first lease-up of a new 100\% Affordable project. Eventually, the lease-up team was able to gather additional temporary staff and completed the lease-up by the deadline of December 31, 2023. Going forward, MOHCD expects MHDC to take on more of an active role in all aspects of the lease up including monitoring their contractor with lease-up activities and adjusting to their needs such as staffing, rent concessions, and rent reductions to ensure that a project's lease-up is effective and timely.

MEDA has most recently worked on the marketing for 681 Florida. During previous leasing events, MEDA did not complete marketing plans or leaseups, instead TNDC took the lead on the marketing plan and lease-up activity for 681 Florida. MEDA's main duty was to execute on the ground, market within the neighborhood, and help households apply for the lottery and with lease-ups through their housing counseling departments. They were very successful with marketing to the neighborhood and targeted groups. For 681 Florida, 1,156 applicants received Neighborhood Preference. If leading a lease-up on their own, MEDA would need support from MOHCD or a $3^{\text {rd }}$ party contractor to help guide them through the marketing and lease-up process. Also, they would need a compliance team or $3^{\text {rd }}$ party contractor to work on lease-up files to ensure they meet the compliance requirements. In the past, with the Small Sites Program, MEDA has had challenges maintaining its staffing. MOHCD would require adequate staff to be allocated for marketing and lease-up.

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

| Site Description |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning: | NCT - Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial <br> Transit District (See Planning Code Section 754) |


|  | and the 105-X and 55-X Height and Bulk <br> Districts |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum units allowed by <br> current zoning (N/A if rehab): | The Site is located in the NCT - Mission Street <br> Neighborhood Commercial Transit District. The <br> NCT designation doesn't restrict the overall <br> number of units, but stipulates that to ensure an <br> adequate supply of family-sized units in existing <br> and new housing stock in NCT, new residential <br> construction must include a minimum percentage <br> of units of at least two bedrooms; however, <br> pursuant to 207.6(b)(3) of the Planning Code, this <br> requirement is waived for buildings containing <br> 100\% affordable housing units |
| Seismic (if applicable): | Liquefaction Zone per Planning maps. More <br> review will be conducted during predevelopment. <br> Sponsor is currently procuring a Geotechnic and <br> Soils consultant. |
| Soil type: | Soil Mitigation Plan prepared by Professional <br> Service Industries, Inc. dated June 20, 2013. Per <br> report, Lead was the only metal detected at a <br> concentration above the screening criteria of ten <br> times its soluble limit threshold concentrations. <br> The only sample with lead above this screening <br> criteria was the one-foot bgs composite sample <br> with a total lead concentration of 550 mg/kg. |
| Adjacent uses (North): | Under SB35 or AB2162, the Projects would be <br> exempt from CEQA. No federal funds are <br> expected at this time. <br> Phase I report prepared by Professional Service <br> Industries, Inc. dated January 13, 2013. Phase II <br> Subsurface Investigation was conducted on <br> January 21, 2013, by Professional Service <br> Industries, Inc. Based on the 2013 studies <br> remediation at the site will be required and <br> Sponsor will provide the remediation plan to <br> MOHCD and Department of Public Health for <br> approval. The Sponsor will commission a new <br> Phase I study by October 17, 2024, as part of due <br> diligence required for the financing for the <br> Projects and to determine the extent of <br> remediation required for the Projects. |
| Marshall Elementary School |  |


| Adjacent uses (South): | US Bank Branch immediately south surrounded by two- to four- story residential developments with ground floor commercial. To the southwest is the BART plaza. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adjacent uses (East): | Capp Street is the adjacent border and includes two- to four- story residential developments with ground floor commercial. HSH is currently operating a Tiny Homes Village on the former Walgreens parking lot on Capp Street. |
| Adjacent uses (West): | Mission Street is the adjacent border. Across Mission Street are two- to four- story residential developments with ground floor commercial and the southwest BART plaza. 1950 Mission, a $100 \%$ affordable housing project, is directly across the street. |
| Neighborhood Amenities within 0.5 miles: | - Grocery Stores <br> - Foods Co <br> - E\&M Market <br> - Hwa Lei Market <br> - Mi Tierra Market <br> - Super Mercado <br> - Foodhall <br> - La Canasta Produce <br> - Schools <br> - Marshall Elementary School <br> - San Francisco Friends School <br> - Millenium School <br> - La Scuola International School <br> - Petite Explorer Preschool <br> - Healthcare <br> - Women's Community Clinic <br> - Mission Neighborhood Health Center <br> - Native American Health Center <br> - San Francisco Family Clinic Consortium <br> - UCSF Alliance Health Project <br> - One Medical: Supriya Bhat, MD <br> - Places of Worship <br> - St John the Evangelist Episcopal Church |


|  | - Fuente de Vida SF "Un Oasis Espiritual" <br> - Full Gospel Chapel <br> - CornerstoneSF Church - Mission Campus <br> - Experience Church <br> - Grace Fellowship Community Cumberland Presbyterian Church <br> - Parks Kidpower Park In Chan Kaajal Park Franklin Square |
| :---: | :---: |
| Public Transportation within 0.5 miles: | SFMTA lines $14,14 \mathrm{R}, 33,55$ and 49 are less than 50 ft away. BART 16th Street southeast Station is located at the Site. BART southwest Station is located across the street from the Site. |
| Article 34: | Not Exempt: will seek authorization during predevelopment period. |
| Article 38: | Not Exempt: Per https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/ site is located in an area with elevated pollutant concentrations. Sensitive use buildings, as defined in the Applicability section of the Ordinance, must comply with Health Code Article 38. |
| Accessibility: | TBD |
| Green Building: | TBD - Green features will be determined during predevelopment and are expected to meet the minimum TCAC Green Building Requirements and the City's Green Building Code. |
| Recycled Water: | TBD |
| Storm Water Management: | TBD |

2.1 Description. The Site consists of a 57,325 square foot lot located at the northeast corner of Mission Street and 16th Street. The Site extends to Capp Street to the East and bound by 16th Street to the South, and 16th and Mission Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Plaza.
2.2 Zoning. The Site is located in the NCT - Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District (See Planning Code Section 754) and the 105-X and 55-X Height and Bulk Districts. The NCT district is intended to promote a vibrant mix of uses while maintaining the characteristics of this formerly industrially zoned area. Within the NCT, permitted uses include, but are not limited to retail, educational facilities, and housing, with family-sized dwelling units encouraged.

Pursuant to 207.6(a) of the planning code, to ensure an adequate supply of familysized units in existing and new housing stock, new residential construction must include a minimum percentage of units of at least two bedrooms; however, pursuant to $207.6(b)(3)$ of the Planning Code, this requirement is waived for buildings containing $100 \%$ affordable housing units

The Project is expected to qualify for ministerial approvals from the Planning Department through SB35 or AB2162, for example, which may be used in conjunction with the State Density Bonus Program or the Affordable Housing Density Bonus Program. Planning has mentioned that the project will qualify for a higher based density if the entire parcel, i.e. both the Family portion and the PSH portion, applies under the same State Density application. If combined, the narrative portion of Planning's application may be simplified as well.

The BART plazas are classified as Open Space. If some/all of the adjacent BART plaza were merged with the Site, then this merged site would adhere to the $105-\mathrm{X}$ and can utilize SB35 or AB2162 to maximize height.

### 2.3 Probable Maximum Loss. N/A

2.4 Local/Federal Environmental Review. Under SB35 or AB 2162, or other affordable bonus programs, the Project would be exempt from CEQA. No federal funds are expected at this time.

### 2.5 Environmental Issues.

- Phase I/II Site Assessment Status and Results. The Sponsors will conduct Environmental studies within 6 months and will report the Site's status to MOHCD.
- Potential/Known Hazards. TBD
2.6 Adjacent uses and neighborhood amenities. 1979 Mission is a prime example of urban infill development, surrounded by a dense and well-established neighborhood. A public plaza with one of the entrances to the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street BART station is immediately adjacent to the Site's southwest corner. Further to the south and west, the neighborhood is densely built up with a mixture of multifamily and commercial buildings ranging in height from one to nine stories. This pattern repeats itself to the north and east, with a mixture of uses where residential is slightly more predominant. A public elementary school, Marshall Elementary, is located immediately next door to the north of the Site along Capp Street. The Site enjoys immediate access to BART, and bus lines operated by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) that offer direct service to downtown, and ample crosstown routes. Mission Street has a long history as one of San Francisco's most prominent shopping districts with a vibrant mix of local businesses that cater to the neighborhood's Latinx and Asian residents.
2.7 Green Building. Green features will be determined during predevelopment and are expected to meet the minimum TCAC Green Building Requirements and the City's Green Building Code.
2.8 Flood Designation. This location does not fall within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) pursuant to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM).


## 3. COMMUNITY SUPPORT

3.1 Prior Outreach. Both MHDC and MEDA have engaged in conversations for the past three years with Plaza 16 Coalition, a key neighborhood stakeholder that has been pivotal in the community advocacy efforts for this Site.
3.2 Future Outreach. The Sponsors will hold quarterly stakeholder meetings with Plaza 16 Coalition which will increase in frequency during key milestones, such as the design stage and marketing/lease-up. For ongoing engagement of those who cannot attend meetings, the Sponsors also have a strong online communications and media presence on social media.
3.3 Proposition I. Chapter 79 of the City's Administrative Code requires public noticing (Prop I) for initial City funding made to any new construction project. The Sponsor will complete the noticing process 30 days before the Mayor signs the loan documents.

## 4. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

### 4.1 Site Control.

4.1.1 Proposed Property Ownership Structure. The Sponsors will create two new parcels - one for the PSH Project and one for the Family Project -- during predevelopment, which MOHCD will own and ground lease to the respective Limited Partnership entities. Each Ground Lease will carry a 75 -year term with an option to extend the term for one 24 -year period. The ground lease base rent payment will be $\$ 15,000$ per year for the Family Project and $\$ 1$ per year for the PSH Project. If there is commercial space in the Family Project, it may be governed by a commercial ground lease.
4.2 Proposed Design. The RFQ initially noted a minimum unit size and programming of the building. At this time, the Sponsor has not completed the RFQ for the design team and will return to MOHCD with design as is it developed.
4.3 Proposed Rehab Scope. N/A
4.4 Construction Supervisor/Construction Representative's Evaluation. The PSH and Family Projects are at the preliminary stages with the Sponsors outreaching to procure Owner's Representative, Architect, Structural Engineer, Civil Engineer, Surveyor and Environmental Consultant. The Geotechnical Engineer, Langan, that worked on the previous project has been granted a waiver by the City's Contract Monitoring Division to be retained for the project. The General Contractor will be procured in a subsequent Request for Proposal process.

The PSH and Family Projects will be located adjacent to each other at Mission $/ 16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Capp Streets, bordering the existing $16^{\text {th }}$ Street BART Plaza. BART and MEDA each will be conducting a structural study/analysis to determine if the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street BART plaza's infrastructure can support a Family Housing building above in its air space. The Family Housing Project with 250
units will be facing Mission Street and $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and this building's foundation/structure will interface with BART's infrastructure below and "zone of influence". The PSH project with 150 units will be constructed facing Capp Street and presumably, away from the BART zone of influence.

Preliminary discussions with Planning indicate the following:

- The $16^{\text {th }}$ Street Bart Plaza's Zoning Allows Residential Use Above, Which Will Allow Retention of the SB35 and/or SB423 Streamline Ministerial Approvals.
- The Different Height Limits Within the Property May Be Resolved with additional Stories Granted Via SB35 and/or SB423's Waiver and/or Concession.

Currently, no architectural or conceptual plans have been developed to establish initial square footage, number of stories and selection of materials. The Project Sponsors have provided preliminary construction costs of \$117.2MM for a PSH project with 120 studios and 301 -bedrooms and $\$ 204.5 \mathrm{MM}$ with 250 family units. These costs were developed by California Housing Partnership Corporation, the Project's Financial Advisor, and assumed to be based on current construction costs. These costs will need closer analysis when conceptual floor plans have been developed since these current construction costs may not adequately cover the following:

- Escalation (Labor and Materials/Future Supply Chain Issues/Inflation)
- Changes In Building Code
- Plan-Checking Compliance
- Design Contingency

The Challenges These Projects Face are as Follows:

- BART:

O Coordination, Review and Approval Process
O Zone Of Influence

- Air Rights
- Public Safety and Continuous Function with an active construction area adjacent and/or above the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street BART plaza


## - LOT SPLIT PROCESS FOR PSH PROJECT

- SFPUC AND PG\&E’S PERMANENT POWER SERVICE APPLICATIONS: Identifying adequate service and/or points of infrastructure connection
- SFMTA: With traffic congestion along mission street and $16^{\text {th }}$ street, SFMTA may require construction work for concrete foundation pours as
well as tower crane installation/demobilization and other specialty construction items, to be performed overnight, which will require night noise permits and substantial additional costs for premium pay, traffic control officers and disruption to the community.
- ARCHEOLOGICAL: Any archeological findings at the Site during construction will delay construction and add to the construction cost.
- COMMUNITY: If the community demands on-site parking and if required to be underground, this will add substantial costs due to unforeseen conditions, extra costs to remove hazardous soils, additional shoring, foundation costs and interface with BART.
4.5 Commercial Space. The RFQ states that MOHCD funds may be used to fund commercial spaces, as long as the use of funds falls within eligible uses outlined in MOHCD's Commercial Underwriting Guidelines. MEDA's budget for the Family Project includes two 10,000 SF commercial spaces, but MEDA will undertake a feasibility and massing study once they engage an Architect and will report back to MOHCD the details of the commercial space scope. Commercial space will only be considered as a requirement of entitlements. The PSH Project will not include commercial space.
4.6 Service Space. Service Space will be determined during the design phase.
4.7 Interim Use. On Oct 30, 2023, MOHCD executed an interim use Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) to detail HSH's use of the site. The 57,325 SF property contains approximately $24,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of surface parking lot, which would otherwise remain unused until the affordable housing commences construction. The MOU gives HSH the authorization to use the surface parking area to build 65 temporary Tiny Homes as part of the Alternative Shelter program. Pursuant to the terms of the MOU, HSH's use of the site commenced on October 30, 2023, and expires January 1, 2026. HSH may request an extension as needed, as determined by MOHCD and the construction schedule of the buildings. HSH also has the right to terminate the MOU with at least one month's written notice to MOHCD. If the Developer applies for funding that is likely to be awarded prior to the MOU's expiration date, MOHCD may provide HSH with a written notice to vacate the Site.
Under the terms of the agreement, HSH is prohibited from subleasing or assigning the use of the property to any other entity. HSH is responsible for all costs associated with the interim use, including utilities, operating expenses, maintenance, and repairs. Furthermore, HSH assumes full liability for any claims, damages, liabilities, or losses incurred during the interim period. HSH agreed to receive the site "as-is", and cannot perform any alterations to the property without prior notification to MOHCD.

The Sponsors may conduct Due Diligence activities during the interim use period but must notify MOHCD and HSH 60 days before those activities occur.
4.8 Infrastructure. The Family Project's Infrastructure scope falls under two categories: plaza redevelopment and structural feasibility.
The RFQ requires the Sponsor to "work with BART to develop [an] urban design vision for [the] existing northeast BART plaza and station access points, to be pursed in conjunction with similar improvements to [the] southeast plaza and station access points." The Sponsors and BART will detail the needs of northeast plaza in terms of safety, circulation, and develop the northeast BART plaza and station entrance. MOHCD will assist BART in funding applications for the redevelopment of the southeast plaza and station entrance, including IIG and AHSC as needed. The Family Project will be responsible for the costs and labor associated with design and construction of the residential units over the northeast plaza, whereas responsibility for the entirety of the southwest plaza is confined to BART's applications for infrastructure funds. MOHCD responsibility for the southwest plaza is only as co-applicant for infrastructure funds, but for no additional scope.

As required by the RFQ, the Sponsors must strive to maximize the number of affordable units, and therefore must consider the feasibility of enclosing the northeast BART plaza and constructing units within its airspace.

The second infrastructure component involves the Zone of Influence of the subterranean station and rail. The Zone of Influence refers to the area surrounding the tunnel that is likely to be affected by the load of above structures and activities. BART's tracks run below Mission Street, and the Zone of Influence extends approximately 50 feet into the Site along its frontage on Mission Street. The foundations of the Family Project would fall within the Zone of Influence because its size would likely require a pile foundation. These piles would possibly be driven within the BART station itself. The Sponsors will work with a third-party Structural Consultant to understand the required considerations of constructing the superstructure and plazas. Work on the Family Project must be pursued in a manner that preserves access to the BART station elevator, escalators, and stairs with no or minimal disruption to BART's transit operations and maintenance.

At this stage, the extent of the work and costs associated with these infrastructure components are unknown. The Sponsor has yet to initiate the structural feasibility study or engage a design team to develop a project vision. The Investigative Study will be conducted within the 6 months following selection of an Architect, and a massing/feasibility study completed 6 months after the Investigative study is completed. MOHCD staff will provide an update at preliminary gap approval of these costs and scopes.

MOHCD does not anticipate the Investigative study to impact the schedule or budget of the PSH Project.
4.9 Communications Wiring and Internet Access. The Sponsor will work with the MOHCD Construction Representative to determine the appropriate communications wiring scope that meets MOHCD's standards.
4.10 Public Art Component. The Projects will be required to budget for Public Art as required by Local Code. However, at this time the number of units and the development budget have not been detailed. The Hard Cost of Construction included in the current Budgets are based on comparable projects, not a General Contractor estimate. The below chart is provided as an example and should not be relied on for the final Art Commission obligation of either site. The formula for the Public Art obligation is calculated as (Hard Cost) x $1.0 \% \times$ (MOHCD Loan Amount/TDC) = Public Art Obligation.

|  | Family | PSH |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Hard Cost of Construction | $\$ 186,480,760$ | $\$ 117,197,735$ |
| $1 \%$ of Hard Costs | $\$ 1,864,807$ | $\$ 1,117,935$ |
| MOHCD Loan Amount | $\$ 75,000,000$ | $\$ 30,000,000$ |
| Total Development Cost | $\$ 261,765,993$ | $\$ 144,295,447$ |
| MOHCD Percentage | $28.6 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ |
| Obligation Amount | $\$ 533,334$ | $\$ 232,530$ |

4.11 Marketing, Occupancy, and Lease-Up The PSH Project will serve households exiting homelessness. Of the 150 PSH units, all but the manager's unit will serve formerly homeless persons, subsidized through a 15year LOSP contract. The 150 PSH units will be leased through the Coordinated Entry System administered by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. MOHCD's marketing policies and procedures will be applied to the approximately 250 -units in the Family Project and tenants will be selected through DAHLIA, which has four preference groups required by Chapter 47 of the Administrative Code. The following preferences will apply to the Family Project only:

| MOHCD Preference | Applicant Category* |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Certificate of Preference (COP) Holders |
| 2 | Displaced Tenants Housing Preference (DTHP) Certificate Holders <br> $(20 \%$ of the lottery units; 50 units total) |
| 3 | Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference (NRHP) <br> $(40 \%$ of the lottery units; 100 units total) |
| 4 | Live/Work in San Francisco |
| 5 | All Others |
| *New from DAHLIA as of January 2024: Priority for US Military Veterans. US Veterans receive priority within the above preference <br> categories. |  |

The unit set asides shown above are based on a 250 -unit Family Project. The Sponsor will return at preliminary gap with final unit counts.
4.12 Relocation. Currently, no residents live onsite aside from the temporary Tiny Homes overseen by HSH. Due to the terms of the MOU between HSH and MOHCD, the Site will be vacated at the time financing for the housing developments is secured. No relocation is required for residents. There are two current commercial tenants on Site: Sandy Trang and Cung Duong, who lease the premises at 2970 and 2970A $16^{\text {th }}$ Street, and Bing Chui Wong and Lai Mei Chang, who lease the premises at $296016^{\text {th }}$ Street. The Sponsor will investigate the commercial standing of these tenants and if necessary, will bring on a relocation consultant. Sponsor will return at preliminary gap with a commercial relocation plan developed for MOHCD staff's approval.

## 5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

| Development Team |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consultant Type | Name | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SBE/ } \\ & \text { LBE } \end{aligned}$ | Outstanding Procurement Issues |
| Architect | Mithun and Herman Coliver Locus Architecture | No | None |
| Landscape Architect | TBD | TBD | N/A |
| JV/other Architect | Herman Coliver Locus | Yes | None |
| General Contractor | TBD | TBD | N/A |
| Owner's Rep/Construction Manager | TBD | TBD | None - in progress. |
| Financial Consultant | Lauren Maddock, CHPC | No | N/A |
| Other Consultant | TBD | TBD | N/A |
| Legal | TBD | TBD | N/A |
| Property Manager | Caritas Management | No | N/A |
| Services Provider | Lutheran Social Services PSH) | No. | N/A |
| Other | TBD | TBD | N/A |

5.1 Procurement Plan. The Sponsors are currently working with Contract Management Division ("CMD") and MOHCD on the procurement plan and RFQs for Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer, Joint Trench, and Owner's Construction Representative. The Sponsors have completed the CMD process for the Architect and have chosen Mithun and Herman Coliver Locus Architecture. Procurement of the General Contractor will start after Loan Committee approval. The Sponsors intend to engage the same organizations for the Family Project and the PSH Project. LBE/SBE Goals: Per CMD, the LBE/SBE goal for the entire project has been set to $25 \%$.
5.2 Opportunities for BIPOC-Led Organizations. This Project intends to meet or exceed contracting goals for LBE/SBE, with a special focus on working with minority-owned businesses and local businesses from the Mission. Sponsor will direct project resources to organizations that reflect the community while seeking to reduce barriers to participation from historically disadvantaged companies and firms. In addition to directly awarding work to qualified BIPOC-led organizations, the Sponsor will seek to work with firms that can demonstrate meaningful outcomes implementing racial equity into their work.
6. FINANCING PLAN (See Attachment F for Cost Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments; See Attachment G and H for Sources and Uses).

### 6.1 Prior MOHCD/OCII Funding: There is no prior funding.

6.2 Disbursement Status. N/A
6.3 Fulfillment of Loan Conditions. N/A
6.4 Proposed Predevelopment Financing
6.4.1 Predevelopment Sources Evaluation Narrative Currently MOHCD is the sole predevelopment lender. It is unlikely that the funds provided for predevelopment are sufficient to carry the Projects through construction start. The Sponsors will provide MOHCD with a draw down schedule during predevelopment. In the event that additional predevelopment funds are needed, the Sponsor will seek additional non-City funding, with terms approved by MOHCD.

### 6.4.2 Predevelopment Uses Evaluation:

| Underwriting Standard | Family Bldg. <br> Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | PSH Bldg. <br> Meets <br> Standard? <br> (Y/N) | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition Cost is based <br> on appraisal | N/A | N/A | N/A no acquisition <br> cost |
| Holding costs are <br> reasonable | N/A | N/A | N/A MOHCD owns <br> land |
| Architecture and <br> Engineering Fees are within <br> standards | Yes | Yes | Funds may not be <br> sufficient for the <br> Family Project if <br> the building needs <br> to be split into two |
| Consultant and legal fees <br> are reasonable | Yes | Yes |  |


| Entitlement fees are <br> accurately estimated | Yes | Yes | Entitlement fees <br> have been estimated <br> and need to be <br> assessed once <br> Project details are <br> refined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Management <br> Fees are within standards | Yes | Yes |  |
| Developer Fee is within <br> standards | Yes | Yes |  |
| Soft Cost Contingency is 5- <br> $10 \%$ per standards | Yes | Yes |  |

6.5 Permanent financing is being presented to demonstrate the Projects' overall feasibility but not intended to be presented for approval at this time. Sponsor will request full approval as part of MOHCD's Gap Financing commitment.

### 6.5.1 Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative:

Family Project: Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative: The Sponsors have proposed the following permanent sources for demonstration of feasibility, which should not be relied on for actual permanent commitments:

- MOHCD Gap Loan: $\$ 75,000,000$ ( $\$ 300,000 /$ unit). The RFQ states that the Family Project will receive a MOHCD loan equivalent to $\$ 300,000$ per unit, which equals $\$ 75,000,000$ with the assumption of 250 units. The Sponsors will return at preliminary gap with a more detailed and supported number of units, which will inform the amount of MOHCD gap.
- Tax Exempt Perm Loan: $\$ 38,509,896$. The Sponsor assumes $6.5 \%$ interest rate for 15 years. MOHCD staff will work with the Sponsors on a unit mix and Operating Budget that reflects underwriting guidelines and standards. The Sponsors will return at preliminary gap with a detailed budget for a perm loan align with MOHCD underwriting.
- Deferred Developer Fee: $\$ 0$.
- GP Equity: $\$ 100$
- Investor Equity: $\$ 97,073,626$. The Sponsors assume $\$ 0.90$ per credit, which is conservative in this market. The Sponsors will return at preliminary gap with an Investor Equity amount that reflects market conditions at that time.
- HCD (AHSC \& IIG): $\$ 36,347,425$ and $\$ 14,229,300$, respectively. The Sponsors have provided AHSC and IIG as sources for demonstration purposes only. The Sponsors will return at preliminary gap with a better understanding of which HCD sources the Project will seek.
- Deferred MOHCD Interest: $\$ 605,646$. The Sponsors have assumed deferred HCD interest as a source in order to demonstrate feasibility. The Sponsors will return at
preliminary gap with an amount that reflects which Sources and Uses will be pursued at that time.

PSH Project: Permanent Sources Evaluation Narrative: The Sponsor proposes to use the following permanent sources for demonstration of feasibility, which should not be relied on for actual permanent commitments:

- MOHCD Gap Loan: $\$ 30,000,000$ ( $\$ 200,000 /$ unit). The RFQ states that the PSH Project will receive a MOHCD loan equivalent to $\$ 200,000$ per unit, which equals $\$ 30,000,000$ with the assumption of 150 units. MHDC will return at preliminary gap with a more detailed and supported number of units, which will inform the amount of MOHCD gap.
- 4\% Tax Credit Equity: $\$ 75,807,147$. Sponsor is assuming $\$ 0.92$ in federal credit pricing, which is conservative in this market, considering the market and recent pricing from projects in the MOHCD pipeline. Should the market improve an increase in equity would assist in reducing the MOHCD gap loan.
- MHP Loan: $\$ 35,000,000.55$ years, $3 \%$ simple interest rate with a $0.42 \%$ mandatory payment, and residual receipts payments. The Sponsor will provide a detailed analysis of competitiveness by preliminary gap.
- AHP Grant: $\$ 1,488,300: 15$ years, $0 \%$ interest. The Sponsors are showing AHP as a source and will apply at each funding round until awarded.
- Private Mortgage: $\$ 0$. Mortgage cannot be supported by LOSP so Sponsor is not showing a permanent loan in the current pro forma.
- Deferred Developer Fee \$0: The Sponsor is showing $\$ 0$ for deferred developer fee since the PSH Project is supported by LOSP subsidy and can't cover deferred developer fee.
- General Partner Equity ( $\$ 1,500,000$ ):
- NPLH: MOHCD commits to use up to $\$ 30,000,000$ in No Place Like Home Funds (NPLH) from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), which is the cap per the HCD regulations.
6.5.2 CDLAC Tax-Exempt Bond Application: Sponsor will return to the Loan Committee at the time of preliminary gap with a CDLAC Bond competitiveness calculation.


### 6.5.3 HOME Funds Narrative: N/A

6.5.4 Commercial Space Sources and Uses Narrative: The Sponsor has submitted a budget for commercial space for the Family Project showing $\$ 4,395,119$ as the total cost of construction. The Sponsor will return at preliminary gap with a refined commercial budget once it is determined whether or not the Family Project will include commercial space.

### 6.5.5 Permanent Uses Evaluation

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Underwriting Standard } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Family Bldg, } \\ \text { Meets Standard? } \\ \text { (Y/N) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { PSH Bldg.Meets } \\ \text { Standard? (Y/N) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Comments }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Hard Cost per unit is } \\ \text { within standards }\end{array} & \text { Yes } & \text { Yes } & \begin{array}{c}\text { The Project Sponsors } \\ \text { have provided } \\ \text { preliminary }\end{array} \\ \text { construction costs of } \\ \text { \$117.2MM for a PSH } \\ \text { project with 120 studios } \\ \text { and 30 1-bedrooms } \\ \text { (\$781,333 per unit) and } \\ \text { \$204.5MM with 250 } \\ \text { family units (\$818,000 } \\ \text { per unit) These costs } \\ \text { are based on current } \\ \text { construction costs and } \\ \text { will need closer analysis } \\ \text { when conceptual floor } \\ \text { plans have been }\end{array}\right\}$

| Entitlement fees are <br> accurately estimated | Yes | Yes | Entitlement fees have <br> been estimated and need <br> to be assessed once <br> Project details are <br> refined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Loan interest <br> is appropriately sized | TBD | TBD |  |
| Soft Cost Contingency is <br> $5-10 \%$ per standards | Yes | Yes |  |
| Capitalized Operating <br> Reserves are a minimum <br> of 3 months | Yes | Yes |  |
| Capitalized Replacement <br> Reserves are a minimum <br> of \$1,000 per unit (Rehab <br> only) | N/A (not rehab) | N/A (not rehab) |  |
| Other standards |  |  |  |

6.5.6 Developer Fee Evaluation: Below is the total developer fee for each project as presented by the Sponsors. The Sponsor will return to Loan Committee at preliminary gap with a revised Developer fee calculation:

## Family Project:

| Total Developer Fee: | $\$ 3,855,100$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Project Management Fee Paid to Date: | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Amount of Remaining Project Management Fee: | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| Amount of Fee at Risk (the "At Risk Fee"): | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  |
| Additional Project Management Fee <br> $(\$ 10,000 /$ restricted unit over 100 units) | $\$ 1,480,000$ |  |
| Amount of Commercial Space Developer Fee (the <br> "Commercial Fee"): | $\$ 175,000$ | Assumes there will be <br> commercial developer |
| Amount of Fee Deferred (the "Deferred Fee"): | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Amount of General Partner Equity Contribution <br> (the "GP Equity"): | $\$ 100$ |  |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of <br> Developer Fee remaining and payable for Project <br> Management | Amount Paid at <br> Milestone | Percentage <br> Project Management Fee |
| Entitlement Approval |  | $\$ 165,000$ |
| Submission of HCD funding application | $\$ 110,000$ | $15 \%$ |
| Submission of joint CDLAC and TCAC <br> application | $\$ 110,000$ | $10 \%$ |


| Construction close | $\$ 220,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| During Construction | $\$ 220,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Project Close-out | $\$ 110,000$ | $10 \%$ |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of <br> Developer Fee defined as At-Risk Fee |  | Percentage At Risk Fee |
| $95 \%$ lease up and draft cost certification | $\$ 516,000$ | $20 \%$ |
| Permanent conversion | $\$ 1,290,000$ | $50 \%$ |
| Project close-out | $\$ 774,00$ | $30 \%$ |

PSH Project:

| Total Developer Fee: | \$4,190,000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Management Fee Paid to Date: | \$0 |  |
| Amount of Remaining Project Management Fee: | \$1,100,000 |  |
| Amount of Fee at Risk (the "At Risk Fee"): | \$1,590,000 |  |
| Amount of Commercial Space Developer Fee (the "Commercial Fee"): | N/A |  |
| Amount of Fee Deferred (the "Deferred Fee"): | \$0 |  |
| Amount of General Partner Equity Contribution (the "GP Equity"): | \$1,500,000 |  |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of Developer Fee remaining and payable for Project Management | Amount Paid at Milestone | Percentage Project <br> Management Fee |
| Predevelopment Loan Closing | \$165,000 | 15\% |
| Approval of Entitlements | \$165,000 | 15\% |
| Submission of HCD App | \$110,000 | 10\% |
| Submission of TCAC App | \$110,000 | 10\% |
| Construction Closing | \$220,000 | 20\% |
| During Construction | \$220,000 | 20\% |
| Project close-out | \$110,000 | 10\% |
| Milestones for Disbursement of that portion of Developer Fee defined as At-Risk Fee |  | Percentage At Risk Fee |
| 100\% lease up and draft cost certification | \$318,000 | 20\% |
| Permanent conversion | \$795,000 | 50\% |
| Project close-out | \$477,000 | 30\% |

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

 Proforma)7.1 Annual Operating Budget. Since this Loan Evaluation is for a predevelopment request, the annual operating budget is being presented to demonstrate the project's overall feasibility but is not intended to be presented for approval at this time.

The PSH Project will include $100 \%$ LOSP and the operating budget will be funded with HSH general funds. Major operating budget drivers for all MOHCD projects include insurance, utilities, and payroll, and for PSH projects, additional cost drivers are front desk coverage and repairs of damage to units and common spaces. The operating budget will need to be refined through predevelopment so that Sponsor presents a MOHCD budget at gap financing application within underwriting guidelines and in line with comparable projects. In addition, MHDC should apply for additional subsidy to solidify the Project budget for future years, including Continuum of Care (CoC) funding for a portion or all the PSH units. If awarded CoC , then the Project will need to apply for and obtain NEPA Approval.

The Family Project will not include units subsidized by LOSP.

### 7.1.2 Operating Budget Comparison

Cost comparables for the Family Project include new construction projects of multifamily housing of more than 75 units, non-LOSP buildings, and rental residential properties. The average PUPA of the comparable properties is $\$ 13,437$. As provided within the budget provided by the Sponsor, the first year, 2027 PUPA is $\$ 8,002$, below the average of comparable buildings. The Sponsors will continue to work with MOHCD staff on a revised and accurate Operating Budget closer to the time of preliminary gap financing.


### 7.2 Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation.

## PSH PROJECT:

The proposed annual operating budget is $\$ 2,743,029$, or $\$ 18,287$ PUPA before reserves, fees and debt service. Operating costs are reasonable for a permanent supportive housing project of this size, and slightly above average of comparable $100 \%$ permanent supportive housing projects escalated to 2026. The operating budget, based on 1633 Valencia Street and approved by Loan Committee earlier this year, incorporates lessons learned from other supportive housing projects, which has needed increased staffing and part time site security for similar size building and population. MOHCD will work with the Sponsor to refine the operating budget before going to MOHCD for gap financing approval.


| $\begin{array}{c}\text { (Family Project) } \\ \text { Underwriting Standard } \\ \text { Meets Standard? (Y/N) }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { (PSH Project) } \\ \text { Meets Standard? (Y/N) }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Debt Service Coverage } \\ \text { Ratio is minimum 1.1:1 in } \\ \text { Year 1 and stays above 1:1 } \\ \text { through Year 17 }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { No, DSCR is 1.09 in Year 1 } \\ \text { but rises above 1.1:1 in } \\ \text { years afterwards }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { No. PSH Project doesn't } \\ \text { include DSCR because } \\ \text { there is no permanent debt }\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Vacancy meets TCAC } \\ \text { Standards }\end{array}$ | Yes | Yes |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Annual Income Growth is } \\ \text { increased at 2.5\% per year } \\ \text { or 1\% for LOSP tenant } \\ \text { rents }\end{array}$ | Yes | Yacancy is 5\% |$]$| Yes |
| :---: |


| Property Management staffing level is reasonable per comparables | Yes | Proposed staffing for the PSH Project is rich, and based on the 1633 Valenci projected staffing, which is based on recent experience of operating similar size PSH <br> Project. Proposed staffing and security will be reviewed with final LOSP Contract underwriting prior to executing the LOSP agreement in 2028: <br> 1 FTE Property Manager (PM) <br> 2 FTE Assistant PM . 5 FTE Housing Support Specialist (HSS) <br> 4.9 FTE Front Desk Coverage <br> 3 FTE Janitor <br> 3 FTE Maintenance Tech 1 FTE security services contract for 5 hours / day 7 days / week |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset Management and Partnership Management Fees meet standards | Yes | Yes |
| Replacement Reserve Deposits meet or exceed TCAC minimum standards | Yes. The Sponsor estimates a Replacement Reserve annual deposit of \$125,000 (\$500/unit/annum). TCAC requires $\$ 250$ per/unit/annum. | Yes. The Sponsor estimates a Replacement Reserve annual deposit of \$75,000 @ \$500/unit/annum (TCAC requires $\$ 250 /$ unit/annum for new construction) |
| Limited Partnership Asset Management Fee meets standards | Yes | Yes |

Operating costs are subsidized by LOSP program, allowing residents to pay 30\% of their income in rent, Projected staffing level is based on 1633 Valencia Street and is high at 15.4 FTE , or 1 FTE per 9 households, including full time desk clerk coverage, vacation \& holiday desk clerk coverage, one Property Manager and two

Assistant Property Managers, 0.5 FTE Housing Support Specialist; 3 FTE janitors and 3 maintenance staff. The budget includes a security services contract for 5 hours /day 7 days a week to provide assistance both inside and outside of the building. Within the building, the security service would visit floors and report any incidents to the front desk staff; they would assist with de-escalation when there is an altercation, as well as help secure the front desk area when the desk clerk needs to step away from the desk. They would help block unauthorized guests into the property, which has been an ongoing issue at other supportive housing projects. Outside the building, security would help de-escalate incidents between residents. The staffing budget for the PSH Project is based on the 1633 Valencia Project, a 145-unit project for formerly homeless persons approved by Loan Committee earlier this year. The staffing plan and proposed security will be further discussed with HSH and MOHCD before the LOSP contract underwriting is taken to Loan Committee prior to entering into the LOSP agreement.


## Staffing Summary.

Permanent Supportive Housing: Below is the staffing chart from tab 6 a of the PSH pro forma.

| Office Salaries | Desk Clerk | \$24.25 | \$50,450 | 1.0 | \$50,450 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Desk Clerk | \$24.25 | \$50,450 | 1.0 | \$50,450 |
|  | Desk Clerk | \$24.25 | \$50,450 | 1.0 | \$50,450 |
|  | Desk Clerk | \$24.25 | \$50,450 | 1.0 | \$50,450 |
|  | Desk Clerk | \$24.25 | \$50,450 | 0.9 | \$45,405 |
|  | Desk Clerk <br> Contract | \$30.72 | \$63,907 | 1.0 | \$63,907 |
|  | Average | \$25.33 | Subtotals | 5.9 | \$311,112 |


| Manager's Salary | Property <br> Management | \$40.14 | \$83,500 | 1.0 | \$83,500 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Assistant Property Manager | \$28.66 | \$59,623 | 2.0 | \$119,246 |
|  | Housing Support Specialist | \$20.91 | \$43,500 | 0.5 | \$21,750 |
|  | Average | \$29.91 | Subtotals | 3.5 | \$224,496 |
| Janitorial | Janitor Housekeeper | \$25.36 | \$52,744 | 3.0 | \$158,232 |
|  | Average | \$25.36 | Subtotals | 3.0 | \$158,232 |
| Maintenance | Maintenance Tech | \$27.56 | \$57,330 | 2.0 | \$114,660 |
|  | Maintenance Manager | \$33.08 | \$68,796 | 1.0 | \$68,796 |
|  | Average | \$30.32 | Subtotals | 3.0 | \$183,456 |
| Total, Janitorial \& Maintenance: | Average, J\&M | \$27.84 | SubTotals, $J \& M$ | 6.0 | \$341,688 |
| Security Payroll/Contract | Security Services Contract | \$39.48 | \$82,125 | 1.0 | \$82,125 |
|  | Average | \$39.48 | \$82,125 | 1.0 | \$82,125 |
| Total FTEs and Expenses, Non-Services Staffing |  |  |  | 16.4 | \$959,421 |

The RFQ requires a 1:25 ratio of services staff for the PSH project; however, HSH's current services ratio is $1: 20$ so the Project will need to increase services from 6 FTE Case Managers to 7.5 FTE. MOHCD staff will work with the Sponsor to refine the staffing so that it reflects the appropriate level of staff.

| Paid by HSH in a separate Services Budget | Case Manager | \$29.33 | \$61,000 | 5.8 | \$353,800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Program and Clinical Supervisor | \$45.67 | \$95,000 | 2.0 | \$190,000 |
|  | Resident Service Coordinator II | \$42.15 | \$87,667 | 1.5 | \$131,500 |
|  | Director Oversight and Data Analyst | \$43.27 | \$90,000 | 0.4 | \$36,000 |
|  | Benefits | \$63.58 | \$132,244 | 1.0 | \$132,244 |
|  | Misc (Supplies, Training, Travel, Indirect) | \$76.30 | \$158,696 | 1.0 | \$158,696 |
|  | Average | \$50.05 | Subtotals | 11.7 | \$1,002,240 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total FTEs and Expenses, Services Staffing |  |  |  | 11.7 | \$1,002,240 |

Income Restrictions for All Sources. The RFQ required that Sponsors of the Site adhere to separate income requirements for each portion of the Project. The unit mix will be determined at a later date within the parameters of the RFQ, which stated as such:

Family Project: Serve low-income families (in 1-3-bedroom units) unsubsidized with an income range between 30\%-80\% MOHCD Unadjusted Area Median Income, average no more than $60 \%$ MOHCD AMI; no studios; include set-aside for referrals from MOHCD for HIV+ households (Plus Housing program). The Sponsors have submitted a budget model that does not reflect the requirements of the RFQ, such as 102 units at $80 \%$ AMI. As such, the Sponsors will revise their assumptions in order to align with the RFQ and MOHCD underwriting guidelines. See Section 9, Loan Conditions.

## 8. SUPPORT SERVICES

8.1. Services Plan. Lutheran Social Services (LSS) shall provide supportive services to PSH households through Full Time Case Managers, Service Coordinators and other Service Specialists while Mission Housing services staff will provide support services to family households w through Full Time Case Managers, Service Coordinators and other Service Specialists. Supportive services include Intakes and Assessments, Case Management, Supportive Counselling, Individualized Service Planning, Benefits Counseling, Job Training and Employment Counseling, Immigration Assistance, Health Insurance Counseling, Crisis Intervention, Mediation, Housing Stabilization and Eviction Prevention. The HSH ratio for FTE to unit is 1:20. The RFQ states 1:25 ratio.
8.2 Services Budget. This is a preliminary plan and budget. The Sponsor will work with MOHCD and HSH to approve the plan and budget during predevelopment
$8.3 \mathrm{DPH} / \mathrm{HSA}$ Assessment of Service Plan and Budget. This is a preliminary plan and budget. The Sponsor will work with MOHCD and HSH to approve the plan and budget during predevelopment.

## 9. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Proposed Loan/Grant Terms

| Financial Description of Proposed Loan |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loan Amount: | $\$ 3,500,000$ (Family Loan) | $\$ 2,500,000$ (PSH Loan) |
| Loan Term: | Predevelopment Period, <br> Construction Period, plus <br> 55 years of operating | Predevelopment Period, <br> Construction Period, plus <br> 55 years of operating |
| Loan Maturity Date: | Estimated 2078 | Estimated 2078 |
| Loan Repayment Type: | Repayment due to the <br> extent that residual cash | Repayment due to the <br> extent that residual cash |


|  | flow is available and at <br> expiration of the loan term | flow is available and at <br> expiration of the loan term |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loan Interest Rate: | $3.00 \%$ | $3.00 \%$ |
| Date Loan Committee <br> approves prior expenses <br> can be paid: | November 17,2023 | November 17, 2023 |

### 9.2 Recommended Loan Conditions

1.Sponsor must provide MOHCD with detailed monthly updates via the MOH Monthly Project Update, including on:

- Community outreach completed,
- Outcomes achieved related to racial equity goals, and
- Commercial-use programming.

2. MOHCD is requiring that if the Sponsors are unable to meet the milestones per the Attachment A of this document, the Sponsor will engage a Project Management consultant with expertise in new construction of multi-family residential with a significant infrastructure component, to lead the Project Management. Consultant fees will be paid from the Sponsors' developer fee and will not be added to the development budgets.
3. The Sponsors must amend the MOU to delineate asset management and operations duties between the Sponsors.
4. The Sponsors must conduct a Phase I Environmental Investigation by October 17, 2024. If a Phase II study is recommended by the Sponsor-procured Phase I report, then a Phase II report must be submitted to MOHCD by the time of Gap Approval. Any other Environmental Report recommended by a third-party other than the Environmental Consultant procured by the Sponsor isn't subject to the same deadline.
5. The current proformas should meet MOHCD underwriting guidelines. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with a services plan and proposed staffing levels that meet MOHCD underwriting standards prior to gap loan approval. Any changes to the current proposed staffing will need to be presented to MOHCD at least 90 days prior to gap loan approval.
6. Sponsor must work with MOHCD staff and project's General Contractor to Value Engineer the construction budget in order to maximize MOHCD funding.
7. Sponsor must work with MOHCD staff to revise unit mix and project scope, including the improvement of the BART plaza and its air-space.
8. Sponsor must provide signed LOI/s from commercial tenants prior to MOHCD's gap loan closing.
9. Sponsor must provide MOHCD with information outlining cost containment, efficiencies and innovation strategies to reduce overall project costs and maximize efficiency of MOHCD gap loans.
10. Sponsor must provide commercial space plan, if applicable, to MOHCD no less than 90 days prior to loan committee date for gap loan, including outcomes achieved related to racial equity goals.
11. Sponsor to work with MOHCD and HSH to establish the LOSP budget and income restrictions for the referrals from coordinated entry.
12. Sponsor must: a) provide for MOHCD review of the Request For Proposals (RFP) for equity investors and lenders for each project before it is finalized and distributed; b) provide for MOHCD review of all raw financial data from developer or financial consultant prior to selection; c) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all selected investors and lenders; and, d) provide for MOHCD review and approval of all letters of intent from financial partners.
13. Sponsor must provide initial draft marketing plan for each project within 12 months of anticipated TCO, outlining the affirmative steps they will take to market the project to the city's preference program participants, including cop holders, displaced tenants, and neighborhood residents, as well as how the marketing is consistent with the mayor's racial equity statement and promotion of positive outcomes for African American San Franciscans.
14. Sponsor must provide quarterly updated response to any letters requesting corrective action.
15. Sponsor must submit an updated $1^{\text {st }}$ year operating budget and 20-years cash flow - if any changes have occurred - by November $1^{\text {st }}$ before the year the project will achieve TCO so that MOHCD may request the LOSP subsidy.
16. The above contemplated MOHCD predevelopment loans amounts may be insufficient to cover the full cost of predevelopment activities. Sponsor must obtain MOHCD approval for any additional predevelopment financing.
17. Sponsor must return at preliminary gap with a commercial relocation plan developed for MOHCD staff's approval.
18. Sponsor must complete a structural feasibility study to assess structural requirements and the possibility for building over BART's airspace to MOHCD by December 17, 2024, or by a later date as extended by MOHCD in its sole discretion.

## 10. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

Date: $\qquad$
Daniel Adams, 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.

Marc Slutzkin, Deputy Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
[ ] APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Date: $\qquad$
Anna Van Degna, Director
Controller's Office of Public Finance

Attachments: A. Project Milestones/Schedule
B. Borrower Org Chart
C. Developer Resumes
D. Asset Management Analysis of Sponsor
E. Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria
F. Site Map with amenities
G. Elevations and Floor Plans, if available
H. Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments
I. Predevelopment Budgets
J. Development Budgets
K. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budgets
L. 20-year Operating Pro Formas

FW: Request for Predevelopment Financing for 1979 Mission Street
Adams, Dan (MYR) [Dan.Adams@sfgov.org](mailto:Dan.Adams@sfgov.org)
Mon 5/20/2024 6:34 AM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
I approve the above request. Thank you.
Daniel Adams
Director
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco

## 1979 Missions St.

Menjivar, Salvador (HOM) [salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org](mailto:salvador.menjivar1@sfgov.org) Thu 5/23/2024 4:10 PM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
I approve Mission Economic Development Agency and Mission Housing Development Corporation Request for $\$ 6,000,000$ in predevelopment loans for the development of approximately 250 new affordable family rental units and approximately 150 new permanent supportive housing rental units on the land located at 1979 Mission and 16th Street \& Capp Streets.

Best,

Salvador Menjivar
Director of Housing
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

## Request for Predevelopment Financing for 1979 Mission Street

Slutzkin, Marc (CII) [marc.slutzkin@sfgov.org](mailto:marc.slutzkin@sfgov.org)
Fri 5/17/2024 11:32 AM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) [Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org](mailto:Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org)
Cc:Ely, Lydia (MYR) [lydia.ely@sfgov.org](mailto:lydia.ely@sfgov.org);Kaslofsky, Thor (CII) [Thor.Kaslofsky@sfgov.org](mailto:Thor.Kaslofsky@sfgov.org);Colomello, Elizabeth (CII) [elizabeth.colomello@sfgov.org](mailto:elizabeth.colomello@sfgov.org);Adams, Dan (MYR) [Dan.Adams@sfgov.org](mailto:Dan.Adams@sfgov.org)

Hi Vanessa,

I approve the above request on behalf of OCII.

Thanks

Marc


Marc Slutzkin
Deputy Director

[^0]f www.sfocii.org

## REQUEST FOR PREDEVELOPMENT FINANCING FOR 1979 MISSION STREET

## Katz, Bridget (CON) [bridget.katz@sfgov.org](mailto:bridget.katz@sfgov.org)

Fri 5/17/2024 11:32 AM
To:Amaya, Vanessa (MYR) < Vanessa.Amaya@sfgov.org>
Approve

## Bridget Katz

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

## Attachment A: Project Milestones and Schedule

| Performance <br> Milestone | Family Bldg. | PSH Bldg. | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop I Noticing | April 2024 | April 2024 | Done |
| Predev Financing <br> Commitment | May 17, 2024 | May 17, 2024 | Loan Committee <br> $5 / 17 / 2024$ <br> Communications <br> and Outreach plan <br> Development Team <br> Selection <br> May 20, 2024 <br> Architect |
| Structural <br> Engineer | May 20, 2024 |  |  |
| General <br> Contractor | May 30, 2024 | May 30, 2024 |  |
| Owner's <br> Representative | Mune 30, 2024 | June 30, 2024 |  |
| Property Manager | Completed | May 9, 2024 | Mithun and Herman |
| Service Provider | Completed | Completed | Coliver |
| BART/Geotech <br> Investigation | May 31, 2024 | Caritas |  |
| Sponsors' portion of <br> Investigative Study <br> Completed | December 17, 2024 | N/A | LSS |
| Architect-provided <br> Analysis of Massing <br> Feasibility | February, 2025 | N/A |  |
| Lot-Line <br> Adjustment Draft | N/A | July 30, 2024 | PSH will take lead |
| on lot subdivide |  |  |  |
| Submittal of <br> Conceptual Design | July 30, 2024 |  |  |
| Design | Mruary 28, 2025 |  |  |


| Submittal of 50\% <br>  <br> Cost Estimate | Feb 28, 2025 | Sept 30, 2024 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Submittal of 50\% <br> Design <br>  <br> Cost Estimate | May 30, 2025 | Dec 31, 2024 |  |
| Submittal of 50\% <br> CD Set \& Cost <br> Estimate | July 30, 2025 | Feb 28, 2025 |  |
| Submittal of Pre- <br> Bid Set \& Cost <br> Estimate (75\%-80\% <br> CDs) | Sept 30, 2025 | April 30, 2025 |  |
| Commercial Space |  |  |  |
| Commercial <br> Space Plan <br> Submission | Jan 2026 |  |  |
| LOI/s Executed | N/A |  |  |
| Environ <br> Review/Land-Use <br> Entitlements | TCO |  |  |
| Planning <br> Application <br> Submission | July 30, 2025 | February 28, 2025 |  |
| CEQA Environ <br> Review Submission | N/A | N/A |  |
| NEPA Environ <br> Review Submission | TBD | Nrior to |  |
| CUP/PUD/Variance <br> Submission | N/A | NBD |  |
| PUC/PG\&E | Feb 28, 2025 |  |  |
| Temp Power <br> Application <br> Submission | Sept 30, 2024 |  |  |
| Perm Power <br> Application <br> Submission | Sept 30, 2024 |  |  |
| Permits |  |  |  |


| Building / Site Permit Application Submitted | 9 months prior to construction | 9 months prior to construction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Addendum \#1 Submitted | 6 months prior to construction or as needed by financing | 6 months prior to construction or as needed by financing |  |
| Addendum \#2 Submitted | As needed after construction commencement | As needed after construction commencement |  |
| Request for Bids Issued | Sept 30, 2025 | April 30, 2025 |  |
| Service Plan Submission |  |  |  |
| Preliminary | Dec 2025 | April 2025 | Prelim Gap Approval |
| Final | Jan 2026 | May 2025 |  |
| City Financing |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Gap Financing Application | Jan 2026 | May 2025 | Needed for HCD Apps |
| Gap Financing Application | July 2026 | October 2025 |  |
| Other Financing |  |  |  |
| HCD Application | March or Aug 2026 | June 2025 |  |
| Construction <br> Financing RFP | Late 2026/Early 2027 | October 2025 |  |
| AHP Application | N/A | March 2025 |  |
| CDLAC <br> Application | April or Aug 2026 | April 2025 |  |
| TCAC Application | April or Aug 2026 | April 2025 |  |
| Other Financing Application | N/A | N/A |  |
| LOSP Funding Request | December 2026 | June 2025 |  |
| Closing |  |  |  |


| Construction <br> Loan Closing | Jan 2027 | Jan 2026 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Conversion of <br> Construction Loan <br> to Permanent <br> Financing | March 2030 | March 2029 |  |
| Construction | Jan 2029 | Jan 2028 |  |
| Notice to Proceed | Jan 2027 | Jan 2026 |  |
| Temporary <br> Certificate of <br> Occupancy/Cert of <br> Substantial <br> Completion | March 2029 | March 2027 |  |
| Marketing/Rent-up | May 2029 | May 2027 |  |
| Marketing Plan <br> Submission | July 2029 | July 2027 |  |
| Commence <br> Marketing | Aug 2029 | August 2027 |  |
| 95\% Occupancy | Dec 2029 | Dec 2027 |  |
| Cost <br> Certification/8609 | Joject transfer to | Projer\| |  |
| Asset Management |  |  |  |

## Attachment B: Borrower Org Chart

The Sponsors are in the process of forming limited partnerships to be the owners of the Family Project and PSH Project.

## Attachment C: Development Staff Resumes

Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA)
Karoleen Feng, Chief Real Estate Officer with over 19 years of Bay Area affordable housing experience, leads the team overseeing new unit production, preservation, asset management, and housing finance reporting. Her notable achievements include 100\% affordable projects such as Casa Adelante 681 Florida, Casa Adelante 2828 16th Street, and Casa Adelante 2060 Folsom. Karoleen's funding acumen, encompassing grants and municipal bonds, combined with community engagement, has led to the creation or retention of $1000+$ affordable housing units in the Mission area over the past 12 years. Holding a Masters of City Planning and a Bachelor of Arts from the University of California, Berkeley, she also serves as the Board President of the Council of Community Housing Organizations.

Jose Garcia, Associate Director of Preservation at MEDA, possesses over seven years of affordable housing preservation expertise in San Francisco. In his role, he previously supervised RAD resident relocation, currently oversees the small sites program, and leads new production projects. Jose holds a Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration from California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo and is a graduate of the California Housing Development Training Institute (HDTI).

Victoria Vera, Project Assistant at MEDA's Community Real Estate Production team has over two years of experience in affordable housing, focusing on project management throughout the development cycle. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley. Previously, she was a Coro Fellow in the Public Affairs Fellowship and engaged in labor, public administration, and nonprofit initiatives. Victoria is a recent graduate of the NPH Bay Area Housing Internship Program (BAHIP).

## Mission Housing Development Corporation (MHDC)

Kevin Kitchingham, Director of Housing Development \& Construction Management, has 18 years of experience as an affordable housing professional. His accomplishments include working on more than $\$ 750$ million worth of transactions in both the public and private sectors. Before spending a decade at the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Kevin was the Housing Director of a community based non-profit developer in Bernal Heights. Kevin is a graduate of San Francisco State University, with a Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies.

Wade Reynolds, Senior Project Developer, provides over 12 years of affordable housing development facilitating the delivery of new construction and rehabilitation projects. Wade focuses on all facets of housing development from site acquisition, design, funding, planning, permits, construction to lease-up and project closeout. Wade is a graduate of the University of North Carolina, with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology.

Carlos Melgoza, Project Developer, Carlos Melgoza has been a Project Developer with Mission Housing since October, 2021 after working with the Housing Action Coalition on housing advocacy. Over the past couple of years, Carlos's work has been focused on site rehabilitation, assisting in rehabilitating five former Housing Authority sites and completing conversion in late 2023. Currently, he's working on a site around the corner from 1979 Mission Street using HCD Portfolio Reinvestment Program (PRP) funding, and on the early stages of a PRAC to RAD conversion and rehab. Additionally, he's been working with Dolores Street Community Services and HSH on two Home Key rehabs for TAY communities. Carlos began his education at UC San Diego and finished at San Francisco State with a degree in Urban Studies and Planning. He is also a LISC HDTI 2024 graduate.

## Attachment D: Asset Management Evaluation of Project Sponsor

Mission Housing Asset Management staff will oversee asset management \& compliance responsibilities for the PSH Project.

Total Number of Projects and Average Number of Units Per Project Currently in Developer's Asset Management Portfolio:
MHI's Asset management department currently oversees 32 buildings with 1,422 units in the City of San Francisco.

Developer's Current Asset Management Staffing Including Job Titles, Full Time Employees, an Organizational Chart and the Status of Each Position (filled/vacant):
Mission Housing's Asset management department currently has a staff of 8 people. The Asset Management Department is led by the Director of Asset Management. 2 senior asset managers and 2 asset managers oversee Mission Housing's portfolio, with support from a compliance manager and an administrative assistant. The AM team also includes a facilities manager who helps oversee property maintenance plans and capital improvements that are funded by replacement reserves. All positions are 1.0 FTE each.

Description of Scope and Range of Duties of Developer's Asset Management Team:
Mission Housing's Asset Management staff has oversight over all operations of the properties in the portfolio. Asset Management reviews financials, approves budgets, approves substantial capital initiatives, is a part of the team that determines long term capital projects. Asset management approves all annual budgets for the properties, does all of the reporting and communication to all of financial partners, and approve all operating reserve draws or internal line of credit requests when a property is short of cash and needs a temporary funding to meet property operations costs. Asset management submits grants and loan applications for the properties to secure or continue operating funding.

Description of Developer's Coordination Between Asset Management and Other Functional Teams, Including Property Management, Accounting, Compliance, Facilities Management, etc. There is constant coordination between Property Management, related departments and Asset Management. Asset management oversees all aspects of operations so there is constant coordination with property management on a daily basis in regard to those issues. Asset and Property Management work together on the annual audits and budgets. In addition, there is constant coordination around cash management and the financial oversight of the property. There is also contact around preparation of the financials. Asset Management and Compliance primarily coordinate around compliance issues that directly affect ownership and the partnership. Asset management and facilities coordinate around preparation the budget and capital projects. The Asset Management staff also coordinates around emergencies.

Developer's Budget for Asset Management Team Shown as Cost Center for SF Projects: Asset Management staffing budget is $\$ 957,996$.

Number of Projects Expected to be in Developer's Asset Management Portfolio in 5 Years and, If Applicable, Plans to Augment Staffing to Manage Growing Portfolio:
Mission Housing currently has 1 project in predevelopment. If the project for which this loan evaluation is included, it is anticipated that Mission Housing will have at least 38 projects in its portfolio over the next 5 years.

## Attachment E: Threshold Eligibility Requirements and Ranking Criteria

The City's expectations of the Selected Developer are the following:

1. Efficiently and quickly produce high-quality and community-serving affordable housing and related infrastructure, efficiently and quickly, through demonstrated excellence and technical expertise.
2. Maximize the benefit of the City's subsidy dollars through demonstrated cost effectiveness, whether via use of efficient construction techniques and/or materials, or other identified cost-saving measures.
3. Offer units to households having experienced homelessness that are referred through the City's Coordinated Entry System, per City requirements.
4. Align with the implementation of City policies on anti-displacement, racially inclusive communities, and creating stable housing for vulnerable populations;
5. Ensure that the development team is working within a culturally competent approach to engagement with its contractors and the public throughout the development process;
6. Select development/operations/services partners that are able to work with MOHCD and HSH to deploy city resources, tools and expertise to create developments that are responsive to populations disproportionately impacted by systemic racism.
7. Produce a development that includes both an Initial Scoping Project and a Primary Project that includes at least two (possibly 3) Residential Buildings and associated infrastructure improvements and resident and neighborhood amenities.
8. Produce a development is responsive the unique historical and cultural context of the Site

The Primary Project to be developed must:

- Establish a Site design that facilitates horizontal (infrastructure) improvements and vertical (building) improvements as follows:
- Infrastructure Program: Work with BART to develop urban design vision for existing northeast BART plaza and station access points, to be pursued in conjunction with similar improvements to southeast plaza and station access points. Consider needs for activation, safety and maintenance.
- Mission Street/16th Street Program: 1-3-bedroom (family) units and ground floor commercial spaces that act as neighborhood serving resources and address resource gaps, through programs determined through a comprehensive community outreach process; this could be broken into two separate buildings to maximize competitiveness for leveraged funding. MOHCD preliminarily estimates capacity for as many as 200 units;
- Capp Street Program: studio and 1-bedroom (adult) units for households referred from Coordinated Entry; MOHCD estimates capacity for as many as 150 units
- Maximize density and unit count that may be built "as of right" using all available tools. o Use streamlined ministerial approval processes and maximize density per as-of-right zoning. For example, SB35 or AB2162 may be used in conjunction
with the Affordable Housing Density Program or the State Density Bonus Program; o Adjust unit sizes to serve the proposed target populations (see notes above)
- Designate a minimum number of units for Households Experiencing Homelessness, subsidized by the City's Local Operating Subsidy Program;
- For Mission/16th Street Program: Serve low-income families (in 1-3-bedroom units) unsubsidized with an income range between $30 \%-80 \%$ MOHCD Unadjusted San Francisco Area Median Income, average no more than 60\% MOHCD AMI; no studios; include set-aside for referrals from MOHCD for HIV+ households (Plus Housing program);
- For Capp Street Program: Serve formerly homeless adults in a minimum of 120 studio units (up to 150 units), subsidized by the City's Local Operating Subsidy Program1 ("LOSP") and a City services contract at a case management ratio of approximately 1:20; may include some 1-bedroom units to support provision of in-home health care; must include generous common spaces/amenities for residents;
- Conduct culturally competent community outreach to engender support for the Primary Project;
- Maximize the benefit of the City's subsidy dollars through demonstrated Cost Effectiveness, whether via use of efficient construction techniques and/or materials, or other identified cost-saving measures;
- The site's development plan must accommodate funding constraints, namely, a maximum $\$ 300,000$ of City subsidy per multi-bedroom unit and $\$ 200,000$ per studio/PSH unit, excluding land.
- The proposal must secure construction and permanent financing that minimizes and leverages City resources to the greatest extent possible, e.g. a State of California, Housing \& Community Development (HCD) loan and/or philanthropic contribution
- Commence construction on the Project as soon as possible, using streamlined ministerial approval processes for entitlements and permitting. For example, SB35 or AB2162, which may be used in conjunction with the Affordable Housing Density Program or the State Density Bonus Program;
- Serve at least 30\% Extremely Low Income (ELI) households, eg $\$ 29,100$ for a single person household, or $\$ 41,550$ for a family of four;
- In the Capp Street building this may be homeless households referred through the Coordinated Entry System or income restricted units that are subject to the Chapter 47 Preferences.
- In all buildings, the Selected Developer must maximize the number of target population placements into the Project (COP holders Neighborhood Preference, etc)
- The proposal must align with the implementation of City policies on antidisplacement, racially inclusive communities, and creating stable housing for vulnerable populations, as described below in Section III;
- At the time of publication, the final planning, permitting and operations timeline for the proposed Tiny Homes Village are being finalized. The Selected Developer
must be prepared to undertake predevelopment activities accordingly in collaboration with HSH and MOHCD.
- The Sponsors must:
- Work with BART, City agencies, and community members to evaluate expanding the scope of the Project to include improvements to and/or potentially including development over the adjacent BART Plaza parcel in order to allow for a larger affordable housing building, in conjunction with improvements to both the southwest BART plazas.
- Prepare a technical memo that includes budget projections, and conceptual designs for each project concept evaluated.
- Work with BART and MOHCD staff to help develop BART's urban design vision for their potential station modernization efforts to both BART-owned plazas. This may include collaborating and coordinating with BART on complimentary community design workshops for the housing and station/plaza improvements.
- Establish a community outreach strategy that includes culturally competent strategies for working with diverse stakeholders.
- In an effort to redress past and present inequities, the selection process for the RFQ favored applicants with direct experience working with COP holders, or populations who share characteristics with the COP population. Additional expectations for any proposed Project related to Racial Equity include:
- Maximize the number of priority placements (COP holders, Neighborhood Preference, etc.)
- Maximize (meet or exceed) the City's requirements for promotion of SBE/LBE organizations with contracts and local hiring with construction labor.
- Provide initial draft marketing plans within 18 months of anticipated Temporary Certificate of Occupancy ("TCO"), outlining the affirmative steps Respondents will take to market each Project to the City's preference program participants including Certificate of Preference (COP) Holders, Displaced Tenants, and Neighborhood Residents, as well as how the marketing is consistent with the Mayor's Racial Equity statement.
- Submit responses to requests for demographic data regarding the Boards of Directors of member organizations of the Development Team's and of the staff of the Respondents that are selected. This data will not be evaluated or scored.
- Split any Developer Fee per MOHCD Underwriting Guidelines,
- $\$ 300,000$ per unit for Mission/16th Street Program and $\$ 200,000$ for Capp Street Program
Ranking Criteria was Based on the below Scoring Categories:

|  | Category | Possible <br> Points | Sc <br> or <br> e |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  | Experience achieving high rates of housing retention <br> Implements low barrier tenant selection policies <br> Contributes to long-term sustainability of the development <br> Achieving cost efficiencies in operations <br> Grounds property management services in trauma informed approach <br> Capacity to attract and retain adequate staffing to take on this project | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \text { for } \\ & \text { Capp } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v. | Service Provider/s (5 pts for Mission Street program and 5 pts for Capp Street program) <br> $>$ Experience delivering services to low-income households, including those experiencing homelessness <br> $>$ Experience linking residents to the City's safety net of services <br> $>$ Works with property management to achieve high rates of housing retention <br> $>$ Supports positive ouTCOmes for residents around health and economic mobility <br> $>$ If applicable, provides explanation for service contracts terminated prematurely within the last 5 years <br> > Capacity to attract and retain adequate staffing to take on this project <br> $>$ Experience delivering services with equity; <br> $>$ Engages in collaborative service partnerships; <br> $>$ Utilizes Housing First and housing stability principles to deliver the services. <br> $>$ Indicates that property management and resident services will be provided through a trauma-informed approach. | 5 for <br> Mission <br> 5 for <br> Capp |
| vi. | Racial Equity ( 10 pts) <br> $>$ Demonstrates experience providing housing to COP holders and neighborhood preference holders <br> $>$ Demonstrates experience providing housing to formerly homeless households and serving historically excluded communities of color. <br> $>$ Uses innovative approaches to engagement with COP and neighborhood preference holders <br> $>$ Demonstrates commitment to racially diverse project development teams <br> > Describes experience providing access and implementing effective service delivery strategies to historically excluded communities of color | 10 |
| B. | VISION: | 30 |


| i. | Program Concept (5 pts) <br> $>$ Describes vision for a development program at this site, while best achieving the project goals, and includes: <br> - A residential program and other envisioned uses, including infrastructure and community serving commercial; <br> - Indicates how the proposed uses and amenities will enhance the lives of the proposed target population and the surrounding Mission neighborhood. <br> Indicates populations served by the programs and spaces (tots, children, teens, young adults, adults, elderly, disabled etc.). <br> Utilizes Housing First and housing stability principles to deliver services and engages in collaborative service partnerships. <br> Indicates that property management and resident services will be provided through a trauma-informed approach. | 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iv. | Finance and Cost Containment Approach (5 pts) <br> $>$ Describes the Development Team's overall financing approach to the project, including phasing and creation of separate air rights parcels. <br> > Describes how project is strategically positioned to successfully compete for State funding resources, including funding from the CA Debt Limit Allocation Committee and Department of Housing and Community Development <br> > Includes the Team's process for entitling the project, financially structuring the project and controlling development costs. <br> > Includes innovative strategies intended to minimize MOHCD's projected capital gap financing. <br> > Describes any innovative (i.e. non-standard, routine or commonly used) direct or indirect cost-cutting strategies relevant to overall development, construction or operating expenses. | 5 |  |
| ii. | Community Engagement Strategy (10 pts) <br> Describes community engagement strategy and includes: <br> - The team's philosophy on community engagement; <br> - Process for establishing and/or building positive relationships with surrounding neighbors and the larger community; <br> - Efforts designed to engage all interested community members, particularly BIPOC members of the target populations, including | 10 |  |


|  | monolingual non-English speaking members of the community; <br> - How the Development Team intends to comply with the City's Language Access Ordinance. <br> Describes the and the Team's approach to maintaining and building community relationships after entitlements have been achieved and the development is in operations. Indicates how particular community engagement strategy will address the historical exclusion of communities of color from quality housing, including but not limited to marketing to attract target populations. <br> Addresses communications throughout the life cycle of the project, from concept and entitlements through construction, lease-up/marketing, and ongoing operations. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iii. | Services Delivery Strategy ( 5 pts ) <br> Describes the Development Team's services delivery strategy for serving both families with children and formerly homeless adults, and includes: <br> - The overall service philosophy; <br> - Model for providing any anticipated services to formerly homeless residents (including case management ratio and provision of amenities such as front desk clerks, if applicable); <br> - The services goals of the proposed vision. <br> Demonstrate how the following principles are implemented: <br> - delivering services with equity; <br> - trauma-informed approach to support services; <br> - engaging in collaborative service partnerships; and <br> - Housing First and housing stability principles to deliver the services. <br> Serving a diverse population of Tenants, including nonEnglish speakers, persons with disabilities, and individuals with a history of homelessness, substance use and/or mental health challenges; <br> $>$ A brief description of the desired outcome of the services to be provided and innovative approaches to services provision, including the strategy of engaging residents and encouraging access to services. <br> $>$ Describes how services for residents will be coordinated with the existing network of services in the neighborhood and community. <br> Describes strategies used to help BIPOC tenants overcome barriers to accessing supportive services and | 5 |  |


|  | income that mitigate the effects of poverty and lead to improved well-being. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v. | Racial Equity Strategy ( 5 pts) <br> $>$ Explains how vision aligns with the primary goals of this RFQ set forth in the Introduction and Project Expectations. | 5 |  |
|  | TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS | 115 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL SCORE |  |

## Attachment F: Site Map with amenities

Map showing the proposed Project at the center of a circle with a $1 / 2$-mile radius and the location of the applicable site amenities within such radius.


High Quality Transit Station
16th Street Mission Station
2000 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94110 (415) 989-2278

## Grocery Store

Foods Co.
1800 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

## Park

In Chan Kaajal Park
3100 17th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103 (415)831-2700

# Public Schools 

John O'Connell Technical High School
2355 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94110 (415)695-5370
Marshall Elementary School
1575 15th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103 (415) 695-5370

## Medical and Pharmacies

Mission Neighborhood Health Center
240 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, CA 9411

## Attachment G: Elevations and Floor Plans

TBD by the Sponsors. The Sponsors are undergoing CMD's procurement process to engage with a consultant team to conduct preliminary elevations and floor plans. MOHCD staff conducted an internal investigation, provided below, for an official estimate of potential unit layouts. The below unit layout is provided for illustrative purposes and should not be used as a schematic or in the decision-making process.


Attachment H: Comparison of City Investment in Other Housing Developments

Affordable Multifamily Housing New Construction Cost Comparison－San Francisco


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{PROJECTS COMPLETED} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Building Square Footage} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Total Project Costs} \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Project Name \& Address \& ${ }^{\text {Lot } 59.4}$ \& Compl Dato \& ＊of Units \& ＊о限 ${ }^{\prime}$ \& Sosa \& NonRes \& obal \& Ac9，Cosis \& const．costa \& soth cost \& Toationve cost \& Susubids \& Notes on Financing \& Bulling Type \& Stories \&  <br>
\hline  \& ${ }^{11085}$ Mssion \&  \&  \& ${ }^{88}$ \& ${ }^{134}$ \&  \& ${ }_{\substack{6.955 \\ 21.056}}$ \& ${ }_{\text {cosem }} 9$ \& s \&  \& ${ }^{\text {s }}$ \&  \&  \& ${ }^{2}$ \& Trpels \& $\stackrel{1}{8}$ \& <br>
\hline 1208 Shomelel Semicer \& 12 120 Sshomeal \& ${ }^{11.667}$ \& Janzo \& 94 \& 94 \& \& \& \& ${ }_{5}{ }^{83}$ \& \& \& 55003994 \& $2{ }^{2,812,2014}$ \&  \& TjoeiA \& 9 \& dommeemy ．assiont sasmic <br>
\hline 1955 M Mssoon Streot \& 1.150 Mssion Stroes \& 36.59 \& Mar－21 \& ${ }^{157}$ \& 262 \& ${ }_{113,432}$ \& 48，142 \& 181.574 \& s \& 108274，${ }^{\text {a }}$ \& \％15，771，486 \& ${ }_{123,458570}$ \& 44.945 .740 \& HCOAASC Laan \& Tree $A$ \& \& Sasoo Dos Ates <br>
\hline  \& ${ }_{\text {20en fosem }}^{\text {200 }}$ \& $\underset{\substack{20.75 \\ 18.95}}{1.95}$ \& ${ }_{\text {Max } 21}$ \& ${ }^{127}$ \& ${ }_{\substack{222 \\ 186}}$ \& ${ }_{\text {155648 }}$ \& （11，900 \&  \& $5 \quad 13.951$ \& ${ }_{\text {87，008．82 }}$ \& ${ }^{20.100 .172}$ \&  \& ${ }^{3,8897.10}$ \& HCOAASCL Lan \& Treis \& 9 \&  <br>
\hline  \& 688 Fioricas streat \& $\xrightarrow{19.000}$ \& Oockre \& ${ }_{108}^{108}$ \& ${ }_{198}^{198}$ \&  \&  \&  \& ${ }_{5}$ \&  \& \％ \& 边 \&  \&  \& Trpei \& ${ }_{8}^{8}$ \&  <br>
\hline ${ }^{22}$ H Howard \& P22 Howera stroet \& ${ }^{28,893}$ \& ${ }^{\text {Aug } 23}$ \& ${ }^{203}$ \& ${ }^{299}$ \& ${ }^{235680}$ \& \& \& ${ }^{5}$ \&  \& ${ }_{5}^{5}$ \& ${ }_{\text {100746 } 275}^{175}$ \& 46，468， 12 \&  \& Treot \& ${ }^{18}$ \& －गwany ymuermum <br>
\hline ${ }^{\text {Pa }}$ \& ${ }^{2} 2403$ San Jose Amo \&  \& ${ }_{\text {Sop } 23}^{\text {Doce24 }}$ \& ${ }_{70}^{131}$ \& ${ }_{70}^{27}$ \&  \& ${ }^{\text {10，744 }}$ \& ${ }_{\text {cosem }}$ \& ${ }_{5}$ \& － $10.499,518$ \& ${ }_{5}{ }_{5}^{11,6997045}$ \&  \& ${ }^{30493.722}$ \& ${ }^{4 \%}$ \& Treal \& ${ }^{8.9}$ \&  <br>
\hline Completed Projocts（vaverge： \& Averge： \& ${ }^{21,723}$ \& \& 122 \& 188 \& ${ }_{120,120}$ \& 12,09 \& 132，210 \& 182,779 \& 7，195，947 \& 17，56，3588 \& 94，94，9，984 \& 30，03，535 \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Building Square Footage} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Total Project Costs} \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Project Name \& Add \& Lot 9 g．th \& Compl Dato \& ＊of Units \& ＊ot8R＇ \& Ros．${ }^{\text {2 }}$ \& NonRes． \& Toas \& cost \& Constr．Cost \& sot Cost \&  \& Sa， \& Notos on finanding \& sulding Type \& Stories \& Cosmmonts sisuso of <br>
\hline  \& Soirts siont \&  \& ${ }_{\substack{\text { Jul2 } \\ \text { Sor } 24}}$ \& ${ }_{148}^{221}$ \& 334

291 \&  \& 4．223 \& （18577\％ \& s 10．000 \& ¢55689892 \& 19.54 .482 \&  \& ${ }_{1750000}^{175050}$ \& 45 \& Tpol \& 8 \& 边 <br>
\hline  \&  \&  \& ${ }_{\substack{\text { Sop } 24 \\ \text { Aug } 25}}$ \& ${ }_{\text {cki }}^{148}$ \& ${ }_{281}^{282}$ \& $\frac{129872}{\substack{173.000}}$ \&  \& cen \& $\frac{5}{8}$ \&  \&  \&  \&  \&  \& Trpol \& ${ }_{8}$ \& \％ <br>
\hline Trassay 2 WEST．Semoro coll（ccoci） \& 220 ofsom \& 13，091 \& Mar24 \& \& \& 106,710 \& 2.945 \& 1098.65 \& s \& 100，18，9939 \& 31，96．544 \& 132,75 ，537 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ \& s 64，957，065 \&  \& Trpeo \& \& \％ene <br>
\hline Under Construction： \& Average： \& ${ }^{29.661}$ \& \& 170 \& \& ${ }^{1477,771}$ \& ${ }_{\text {19，312 }}$ \& ${ }_{167,058}$ \& 2.500 \& ${ }_{1}^{14,182,9,96}$ \& ${ }^{26,880,351}$ \& 14，476，660 \& 56，54， 629 \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Building Square Footage} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Total Project Costs} \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline Project Name \& ss \& Lot so．f \&  \& ＊otunts \& ＊ 0 \& Ros．${ }^{2}$ \& NonRes． \& Toal \& Aca．Costs \& constr．Cost4 \& sot cost \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Total Dev. Cost w/acq } \\
\text { costs }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& Looal subsidy \& Notes on flinencing \& 97poe \& Storos \& Comomis isage of <br>

\hline  \&  \&  \&  \& ${ }_{88}^{112}$ \& ${ }_{86}^{146}$ \& cose \& ¢， \&  \& ${ }_{\text {s }}^{5}$ \&  \&  \&  \&  \& ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\text {a }}$ \& ${ }_{\text {Treal }}^{\text {Trpeat }}$ \& $\stackrel{8}{8}$ \& <br>
\hline 11393 Maneat Stroot \& 11393 makes Steer \& ${ }_{11,660}$ \& Nor 24 \& ${ }_{187}^{187}$ \& ${ }_{187}$ \& ${ }_{13,537}$ \& 1.46 \& ${ }^{133,77}$ \& \& $132.800,501$ \& ${ }_{22,78,451}$ \& 154，86，9，92 \& 68，468，899 \&  \& \& ${ }_{15}$ \&  <br>
\hline 180 Freaen \& 180 frooon \& 13.091 \& Mar 24 \& ${ }^{85}$ \& 154 \& 9.194 \& 10.282 \& 102226 \& 20.00 \& $75.268,791$ \& 119228.327 \& 9，5，513，118 \& 20．077．591 \& 4\％Cradus，MPP．AtP \& Treois \& 9 \&  <br>
\hline Hemen \&  \& ${ }_{\substack{13,54 \\ 21,13}}$ \& Jan－26 \& ${ }_{\substack{73 \\ 184}}$ \& ${ }_{317}^{117}$ \&  \&  \& 年， 1.778 \& ${ }^{\frac{8}{8}}$ \&  \&  \& （12，991．64． \& $\xrightarrow{20,102281} 1$ \&  \& Typol \& ${ }_{8}^{8}$ \&  <br>
\hline 750 coden 6 ate Prase 1 \& 750 \& ${ }_{13,2026}$ \& Nor 24 \& ${ }^{75}$ \& ${ }^{124}$ \& 57，502 \& ${ }^{11,266}$ \& ${ }_{68,785}$ \& \& ${ }_{53,352452}$ \& 10，08， 121 \& ${ }_{6,4,45,573}$ s \& s 20，000，000 \& 2023 Eucataso Nofa \& Treal \& 8 \&  <br>
\hline  \&  \& $\underset{\substack{12.50 \\ 8,782}}{ }$ \&  \& ${ }_{95}^{95}$ \& ${ }_{9}^{176}$ \& ${ }_{\substack{93,215 \\ 72,37}}$ \& 2880 \&  \& ${ }^{\text {cte }}$ \&  \& ｜ris．a485 \&  \&  \& \& $\frac{\text { Treol }}{\substack{\text { Tree }}}$ \& 9 \& <br>
\hline 2205 mssis on \& 2205 Mssion \& 9，6．78 \& Jan26 \& 63 \& ${ }^{141}$ \& ${ }^{665989}$ \& ${ }_{2}^{2302}$ \&  \&  \& 4．9984．400 \& ${ }^{13,023,611}$ \& ${ }^{519.920271}$ \& \& Cal tome：Prop A Eace HCO ： \& Treeis \& 9 \&  <br>
\hline in Prodevelo \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& ｜34，520 \& 9，314，457 \& 0，110，232 \& ，487，047 \& ${ }^{34,514,555}$ \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Affordable Multifamily Housing New Construction Cost Comparison－San Francisco


| PROJECTS COMPLETED |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  |  | Loasa Susisids | Notes on financing | Bululing Type | Stories |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Address | saq．t | Compl Oato | ＂of t nits | ＊ot8R＇ | Ras ${ }^{2}$ | Sones． | Toal | Aca．Costs | const．Costa | Sont Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Messof Famil fousho | ${ }^{1038 \text { msasion }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{15200 \\ 2234}}$ | Oetic | ${ }^{\frac{88}{113}}$ | ${ }^{134}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 9．9．47 } \\ 120.526}}$ |  |  |  |  | 17，704000 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{8}$ |  |
| 1298 shomemel senior | 1288 shomeal | ${ }^{12.687}$ | Jam20 | 94 | ${ }_{9}$ | ${ }_{66,183}$ |  |  | 831088 | 54， | 20， 21.384 | S5083944 | 27， 212.2014 | 4\％LLHTC HOME A AF | Treot | 9 |  |
| 1950 Msston Streat | ${ }^{1959}$ Mssoson Streat | 36.590 | Mar21 | ${ }^{157}$ | ${ }^{262}$ | ${ }^{113,432}$ | 48,142 | 1181.574 | s | 1088274.374 | 15，771，496 | 123.454870 | $44.954,70$ | HCCOAHSC Loan | Treo $A$ | $\stackrel{9}{ }$ | Pasoo oses Ares |
| ${ }^{20}$ | ${ }^{200}$ | $\xrightarrow{20.075} 1$ |  | ${ }^{127}$ | ${ }_{\substack{252 \\ 186}}^{2}$ |  | （1， |  | ${ }_{\substack{13,931 \\ 725.665}}^{1.9}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{20.10,0.72} 20$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {HeCo Alsc loan }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Tremel }}^{\text {Trpeal }}$ | 8 |  |
| der floride | 681 Fororis steer | ${ }^{10.0000}$ |  | ${ }_{130}^{190}$ | ${ }_{19}^{198}$ | ${ }^{120,830}$ | ${ }_{\text {\％}}^{0.250}$ | ${ }^{1356000}$ | ${ }_{125090}^{125}$ | ${ }_{7}^{295958} 8$ |  | 1002099718 | ${ }_{3} 3,820,5$ | Hcomut loan | Treor |  |  |
| 221 Howard | 221 Howars Strot | ${ }^{2,8,93}$ | ${ }^{\text {Aus } 23}$ | ${ }^{203}$ | ${ }^{259}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{12,4989.50}$ | 38.24 .784 | ${ }_{10074627}$ | 46，468．120 | Calta MP／48LLITC |  | ${ }_{18}$ | 隹 |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Sopre23 }}$ | ${ }_{1}^{131}$ | ${ }^{217}$ |  | －10，741 |  |  | 100．497588 | ${ }^{16.8977045}$ |  | ${ }^{3040937272}$ |  | Trpeol | 8.9 |  |
|  | 1 120 Jonos Stroed ${ }_{\text {Average：}}$ | ${ }_{\text {2，} 21.733}$ | Doc24 | ${ }_{10}{ }_{12}$ | ${ }_{188}^{188}$ | ${ }_{120,120} \frac{10,166}{}$ | ${ }_{12,090}{ }^{3,304}$ | ${ }_{132,270}{ }^{30.470}$ |  | ${ }_{77,195,9477^{32215}}$ |  |  | ${ }^{30.0393,5837}$ | 48\％LITC＋MHP |  |  |  |
| PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name | Address | Lot 8 g．t． | Compl Dast | ＊ofunts | ＊ot8R＇ | Ros．？ | Non．Res． | Toal | \％os3 | Constr．Cost | Sonc cost |  | Local Susidids | Notes on financing | Sulding Type | Stores |  |
| （en |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Jut } 24 \\ \text { Sop } 24}}$ | ${ }_{1}^{221}$ | 334 <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 281 |  | ¢ 4 | ${ }_{\substack{185757 \\ 18003}}$ | 10.000 | ， 125.688898 | ${ }_{19,564.422}$ | $\xrightarrow{145338564}$ | 1750000 |  | Trool |  | ｜en |
|  | ${ }^{\text {and }}$ | ${ }_{\substack{29,8,3^{3}}}^{3}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Sop } 24 \\ \text { A0．} 25}}$ | $\underset{\substack{148 \\ 180}}{180}$ | ${ }_{\substack{281 \\ 282}}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | $\xrightarrow{105.2092085}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {Ochlil }}$ |  | 8 | \％uy |
|  | 220 orsom | ${ }_{13,091}$ | Mar24 | ${ }_{151}$ | 152 | 106,70 | 2.95 |  | s | 100，18，993 | 31，986．544 | s 132，75，537 | 64，957，065 | $14 \%$ Comals， ，ohtco | Trpol | 9 | 边 |
| Under Construction： | Average： | ${ }^{29.661}$ |  | 170 | ${ }^{262}$ | ${ }_{147,747}$ | 19，312 | ${ }_{167,058}$ | 2.500 | 114，182，962 | 26，880，351 | 141，476，660 | $56.542,629$ |  |  |  |  |
| PROJECTS IN PREDEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |  | Building Square Footage |  |  | Total Project Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| me | Address | Lotsof． |  | ＊ofunts | \＃ot8R＇ | Ros．${ }^{\text {a }}$ | NonRes． | Toal | Ac．Costs | Constr．Cosa | Sonc cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Dev. Cost w/acq } \\ \text { costs } \end{gathered}$ | Local subsidy | Notes | \％o | Storos |  |
|  |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{18,313 \\ 9.219}}$ |  | ${ }^{112} 8$ | ${ }^{1148}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 94，001 } \\ 45.585}}$ | ${ }_{\text {c，}}^{1.39} 8$ |  | ${ }^{24.550}$ |  | $\frac{19829724}{17,2999}$ | ${ }_{\substack{88,53,384 \\ 75359.12}}$ |  |  |  | \％ |  |
| ， 1939 Manees Stroet | 1133 Namaes Steet | ${ }^{11.860}$ | Nor 24 | ${ }_{187}$ | ${ }_{187}$ | ${ }_{13,587}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1.840}$ | ${ }_{137,17}^{14}$ |  | ${ }^{1328080.501}$ | 22，73，451 | ${ }_{154,86,9,92}$ | 68，6，3889 | 4\％coodis．AMP．MPP．IIG：LI | Trpel | 15 | Tomsy wmerney |
| 1 Bof Fraolon | 180 Frooon | ${ }^{13.091}$ | Mar 24 | ${ }^{85}$ | ${ }_{154}$ | ${ }^{9,944}$ | ${ }^{10,282}$ | 102226 | 20.00 | ${ }^{752866.791}$ | $19,228.827$ | 4．563，118 | 20.077 .59 | 48 Conats，MHPP．AHP | Treor | 9 |  |
|  |  | cis． | Jan－26 | ${ }_{\substack{13 \\ 184 \\ 18}}$ | ${ }_{312}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { 19，900 }}$ |  |  |  | Sancreas |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { troel }}$ | $\stackrel{8}{17}$ |  |
| 隹 |  | ${ }_{13,026}$ | ${ }_{\text {Nan } 24}$ | ${ }_{75}$ | ${ }_{124}^{124}$ | ${ }_{5}^{57,52}$ | ${ }_{1}^{12,268}$ | 68.78 |  | 53.35245 | 10，08， 121 | 6，3，45，573 | 20．00，000 | O23 Eumatere NOFA | Trpel | 8 |  |
| Esoowsater | （s50 OMsatere | 12.500 | Jun26 | 95 | ${ }^{176}$ | ${ }^{932215}$ | 2880 | 96.015 | 525.000 | 70，128275 | 17，94， 6,5 | ${ }^{88,652,50}$ | 33225，439 |  | Trpol | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 20\％Mssion | ger Mssom | 8.882 | ${ }_{\text {Sop } 25}$ | ${ }_{95}^{95}$ | ${ }^{95}$ |  |  | ${ }^{123} 2$ |  | Catse，740 | ${ }_{\text {24，393665 }}$ | 8，968，405 | ${ }^{5} \quad 23.500000$ | Cathome Proon Eacer HCo |  | 9 | Sele |
| Prodoverolo | ${ }^{\text {2205msson }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5.966}$ | 樶，76 |  | ［0，314，457 | 110.2 | A87，0 | 34，54，55 |  |  |  |  |

## Attachment I: Predevelopment Budget

[Insert pages from proforma; write $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ if gap request]



## Attachment J: Development Budget

[Insert pages from proforma]


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Application Date: \& \(45 / 24\) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline  \& \({ }_{1979}^{45 / 24}\) Mission PSH \& \& \& \# Bearroms: \& 150 \& \& \& Losp Proje \& \\
\hline Project Address: \& 1979 Mission St \& \& \& \# Beds: \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Project Sponsor: \& Mission Housing \& Development Cor \& Orporation and Mis \& Mission Economic \& Development \(A\) : \& \& \& \& \\
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& Total \& Com \& \\
\hline SOURCES \& 30,000,000 \& 75,807,147 \& 35,000,000 \& \& 1,500,000 \& 1,488,300 \& 143,795 \& Ip Capatas should beat \& \\
\hline Name of Sources: \& MOHCD/OCII \& \({ }_{\text {Tax Cradit }}^{\text {Equity }}\) \& MHP \& \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { Deferred } \\
\text { Developer Fee }
\end{array}
\] \& GP Capital \& AHP \& \& \& \\
\hline USES \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline acquisition \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Acquistion cost or value \& \& \& \& \& \& \& 0 \& \& \\
\hline Legal C Cosing costs/ /Broker's Fee \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Heding Costs \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Total AcQulition \& 0 \& 0 \& \& \& \& 0 \& 0 \& \& \\
\hline COnstruction (hard costs) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline - Unit Construction/Rehab \& 18,325,000 \& 37,620,000 \& 35,00,000 \& \& \& \& 90,945,000 \& hclude FFQE \& \\
\hline * Commercial Shell Construction \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Envirommental Remediation \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline * Onsight Improvements/Landscaping \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline * Oftsite Improvements \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& Constition \\
\hline * \({ }^{\text {Infrastructure }}\) Pmprovements \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& HOPE SFIOCII costs for streets etc. \& \\
\hline  \& \& 500.000 \& \& \& \& \& 500.000 \& \& \\
\hline \(9 C\) Cvernead \(\&\) Profit \& \& \({ }_{2}^{2,000,000}\) \& \& \& \& \& 2,000,000 \& \& \\
\hline \(\bigcirc G\) General Condtions Sub-toal Construction Costs \& 18,325,000 \& 3,402,603
\(43,52,603\) \& 35,000,000 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \({ }^{3,402,603} \begin{aligned} \& 96,847,603\end{aligned}\) \& \& \\
\hline Design Contingency (remove at DD) \& 5,287,500 \& \& \& \& \& \& 5,287,500 \& 5\% up to s30MM HC, 4\% \(530-845 \mathrm{MM}, 3 \%\) ¢ \(45 \mathrm{MM}+\) \& 5\% \\
\hline Bid Contingency (remove at bid) \& 5,287,500 \& \& \& \& \& \& 5,287,500 \& 5\% up to s30MM HC, 4\% S30-845MM, 3\% \$445MM+ \& 5.5\% \\
\hline Plan Check Contingencry (removelreduce during Plan Revie) \& reew) \& \begin{tabular}{|}
4.230 .000 \\
\(5,545,130\)
\end{tabular} \& \& \& \& \& \(4.23,000\)
5.545130 \&  \& \({ }_{5}^{4.7 \%}\) \\
\hline \(\xrightarrow{\text { Hard Cost Construction Contingency }}\) Sub-total Constuction Contingencies \& 10.575.000 \&  \& \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \&  \& \& \\
\hline TOTAL CONSTRUCTION Cosis \& 28,900,000 \& 53,297,733 \& 35,00,000 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 117,197,733 \& \& \\
\hline Soft costs \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Architecture \& Design \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Architect design fees \& \& 1,942,943 \& \& \& \& \& 1,942,943 \& http://sfmohcd.org/documents-reports-and-forms \& \\
\hline \(\frac{\text { Design Subconsultant to the Architect (incl. Fees) }}{\text { Architect Constuction Admin }}\) \& \& 690,000
150,000 \& \& \& \& \& 690,000
150,000 \& \& \\
\hline Reimbursables \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline Additional Serices Sub-total Acratect Contract \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 2782943 \& - \& \(\bigcirc\) \& , \& \& 278294 \& \& \\
\hline Other Third Party design consultantst ( not incluct ced under \& \& 2,782,943 \& \& \& \& \& 2,782,943 \& Consultants not covered under architect oontract; \& \\
\hline Architect ontract) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& name consultant tye and contract amount \& \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\quad\)\begin{tabular}{l} 
Total Architecture \& Design \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& \({ }^{0}\) \& 2,782,943 \& \& 0 \& \& 0 \& 2,782,943 \& \& \\
\hline Survey \& \& 14,988

2500 \& \& \& \& \& ${ }^{14,988}$ \& \& <br>
\hline Geotechnical studies \& \& 25.000 \& \& \& \& \& 25,000 \& \& <br>
\hline Cmase I Invireornental Review consultants \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline NEPA 106 Review \& \& 50,000 \& \& \& \& \& 50,000 \& \& <br>
\hline CNAPNA (rehab only \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& Name Consutants 8 contra \& <br>
\hline  \& 0 \& 114,988 \& ${ }^{0}$ \& ${ }^{0}$ \& 0 \& 0 \& 14,988 \& consulans d conlract amount \& <br>

\hline | inancing Costs |
| :--- |
| Construction Financing Costs | \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline Construction Financing Costs \& \& 973,509 \& \& \& \& \& \& 1\% of construction loan amount \& <br>
\hline Construction Loan interest \& \& ${ }^{\text {9,1163,793 }}$ \& \& \& \& \& 9,163,793 \& \& <br>
\hline Titie R Reorrding \& \& 120.000
1000 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline CDLAC \& C IAC fees \& \& ${ }_{243,377}^{1.000}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& Fee for CDLACTCAC laceholder application \& <br>
\hline Other Bond Cost of Issuance \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& Municipal advisor @ 45, Bound counsel@ \& <br>
\hline Other Bond Cost of Issuance \& \& ${ }^{220,000} 5$ \& \& \& \& \& ${ }^{220,000} 58$ \&  \& <br>
\hline 俍 \& 0 \& 10,799,679 \& \& \& 0 \& 0 \& 10,779,679 \& \& <br>
\hline  \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Permanent Loan Origination Fee \& \& 87,660
10,000 \& \& \& \& \& 87,660
10,00 \& \& <br>
\hline Trite \& Recording \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Sub-total Perm. Financing Costs
Total Financing Costs \& ${ }^{\circ}$ \& 112,660
10.89239 \& ${ }_{0}^{\circ}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }_{0}^{\circ}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& (12, $\begin{array}{r}\text { \% } 60 \\ 10.8939\end{array}$ \& \& <br>
\hline Legal Costs Totar Financing Cosis \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Borrower Legal fees \& \& 120,000 \& \& \& \& \& 120,000 \& \& <br>
\hline Land Use / CEQA Attorney fees Tax Credit Counsel \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Boond Counsell \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }^{\text {Construction Lender Counsel }}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& 90,000
15.000 \& \& \& <br>
\hline Other Legal ( owner legal) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Other Development Costs Total Legal Costs \& \& \& \& \& \& \& 450,000 \& \& <br>
\hline Appraisal \& \& 10,000
10000 \& \& \& \& \& ${ }^{10,000}$ \& \& <br>
\hline - Insurancole \& \& 1,794,000 \& \& \& \& \& 1,794,000 \& \& <br>
\hline * Property Taxes \& \& 25.000 \& \& \& \& \& 25,000 \& environmental audit \& <br>
\hline  \& \& \& \& \& \& 25,000 \& \& \& <br>
\hline - Entitlement / Permit Fees \& \& +1.500.000 \& \& \& \& \& 1,500,000 \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& S2,000)/unit, See MOHCD UW Guidelines on: \& <br>
\hline Furishing \& \& 795.000
73000 \& \& \& \& \& 795000
73000 \& nitp:1/smoncco.orgldocuments-repors-and-orms \& <br>
\hline TCAC App Alloe / Monitor Fees \& \& ${ }_{8} 8.865$ \& \& \& \& \& ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{8,8065}$ \& \& <br>
\hline - Financial Consultant fees \& \& \& \& \& \& 54,000 \& \& \& <br>
\hline Construction Management fees / Owner's Rep \& \& $\underset{\substack{206.000 \\ 50.000}}{ }$ \& \& \& \& 144,000 \& \& two years of preconstruction \& <br>
\hline $*$ Relocation \& \& \& \& \& \& \& 50,000 \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline SFUSD Impact Fee \& \& \& \& \& \& 800,000 \& 800,000 \& \& Toal sort cos <br>

\hline Total Other Development Costs \& \& 5,328,865 \& \& \& \& 1,023,000 \& 6,351,865 \& \& $$
=\begin{gathered}
\text { Contingency } \\
\text { as } \% \text { of Total }
\end{gathered}
$$ <br>

\hline | Soft Cost Contingency |
| :--- |
| Contingency (Arch, Eng, Fin, Legal \& Other Dev) | \& \& \& \& 0 \& \& \& \& Should be either $10 \%$ or $5 \%$ of total soft costs. \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\substack{\text { Soft Costs } \\
5.3 \% \\
\hline}
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline TOTAL SOFT COSTS \& $\bigcirc$ \& \[
20,201,092

\] \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
135,300 \\
\hline \mathbf{1 , 4 8 8 , 3 0 0}
\end{array}
$$
\] \& 21,689,392 \&  \& <br>

\hline Reserves \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline * Operating Reseres \& \& 718,322 \& \& \& \& \& 718,322 \& \& <br>
\hline  \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline * 3 month operatitg reserve \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline - Other (specirit) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline TOTAL RESERVES \& \& 718,322 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 718,322 \& \& <br>
\hline developer costs \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Developer Fee - Cash-out Paid at Milestones \& 1,100,000 \& \& \& \& \& \& 1,100,000 \& \& <br>
\hline Developer Fee- - Cash-out A A Risk \& \& 1,590,000 \& \& \& \& \& 1,590,000 \& \& <br>
\hline  \& \& \& \& \& 1,500,000 \& \& 1,500,000 \& \& <br>
\hline Developer Fee - Deferred (also show as source) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Develoment Consuluan Fees \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& Need MOHCD approval for this cost, N/A for most
projects \& <br>
\hline $\frac{\text { Developer Overhead \& Profit }}{\text { TOTAL }}$ DEVELOPER COSTS \& 1,100,000 \& 1,590,000 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1,500,000 \& 0 \& 4,190,000 \& \& <br>
\hline total development cost \& 30,00,000 \& 75,807,147 \& 35,00,000 \& -0 \& 1,500,000 \& 1,488,300 \& 143,795,447 \& \& <br>
\hline Development CostUUnit by Source
Development Costunit as \%of TDC by Source \& ${ }^{200,000}$ \& 505,381 \& 233,333 \& - 0 \& 10.000 \& ${ }^{9,922}$ \& ${ }^{958,636}$ \& \& <br>
\hline Development CostUnitas \% of TDC by Source \& \& \& \& 0.0\% \& 1.0\% \& 1.0\% \& 100.0\% \& \& <br>
\hline Acquisition Costunit by Source \& 0 \& 0 \& - \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \& <br>
\hline Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency)/Unit By Source Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency)/SF \& 192,667 \& 355,318 \& 233,333 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 781,318 \& \& <br>

\hline *Possible non-eligible GO Bond/COP Amount: City Subsidy/Unit \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
18,325,000 \\
\hline 200,000
\end{array}
$$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline Tax Credit Equity Picing: \& ${ }^{0.920}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Construction Bond Amount: \& 97,350,900 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline Constuction Loan Interest Rate (as \%): \& 7.00\% \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

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

[Insert pages from proforma]



## Attachment L: 20-year Operating Proforma

[Insert pages from proforma]


MOHCD Proforma- 20 Year Cash Flow

| Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\frac{\text { INCOME }}{\text { Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued }}$

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} \hline \text { Year 1 } \\ 2028 \\ \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year 2 } \\ 2029 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 3 } \\ & 2030 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year 4 } \\ & 2031 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year 5 } \\ & 2032 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 6 \\ & 2033 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 7 \\ & 2034 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 8 \\ 2035 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 9 \\ & 2036 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 10 \\ 2037 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% annual | Comments (related to annual inc assumption | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total |


| ( | - |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Year 11 } \\ 2038 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 12 \\ 2039 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 13 \\ 2040 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 14 \\ 2041 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 15 \\ 2042 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 16 \\ 2043 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 17 \\ 2044 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 18 \\ 2045 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 19 \\ 2046 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Year } 20 \\ 2047 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| income | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \text { annual } \\ \text { increase } \end{array}$ | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total |
| Residential - Tenant Rents | 2.5\% |  | 7,132,795 | 7,311,115 | 7,493,893 | 7,681,240 | 7,873,271 | 8.070,103 | 8,271,855 | 8,478,652 | 8.690,618 | 8,907,883 |
| Residential - Sos Payments | 4.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Other Non-LOSP) | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Space | 2.5\% |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 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\% |  | 33,282 | 34,114 | 34,967 | 35.841 | 36,737 | 37,656 | 8.597 | 39.562 | 40,551 | 565 |
| Tenant Charges | 2.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Residential Income | 2.5\% |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Commercial Income | 2.5\% |  | - | - | - | - | - | . | - |  |  |  |
| Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account) Cross Potential Income $n / \mathrm{a}$ |  | Lenk from Resere Section below, as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Enter formulas manually per relevant MOH policy; annual incrementing usually not appropriate | 7,216,077 | 7,395,229 | 7,578,860 | 7,767,081 | 7,960,008 | 8,157,759 | 8,360,452 | 8,568,214 | 8,781,169 | 8,99,448 |
| Vacancy Loss - Resididential - Tenant Rents | n/a |  | (356,640) | (366,556) | (374,695) | (384,062) | (393,664) | (403,505) | (413,593) | (423,933) | (434,531) | (445,394) |
| Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments Vacancy Loss-Commercial | n/a |  | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | (10,000) | 10,000 |
| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME |  |  | 6,849,437 | 7,019,673 | 7,194,165 | 7,373,019 | 7,556,345 | 7,744,253 | 7,936,860 | ${ }^{8,134,281}$ | 8 8,336,638 | $8,544,054$ |

OPERATING EXPENSE
Management Fee

| Office Salaries | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manager's Salary | 3.5\% |  | 176,325 | 182,496 | 188,884 | 195,495 | 202,337 | 209,419 | 216,748 | 224,334 | 232,186 | 240,313 |
| Health Insurance and Other Benefits | - ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ 3.5\% |  |  |  | $\because$ |  | $\div$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative Rent-Free Unit | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 176,325 | 182,496 | 188,884 | 195,495 | 202,337 | 209,419 | 216,748 | 224,334 | 232,186 | ${ }^{240,31}$ |


| Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adverising and Marketing | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 11,285 77,583 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11,680 \\ & \hline 80,298 \end{aligned}$ | 12,089 83,109 | ${ }^{12,512} 8$ | $\stackrel{12,950}{89,028}$ | 13,403 92,144 | 13,872 <br> 95,369 | 14,357 98,707 | 14,860 <br> 102,162 | 15,380 <br> 105,738 |
| Office Rent | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Expense - Property | 3.5\% |  | 42,318 | 43,799 | 45,332 | 46,919 | 48.561 | 50,260 | 52.020 | 53,840 | 55,725 | 57,675 |
| Audit Expense | 3.5\% |  | 42,318 | 43,799 | 45,332 |  | 48.561 | 50,260 | 52,020 | 53,840 | 55,725 |  |
| Bookkeeping/Accounting Services | 3.5\% |  | 42,318 | 43,799 | 45,332 | 46,919 | 48,561 | 50,260 | 52.020 | 53,840 | 55,725 | 57.675 |
| Bad Debts | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneou | 3.5\% |  | 141,060 356,81 | ${ }_{3659,972}^{14,97}$ | ${ }_{\text {351, }}^{157}$ | ${ }_{\text {156,396 }}^{\text {395,61 }}$ | -161,869 | 167,535 423,863 | [438,998 | ${ }_{\text {4 }}$ 179,4683 | ${ }_{\text {185, }}^{1899}$ | 192,250 486,393 |


| Utilities |  |  | \%, | 50,32 | , |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electricity | 3.5\% |  | 141,060 | 145,997 | 151,107 | 156,396 | 161,869 | 167,535 | 173,399 | 179,468 | 185,749 | 192,250 |
| Water | 3.5\% |  | 211,590 | 218,995 | 226,660 | 234,593 | 242,804 | 251,302 | 260,098 | 269,201 | 278,623 | 288,375 |
| Gas | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer | 3.5\% |  | 211,590 | 218,995 | 226,660 | ${ }^{234,593}$ | 242,804 | 251,302 | 260,098 | 269,201 | 278,623 | 288,375 |
| Sub-total Utilities |  |  | 564,240 | 583,988 | 604,427 | 625,582 | 647,478 | 670, 140 | 693,594 | 717,870 | 742,996 | 769,001 |
| Taxes and Licenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real Estate Taxes | ${ }^{3.5 \%}$ |  | 141,060 | 145.997 | 151.107 | 156,396 | 161.869 | 167, 535 | 173,399 | 179.468 | 185,749 | 192.250 |
| Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits | 3.5\% |  | 2.116 | 2.190 | 2.267 | 2.346 | 2428 | 2.513 | 2.601 | 2.692 | 2,786 | 2,884 |
| Sub-total Taxes and Licenses |  |  | 143,176 | 148,187 | 153,373 | 158,742 | 164,297 | 170,048 | 76,000 | ${ }^{88,160}$ | ${ }^{88,535}$ | 95,134 |
| Insurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property and Liability Insurance | 3.5\% |  | 282,120 | 291,994 | 302,214 | 312,79 | 323,739 | 335,070 | 346,797 | 358,935 | 371,498 | 384,5 |
| Fidelity Bond Insurance | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker's Compensation | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director's \& Officers' Liability Insurance | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance \& Repair Sub-total Insurance |  |  | 282,120 | 291,994 | 302,214 | 312,791 | 323,739 | 335,070 | 346,797 | 358,935 | 371,498 | 384,500 |
| Payroll | 3.5\% |  | 240,592 | 249,012 | 257,728 | 266,748 | 276.085 | 285,747 | 295,749 | 306,100 | 316,813 | 327,902 |
| Supplies | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracts | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Garbage and Trash Removal | 3.5\% |  | 218,643 | 226,295 | 34,216 | 242,413 | 250,898 | 59,679 | 268,768 | 278,175 | 287,911 | 297,988 |
| Security Payroll' ontract | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HVAC Repairs and Maintenance | 3.5\% |  | 56,424 | 58,399 | 60,443 | 62,558 | 64,748 | 67,014 | 69,35 | 71,787 | 74,300 | 76,900 |
| Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs | 3.5\% |  | 70,530 | 72,998 | ${ }^{75,553}$ | 78,198 | 80,935 | 83,767 | 86,699 | 89,734 | 92,874 | 96,125 |
| Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses Sub-total $^{\text {Maintenance } \& \text { R }}$ | 3.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Maintenance \& Repair Expenses |  |  | 586,188 | 606,705 | 627,940 | 649,918 | 672,665 | 696,208 | 720,575 | 745,795 | 771,898 | 798,915 |
| Supportive Services | 3.5\% |  | 211,590 | 218,995 | 226,660 | 234,593 | 242,804 | 251,302 | 260,098 | 269,201 | 278,623 | 288,375 |
| Commercial Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total operating expenses <br> PUPA (w/o Reserves/GL Base RentBond Fees) |  |  | 2,620,866 | 2,712,596 | 2,807,537 | 5,801 | 3,007,5 | 766 | 3,221,713 | 473 | 451,180 | 3,571,971 |
| Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees |  |  | ple cells. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ground Lease Base Rent |  |  | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | ${ }^{15,000}$ |  |
| Bond Monitoring Fee |  |  | 2,500 125.000 | 2,500 125000 | 2,500 125000 | 2,500 125.000 | 2,500 125000 | 2,500 125000 | 2,500 125,000 | 2,500 | 2,500 125.000 | 2,500 125,000 |
| Replacement Reserve Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Resesve 1 Depososit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required Reserve Deposits, Commercial |  | Commercialt oresidionialaliocation 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees |  |  | 500 | ,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 142,500 | 142,500 | 2,500 | 22,50 | 142,500 | 142,500 |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES ( $w /$ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bon PUPA (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/Bond Fees) |  |  | 2,763,366 | 2,855,096 | 2,950,037 | 3,048,301 | 3,150,004 | 3,255,266 | 3,364,213 | 3,476,973 | 3,593,680 | 3,714,47 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES) |  |  | 4,086,072 | 4,164,577 | 4,244,128 | 4,34,719 | 4,406,341 | 4,48,987 | 4,572,647 | 4,657,308 | 4,742,959 | 4,829,583 |
| DEBT SERVICEIMUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt'/amortized loa |  |  | cells. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard Debt-First Lender |  | Enter comments e: anual increase, elc. | 2,920,905 | 2,920,005 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 | 2,920,905 |
| Hard Debtt- Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42\% pymt, or other 2nd L |  | Enter comments re: anuual increase, etc. | 152,659 | 152,659 | 152,659 | 152,659 | 152,659 | 152,659 | 152.659 | 152,659 | 152,659 | 152,659 |
| Hard Debt - - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender) |  | Enter comments e: anvual increase, elc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hard Debt - Fourth Lender |  | Enter comments ereanual incease, elc. | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial Hard Debt Service |  | Com |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE |  |  | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,07,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 | 3,073,564 |
| CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) |  |  | 1,012,508 | 1,091,013 | 1,170,564 | 1,251,155 | 1,332,777 | 1,415,423 | 1,499,083 | 1,583,744 | 1,669,395 | 1,756,019 |
| USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR.) USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL |  |  | $\text { ple cells. }^{1.329}$ | 1.355 | 1.381 | 1.407 | 1.434 | 1.461 | 1.488 | 1.515 | 1.543 | 1.571 |
| "Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy) | 3.5\% | per MOHCD policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due

| MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due |
| :--- |
| Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment | | NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE |
| :--- |
| CDesidual Recelpis Amount Due |



 REMAINDER (Should be zero




|  | $\vdots$ |
| :--- | :--- |


| Deferred Developer Fee \% Split | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \%\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner Distribution \% Split | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% |
| Soft Debt Lender \% Spilt | 67\% | 67\% | \% | 67\% | \% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% |
| MOHCD Base Rent Due | 15,00 | 15,00 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,00 | 15,00 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| MOHCD Base Rent Proposed to be Paid | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |

MOHCD Proforma - 20 Year Cash Flow

| Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | Year 16 | Year 17 | Year 18 | Year 19 | Year 20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\frac{\text { INCOME }}{\text { Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued }}$

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 11 \\ 2038 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year 12 } \\ 2039 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 13 \\ 2040 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 14 \\ 2041 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 15 \\ 2042 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 16 \\ 2043 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year } 17 \\ 2044 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 18 \\ 2045 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 19 \\ 2046 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Year } 20 \\ 2047 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% annual | Comments (related to annual inc assumptions) | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Total | Tot | Total |




| MOHCD Base Rent Due | 15,000 |  |  | 15,000 |  |  | 15,000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOHCD Base Rent Proposed to be Paid | 15,000 | 15,000 |  | 15,000 | 15,000 |  | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued |  | (15,000) |  |  | (15,000) |  |  | (15,000) |
| Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued |  | (15,000) |  |  | (30,000) |  |  | $(45,000)$ |

Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued



Total \# Units:
150
$\underset{\substack{\text { Losp } \\ \text { Units }}}{\substack{\text { Non-LOSP } \\ \text { Units }}}$




Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued
Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued
Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued


Total \# Units:
150
$\underset{\substack{\text { Losp } \\ \text { Units }}}{\substack{\text { Non-LOSP } \\ \text { Units }}}$ -

 | MOHCD Base Rent Due | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MOHCD Base Rent Proposed to be Paid | 15,000 | 15,000 | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | - |
| Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued | 15,000 | 15,000 |  |  |  |  | Cumulative Balance - Mont Accrued Bese Rent Accrued

Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued
Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued


Total \# Units:
150
LOSP
Units
Uon-LOSP
Units
Und


Soft Debt Lender \% Split

Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued
Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued
Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued


| Losp |
| :--- |
| Units |
| $\substack{\text { Non-LOSP } \\ \text { Units }}$ |

oft Debt Lender \% Spit


Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued
Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Base Rent Accrued
MOHCD Residual Rent Proposed to be Paid
Cumulative Balance - MOHCD Residual Rent Accrued


[^0]:    - One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

