

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

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 4, 2022
TO: CITYWIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING LOAN COMMITTEE
FROM: CINDY HEAVENS, SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER
RE: MACEO MAY, TREASURE ISLAND PARCEL C3.2 - ADDITIONAL NOT TO EXCEED GAP LOAN IN THE AMOUNT OF \$14,983,000 DUE TO RAINSTORM DAMAGE REPAIRS TO MODULAR UNITS

PREVIOUS CITY FUNDS COMMITTED	\$24,255,000
LMIHAF	\$ 2,000,000
AHF – Condo Conversion	\$ 2,200,000
AHF – Inclusionary	\$ 7,951,128
ERAF	\$ 11,000,000
Residential Hotel Preservation Fund	\$ 1,103,872
NEW FUNDS REQUESTED	\$14,983,000
2019 GO Bonds	\$ 11,983,000
LMIHAF	\$ 2,000,000
TIDA Developer Housing Subsidy	\$ 1,000,000
TOTAL REVISED LOAN	\$39,238,000

1. REQUEST SUMMARY

Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) and Swords-to-Plowshares (STP) (together “Sponsors”), co-general partners of **Maceo May Apts., L.P.**, a California limited partnership (“Borrower”), request additional gap financing in the not to exceed amount of \$14,983,000 for a 105-unit affordable housing development located on Treasure Island on Parcel C3.2 at 401 Avenue of the Palms (old address)/55 Cravath Street (new address) (the “Project” or “Maceo May”). On November 15, 2019, the Affordable Housing Loan Committee recommended approval of the original loan of \$24,255,000 that included a \$1,040,000 Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) Affordable Housing Program (AHP) bridge loan.

The Sponsors anticipate receiving a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) by January 31, 2023. Once completed, Maceo May Apartments will be the first new one hundred percent (100%)

affordable building completed as part of the redevelopment of Treasure Island. In recognition of the island's history as a Naval Station, all residents of Maceo May will be low-income and/or formerly homeless veterans. The newly completed building will contain 104 affordable residential units and 1 staff unit in a 6-story building. The residential units are a mix of 24 studios, 47 one-bedrooms, and 34 two-bedrooms. Of the 104 affordable units, 33 units will be occupied by formerly homeless veterans currently living on Treasure Island. These residents have been waiting to move to new units originally promised in July 2022 and now delayed to February 2023.

Due to a storm damaging several units that resulted in completion delays and increased financial costs (see Section 2 and 3) and operating subsidy rents not increasing while some expenses increased (See Section 4), the Project now requires an additional \$14.98M, which is the remaining amount needed to cover project increases. The additional requested loan amount must be encumbered no later than February 1, 2023, to prevent subcontractors from halting work due to nonpayment, further delaying the Project, and meet the construction lender's requirement that the Sponsor make the additional loan request before it continues its re-underwriting. It is imperative that the project close out the construction contract so it can obtain lien-free title and convert to permanent financing as soon as possible to avoid additional construction loan interest costs.

To mitigate some of the Project's increases, the Sponsor successfully obtained a San Francisco FHLB AHP award in the amount of the \$1,040,000 AHP bridge loan. The AHP bridge loan obligation and requirements are identified in Amended and Restated Loan Agreement dated January 28, 2020 (Loan Agreement) between the Borrower and the City and County of San Francisco (City), acting by and through the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). In the Loan Agreement an AHP award pays off the AHP bridge loan. With this additional loan request, the Sponsors request a change to the AHP bridge loan repayment terms allowing the AHP award to cover projected budget shortfalls related to cost increases caused by the storm damaged units and construction completion delays. The AHP bridge loan, as well as the rest of MOHCD loan, will be paid through residual receipts.

MOHCD staff have been working closely with the Sponsors and supports this request to allow the City AHP bridge loan to be paid in residual receipts and increase the loan by a not to exceed amount of \$14,983,000, bringing the new total loan to \$39,238,000. If Loan Committee recommends the loan increase, the loan increase of \$14.98M requires Board of Supervisors' approval.

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW AND PROJECT STATUS

a. Project Overview

STP, a One Treasure Island ("One TI") founding member and housing services provider and grantee named on the Continuum of Care ("CoC") contract, selected CCDC as the housing developer to jointly develop the One TI replacement units and new construction units designated for veterans and formerly homeless veterans. Since being selected by STP to jointly develop Maceo May, CCDC has become a One TI member. Together CCDC and STP formed Maceo May Apts., L.P., a limited partnership. Both CCDC and STP are go-general partners of the limited partnership.

In 2011, Treasure Island Community Development (TICD) received approvals for the master development of Treasure Island (TI) that included approximately 8,000 new residential units of which 435 new units are for homeless households that are to be developed by One TI member organizations. In 2011, the Board of Supervisors approved a new agreement with One TI outlining its participation in the development project via housing, economic development and support components and reflects the updated land use plan, development program, housing plan and financing plan described in the TICD Disposition and Development Agreement. The 2011 One TI Agreement explicitly states that Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) will ground lease each One TI Lot to a selected One TI member organization approved by TIDA for the construction of One TI housing units. One TI has proposed and TIDA approved CCDC, as selected by STP. TIDA has provided a ground lease to Maceo May Apts., L.P, for Parcel C3.2, and CCDC and STP together are the developers of the improvements on the ground lease parcel. Please see Exhibit A Summary of Treasure Island, TICD, One-TI, and Development Agreement for more information about Treasure Island redevelopment.

1) Summary of MOHCD’s initial Project expectations on November 15, 2019

When recommended for loan approval on November 15, 2019, Maceo May was one of three developments that was part of a pilot program to explore modular construction, as modular construction had not been used in affordable housing in San Francisco.

At the time that the Project was recommended for a City loan, MOHCD staff determined that building with modulars would save the Project approximately \$4.6 million in hard costs and construction loan financing. Of the \$4.6 million in total savings, \$3.6 million is saving using modular construction rather than stick built. In addition, modular construction was also assumed to reduce construction by 4 months, which results in approximately \$1 million in construction loan savings. However, the construction loan savings would only be realized if there were no delays to the Project.

On January 14, 2020, the Board approved the original loan. On January 28, 2020, the Mayor executed the loan. The Project closed its construction financing on April 27, 2020, forty-one (41) days after the City’s Shelter-In-Place ordinance. Maceo May was financed with tax exempt bonds and 4% low-income housing tax credits, General Partner (GP) equity, State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program (VHHP), deferred developer fee, and City permanent financing. The chart below shows the loan sources and amounts at the construction finance closing in April 2020.

Permanent Sources	Construction Closing Budget
City Loan (Combination of predevelopment and gap)	\$24,255,000
CITYLOAN3–NEWLOAN	\$0
Perm Loan - A Tranche	\$10,108,000
HCD’s VHHP	\$10,000,000

FHLB-SF AHP	\$0
Deferred Developer Fee	\$830,816
Capital Contributions	
General Partner	\$500,000
Limited Partner	\$28,764,209
TOTAL:	\$ 74,458,025

b. Project Completion Delays

Maceo May was extensively damaged during the “atmospheric river” rainstorm that hit the Bay Area on October 20, 2021. Almost all areas of the building sustained severe unexpected damage from the high volume of water driven by high winds. Under the direction and supervision of a third-party expert in water damage, the general contractor stripped virtually all drywall, insulation, cabinetry, flooring, and other fixtures that would hinder the ability of the wood framing to dry. In parallel, the general contractor completed the roof and building envelope that had been in progress at the time of the rainstorm. Once cleared to do so by the water damage expert, the contractor then began the process of rebuilding.

The demolition and rebuilding work has delayed the projected completion of the Project by six and a half (6½) months from July 20, 2022, to January 31, 2023. For tax credit projects like Maceo May, the financial consequences of a delay of this magnitude are severe. The Project will have a reduction in tax credit equity of over \$1.2 million and will lose the rate-lock on both its construction loan and permanent loan interest rates. The original rates were locked in April 2020.

Note that the analysis, particularly in Section 3 and 4, discussing potential insurance coverage is based on conservative and preliminary estimates of the amount of recovery. The Sponsors have reserved their rights under the Project insurance policies and do not concede that any element of the insurance claim is not covered, except for the application of a deductible. Nothing in this Memorandum or other communications by or on behalf of the Sponsors is intended as or shall be construed as an admission by, or a declaration against the interest of, any of them. The builder’s risk insurers have not issued a formal coverage position to date. The Sponsors will continue to work closely with their legal counsel to ensure that Maceo May receives all the insurance payments to which it is entitled. If the Project receives insurance payments more than what is projected below, that excess will directly reduce the amount that the Sponsors will draw from this City gap request. This paragraph applies to the entire Loan Evaluation Memorandum and modifies all statements herein.

3. DEVELOPMENT COST VARIANCE ANALYSIS

a. Revised Project Sources

With the funds secured by the Sponsors and estimated insurance proceeds potential, the Project needs an additional \$14,983,000 to cover cost directly related to the stormed damaged unit repairs, increased financing costs including a reduction in the permanent loan due to

rising interest rates since the permanent loan was delayed due to the storm damaged unit repairs, and an increase in operating expenses. The chart below shows the Project sources required to convert to a permanent loan and assumes a conservative and preliminary estimate that may possibly be covered by the Project’s insurance. (As of this loan request, as stated in Section 2b, the Sponsors have already been approved for up to \$15 million in insurance payments).

Permanent Sources	Construction Closing Budget	Estimates to Convert Permanent Loan
City Loan (Combination of predevelopment and gap)	\$24,255,000	\$24,255,000
CITY LOAN 3 – NEW LOAN	\$0	\$14,983,000
Perm Loan - A Tranche	\$10,108,000	\$1,987,768
HCD’s VHHP	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
FHLB-SF AHP	\$0	\$1,040,000
Deferred Developer Fee	\$830,816	\$800,000
Capital Contributions		
General Partner	\$500,000	\$1,100,000
Limited Partner	\$28,764,209	\$27,525,002
*Estimated Insurance Proceeds from Storm Damage	\$ -	\$28,587,290
TOTAL:	\$ 74,458,025	\$110,278,060

* Conservative and preliminary estimate that may possibly be covered by the Project’s insurance.

b. Evaluation of Revised Sources: The Sponsors proposes to use the following revised sources to convert the Project to permanent loans. The sources discussed below are only the changed sources.

1) **Revised City Loan (\$39,238,000)**. The total revised City loan includes \$24,255,000 of previously committed and disbursed funds and includes the additional loan requested funds of \$14,983,000. The City loan includes \$1 million from TIDA’s Developer Housing Subsidy. The total loan is \$373,695 per unit in City funds and exceeds the average subsidy of the more recent development in the MOHCD pipeline by \$112,245.

The City loan includes approximately \$7,750,255 related to the reduction in the permanent loan due to increase interest rates and changes in the operating expenses. (Please see Estimated Insurance Proceeds below in Section 3.b.8. and operating expenses discussion in Section 4.) The City loan also covers approximately \$7,232,745 in additional storm damaged unit repair hard costs and soft costs related to the time while the storm damaged units were being repaired based on the Sponsors’ insurance policy definition of hard and soft costs.

2) **California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC) Permanent Loan (\$1,987,768)**. When the Project closed its construction financing in April 2022, the loan totaled \$10,108,000 and had locked interest rate of 3.28%. With this loan request, the permanent loan is now reduced by \$8,120,232 due to the

delay to repair the storm damaged units the permanent loan will close nearly one year after the initial estimated closing date in a volatile interest rate environment. The new estimated loan interest rate is 5.9%, 2.62% higher than it was in April 2022. Another factor leading to the reduced permanent loan in this request is that the insurance during operations has increases by over 300% and a required Treasure Island Master Association Fee are added operating costs. However, with this request the operating income has not increased. (Please see Section 4 for a discussion of the operating budget.) However, if the rental income is increased to the maximum proposed rents, the permanent loan is estimated to increase to \$4,778,000, which would reduce the City additional loan request by \$2,238,000 for a revised loan totaling \$12,745,000.

- 3) **FHLB of San Francisco (FHLB-SF) AHP (\$1,040,000):** In August 2021, the Sponsors secured AHP in the amount shown. The AHP was originally intended to pay down the equivalent amount of the AHP bridge loan as outlined in the Amended and Restated Loan Agreement dated January 28, 2020. To reduce the amount of additional capital, with this additional loan request the Sponsors propose to have the AHP remain in the Project rather than repay the City's AHP bridge loan.
- 4) **Limited Partnership Equity (\$27,525,002):** This is a loss of \$1,239,207 due to late credit delivery. Credit delivery is the date that the tax credit investor may claim the credits and it is based on the date that one resident may occupy the building after receipt of TCO. Because the storm damage repair delayed the Project by 6½-months, the credit delivery date estimated at the time of the construction financial closing was also delayed by 6½-months.
- 5) **GP Equity (\$1,100,000).** As stated in MOHCD's Developer Fee, Sponsors are required to contribute a minimum of \$500,000 in GP Equity to the affordable housing development, and the Sponsors met this requirement at the time of construction financial closing. The Sponsors secured an additional combined total of \$600,000 from the Home Depot Foundation and the National Equity Fund that they will contribute to the Project bringing the total GP Equity contribution to the amount shown.
- 6) **Deferred Developer Fee (\$800,000).** Deferred developer fee has decreased by \$30,816 from the construction loan closing. The \$800K does not meet the MOHCD Underwriting Guidelines (MOHCD UG's) at this time because the actual deferred fee on the 20-year proforma presented with this loan request totals \$736,413 and MOHCD requires that the deferred fee on the 20-year proforma and the deferred fee amount are the same. At the time of the construction closing, the deferred developer fee met MOHCD UG's. However, for the purposes of this loan request, the deferred fee is as shown as not meeting MOHCD UG's since the project will be re-underwritten again at permanent conversion, planned in February 2024, and at that time the Sponsors and MOHCD staff will ensure that the deferred developer fee meets the MOHCD UG's.

- 7) **Silicon Valley Bank (SVB) Construction Loan (\$43,704,000):** While not a permanent source, the construction loan term is another factor in the additional loan request to the City. At the time of the construction financial closing, the construction term was 32 months with a loan maturity date of January 1, 2023. The Sponsors could extend the loan for 3 months to April 1, 2023 for no cost and extend for an additional month to May 1, 2023 for \$5000.

As previously mentioned, TCO is anticipated on January 31, 2023. Because leasing up the property will take approximately 3 to 4 months and will not be complete until the extended loan maturity date of May 1, 2023, SVB is re-underwriting the construction loan to extend to the new permanent conversion date of February 2024. However, SVB re-underwriting is occurring concurrent with this loan request, and will not be complete until the Sponsors receive approval for the additional loan from MOHCD. The construction interest on the loan will increase from \$1,791,469 at the construction closing to \$3,425,650, an increase of \$1,634,181. If there are insurance proceeds, this may pay a portion of the construction interest. See Section 3.d below for a discussion on estimated and possibly hard and softs cost covered by insurance proceeds.

- 8) ***Estimated Insurance Proceeds (\$28,587,290):** The estimated insurance proceeds is a preliminary estimate that may possibly be covered by the Project's insurance. It should be noted that while the repairs are shown as part of the Project's budget for this request, it is presented in this manner for this request only. In addition, *the repair work is not eligible for tax credits because the initial units already received credits.* To count the repair work would be equivalent to receiving credits on the unit twice, which is not allowed under the tax credit program. For tax credit purposes, the Sponsors will complete a cost certification for the Project, but a separate cost audit may be conducted for verification that the insurance proceeds were expended as intended. As further discussed in Section 3.d, estimated insurance proceeds are covering approximately 85% of hard costs, as defined in the Sponsors' insurance policy, and approximately 41% of soft costs as also defined by insurance policy.

The Sponsors have submitted a builder's risk insurance claim, which may cover the majority of the cost impacts from the rainstorm. The Sponsors have already been approved for up to \$20 million in insurance payments, with further increases pending submission of invoices. However, insurance payments are made only after costs are incurred and approved by the insurance claims adjuster, often after multiple rounds of review. This process is lengthy, and the total amount of the insurance recovery may not be known until months after the building is complete.

The Sponsors are requesting this gap loan increase and a change to the AHP bridge loan repayment to the City at this time because the Sponsors will need to make payments, particularly those necessary to close out the construction contract, in advance of when these final insurance payments will be received and in advance of the permanent conversion.

It is critical to be able to pay subcontractors in a timely manner, so they do not stop work in advance of completion, further delaying this housing for veterans and formerly homeless veterans. The Sponsors must also close out the construction contract quickly after the work is complete to prevent subcontractors from filing mechanics' liens against the property. Filing the Notice of Completion and obtaining lien-free title are both key milestones to convert the Project to its permanent financing.

Also noteworthy is that Cahill Contractors (Cahill), the Project's general contractor, has pre-paid subcontractors in advance of receiving reimbursements from insurance proceeds. The total advance through September 30, 2022, is \$1,733,055. Cahill plans to advance an additional \$351,653 before the next insurance proceed reimbursement is received, bringing the total advancement to \$2,084,708. It is important to note that 63% of these advance payments have been to the electrical subcontractor who is a certified Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and cannot continue working without payments.

c. Revised Project Uses

Increases to the Project budget due to the storm damaged unit repairs and time delay while the units were being repaired totals \$35,820,035. A portion of the total increase could be covered by insurance proceeds. The chart below shows the changes that have occurred since the construction loan closing in April 2020.

Uses Line Item	Line Item Amount at Construction Loan Closing	Line Item Amount with this additional loan request	Variance between Construction Loan Closing and this additional loan request
CONSTRUCTION (HARD COSTS)			
Total Construction Costs	\$58,105,949	\$89,659,309	\$31,553,360
<i>Subtotal</i>			<i>\$31,553,360</i>
SOFT COSTS			
Total Architect & Design -	\$ 3,452,011	\$ 3,547,711	\$ 95,700
Total Engineering & Environmental Studies	\$ 102,868	\$ 102,868	\$ -
Total Financing Costs	\$ 2,576,574	\$ 4,289,799	\$ 1,713,225
Total Legal Costs	\$ 389,600	\$ 549,600	\$ 160,000
Total Development Costs	\$ 4,567,532	\$ 6,737,628	\$ 2,170,096
Soft Cost Contingency	\$ 537,223	\$ 645,600	\$ 108,377
Total Reserves	\$ 1,226,268	\$ 1,245,545	\$ 19,277
Developer Fee	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -
<i>Subtotal</i>			<i>\$ 4,266,675</i>
TOTAL:	\$74,458,025	\$110,278,060	\$35,820,035

d. Evaluation of Revised Uses: The Sponsors proposes to use the revised source discussed in Section 3.a and 3.b above on the increased Project uses discussed below, and the discussion below only covers the changed uses.

- 1) **Total Construction Costs.** Hard costs have increased by \$31,553,360. The construction repair costs are based on a rough order of magnitude (ROM) provided by Cahill on May 18, 2022. Cahill provided a ROM hard cost construction estimate totaling \$30.1 million, inclusive of 5.87% overhead, profit, general contract insurance, and performance bonding as these charges are applied to all change order contractor amendments. This ROM includes the full demolition/abatement scope, including replacement of all fixtures and finishes that were in place and damaged, as well as PEX piping, Romex, heaters, and light fixtures. The Sponsors added a 5% contingency to the ROM.

MOHCD Construction Representative statement about General Contractor's ROM Hard Costs

The storm damage that the Maceo May has been faced with is quite unlike anything MOHCD has seen before. Due largely to that the fact that the factory built modular units had many finish materials in place before the permanent roof was installed, and the "atmospheric river" rainstorm hit at the exact right time to cause the maximum amount of damage possible. As such, MOHCD lacks any comparable projects to compare these costs to, but all indications to-date support these ROMs as being reasonable projections of the final costs. Having completed the remediation work and having worked extensively with San Francisco Department of Building and Inspection (DBI) to understand any additional work needed to address discrepancies in code interpretation between the City (the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) for site-built work) and the State of California (the AHJ for factory work), the general contractor's ROMs are more solidly confirmed rather than initial estimates provided after and prior to storm damaged unit repairs, which leads to further confidence in the accuracy.

As discussed above in Sections 3.a and 3.b, to date the Sponsor have only received approval for \$15 million in insurance proceeds and Cahill has advanced \$1.7 million toward the storm damaged units. In addition, to date the Sponsors have only billed and received payment for \$5.6 million of the approved \$15 million in storm damaged unit repairs.

The Total Construction Costs increase includes the following:

- \$12,225 for architect cost related to design.
- \$3,847 for special inspections needed to inspect the rebuild of the 3-hour wall and other rainstorm damaged units being repaired by the general contractor.
- \$58,822 for the water consultants monitoring and consulting of the remediation/water intrusion to the stormed damaged units. Cost increases include a projected cost for the final unit air sample clearance, which will occur around unit punch (October and/or November 2022).

Insurance allows soft cost work (architecture, special inspections, and water consultant) to be considered hard cost work for the purposes of an insurance claim. The chart below shows the details of the cost included in the Total Construction Costs and the estimate includes the amount possibly covered by insurance proceeds. In the chart below, insurance is estimated to possible

cover 85% or \$26,857,756 of the hard cost for the rainstorm damaged units. The remaining 15% or \$4,695,603 is anticipated to be covered by the additional City loan.

Construction (Hard Cost) – Unit Construction details of Storm Damage Increases	Hard Cost ROM	Estimated as covered by insurance	Variance of Hard Cost ROM from Insurance Estimates
Construction & Remediation	\$30,138,060	\$25,517,351	\$ 4,620,709
Architecture/Engineering	\$ 81,500	\$ 69,275	\$ 12,225
Special Inspections	\$ 25,650	\$ 21,803	\$ 3,847
Water Consultant	\$ 392,150	\$ 333,328	\$ 58,822
TIDA Storage Lease	\$ 916,000	\$ 916,000	\$-
TOTAL:	\$31,553,360	\$26,857,756	Total Hard Cost Variance: \$4,695,603

2) **Total Architect & Design.** This increase of \$95,700 include costs defined as soft costs by insurance. The cost increase includes:

- \$63,700 for additional construction administration due to the 6 1/2-months delay caused by the storm damage repair, rounded to 7-months delay.
- \$32,000 for construction testing that has been delayed while the storm damaged repairs took place. The estimate assumes 20 full days at \$200 per day.

3) **Total Financing Costs.** Financing has increased by \$1,713,255. This increase is due to increases in the construction loan interest and bond issue fees.

- \$1,634,181 for additional construction loan interest based on the new loan maturity date of February 2024, the new permanent conversion date. See Section 3.b.7 for a discussion about the construction loan maturity date.
- \$79,044 for bond issuer fees for an additional year for both MOHCD and the trustee due to added time to complete the storm damaged unit repairs. The line item also includes the construction lender’s construction management services for an additional 7 months of work caused by the storm damage delay. The total increase amount has been recalculated with the current permanent loan rates

4) **Total Legal Costs.** Legal costs have increased by \$160,000 and include the following legal increases:

- \$100,000 for a contracts/insurance attorney, who provides legal services related to the rainstorm damage. Please note that the contracts/insurance attorney costs are not eligible for insurance reimbursement.
- \$20,000 for Sponsors’ attorneys cost related to the transaction as the Sponsors’ attorneys have reviewed all documents related to triggering a foreclosure and other provisions related to the magnitude of the storm damage unit repairs delay.

- \$40,000 for the limited partner, bond counsel, construction lender, and permanent attorneys with each type of attorney receiving an estimated \$10,000 each to draft, review, and approve new legal documents related to the delay and additional sources of funds being added to the project.
- 5) **Total Development Costs** have increased by \$2,170,096 and includes the following development costs:
- \$2,129,880 for builder’s risk insurance that was renewed on March 1, 2022 after the previous policy expired on February 28, 2022. The previous policy that was included at the time of the construction closing was \$1,122,793. The new policy is approximately a 189% increase. The renewed builder’s insurance includes cost to extend the policy through duration of construction.
 - \$5,000 to complete an additional cost audit to document use of insurance proceeds for the storm damaged units and delays. This work is different from a cost audit required for bond financed developments.
 - \$216 for tax credit monitoring fees due to a slight increase of eligible basis since the construction closing.
 - \$35,000 for extension of Sponsors’ construction management services due to the longer construction period due to the storm damaged units repair delay.
- 6) **Soft Cost Contingency** has increased by \$108,377. The increase is 3% of all soft costs.
- 7) **Total Reserves** has increased by \$19,277. The cost increase is for operating reserve costs related to the interest rate on the permanent loan as discussed in Section 3.b.2 above.

Total soft cost increases related to the delay caused by the storm damage totals \$4,266,675. The chart below details the softs cost as defined in the insurance policy and estimates what insurance may possibly cover. Based on the chart below, insurance is estimated to cover approximately 41% or \$1,729,534 of the total estimated soft cost repairs. The remaining 59% or \$2,537,141 is anticipated to be covered by the additional City loan.

Soft Costs Line items	Amount of Soft Cost increases due to rainstorm damages	Estimated as covered by insurance	Variance of Soft Cost Changes from Insurance Estimates
Architect& Design - Architect Design Fees	\$ 63,700	\$ 54,600	\$ 9,100
Architect& Design - Other Third-Party Design	\$ 32,000	\$-	\$ 32,000
Consultants - Construction Testing			
Financing Costs - Construction Loan Interest	\$1,634,181	\$ 654,886	\$ 979,295
Financing Costs - Bond Issuer Fees	\$ 79,044	\$-	\$ 79,044
Legal Costs – Borrower Legal Fees	\$ 160,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 140,000
Other Development Costs – Insurance during construction	\$2,129,880	\$ 831,952	\$1,297,928

Other Development Costs – Accounting/Audit	\$ 5,000	\$-	\$ 5,000
Other Development Costs – TCAC App / Alloc / Monitoring Fees	\$ 216	\$-	\$ 216
Other Development Costs – Construction Management Fee / Owner Rep	\$ 35,000	\$30,000	\$ 5,000
Soft Cost Contingency (reduction prior to storm)	(\$ 95,323)	\$-	(\$ 95,323)
Soft Cost Contingency (increase due to storm)	\$ 203,700	\$ 138,096	\$ 65,604
Reserves – Operating Reserves	\$ 19,277	\$-	\$ 19,277
TOTAL:	\$4,266,675	\$1,729,534	\$2,537,141

4. OPERATING INCOME AND EXPENSES

For this additional loan increase, the Sponsors have submitted two changes to the operating expenses on the first-year operating budget provided in Attachment C while no change to the operating income at this time. There are 65 units supported by federal Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) operating subsidy and administered by San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) and 39 non-VASH units. Similar to a project-based voucher, the federal government acting through SFHA will provide a fair market rent (FMR) for the unit with VASH operating subsidy while the resident continues to pay an affordable rent at 30% of the resident’s income. Operating income rents with this request are showing 2019 VASH FMRs for and 2019 rents for non-VASH units. FMRs have increased for 2022, and for this Project could result in approximation \$1.59 million in additional income than the 2019 VASH FMR. However, before increasing all rents to 2022 rent levels, the Sponsors wants to receive a SFHA executed Housing Assistance Payment Contract (HAP). With all rents at 2019 levels, the operating rental income with this additional loan request represents the most conservative estimate for the permanent loan. If Sponsors receives a SFHA executed HAP showing the 2022 VASH FMRs, all rents, including non-VASH will be increased to 2022 levels, and the entire first-year budget will be updated, and the full operating budget will be re-evaluated by MOHCD prior to permanent loan conversion and the commercial permanent loan will be resized.

Because this additional gap loan is required to pay off the general contractor’s construction contract and meet a condition of extending the SVB construction loan, the full operating expenses revisions are not provided with this request, with the two exceptions below:

1. The Project’s operating expenses have also been updated to reflect a \$317,000 increase in property insurance costs, based on rates that other large, wood-frame, affordable housing projects have recently faced. The budgeted amount for property insurance increased from \$98,000 at closing in April 2020 to \$415,000 based on an estimate from the Sponsors’ insurance broker on October 4, 2022. This quote reflects that Maceo May is a wood-frame building with a large, estimated replacement cost of \$80,000,000. The estimated replacement cost for this building makes it too large to be enrolled in the Sponsors’ portfolio property insurance policy. The policy must be bid on the open insurance market, which has a low risk tolerance and high premiums for large, wood-frame buildings.
2. The operating budget now includes a Treasure Island Master Association Fee (Master Association Fee). Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) was still negotiating

the Master Association Fee with Treasure Island Community Development, LLC, a California limited liability company (TICD), at the time of closing, and for this reason the private commercial lenders would not allow the Master Association Fees to be a part of the assumed underwriting at the time of closing. However, this was an error as the Master Association Fees are a required fee of all new construction building on Treasure Island. The Master Association Fees are assumed to be \$400 per unit per year or \$42,000 annually.

Any increase to the permanent loan that results from future changes to the VASH FMRs, rents in units without operating subsidy, and operating expenses will be used to reduce the amount of the City loan.

5. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Proposed Loan Terms

Financial Description of Proposed Loan	
Loan Amount:	\$14,983,000
Loan Term:	55 years from the anniversary of the Conversion Date, and co-terminus with the Amended and Restated Loan dated January 28, 2020
Loan Maturity Date:	2077
Loan Repayment Type:	Residual Receipts
Loan Interest Rate:	0%
Date Loan Committee approves prior expenses can be paid:	Rainstorm damage related expenses incurred between October 1, 2021, to January 31, 2023 for hard costs and soft costs with a not to exceed amount of \$7,232,745, the subtotal of source variances.

b. Recommended Loan Conditions

1. MOHCD will only disburse funds to pay off the Cahill contract and prevent construction lien releases and cover some soft costs in a not to exceed amount of \$7,232,745, the subtotal of source variances. The remaining funds, if needed will be disbursed as part of the permanent loan conversion and through the permanent loan closing escrow. Sixty (60) days prior to permanent conversion, MOHCD will re-evaluate the operating expenses to determine that that the permanent loan supports the Project and leverages MOHCD final contribution through escrow. If the permanent loan is increased, MOHCD’s contribution at permanent loan conversion will be decreased.

2. Once a SFHA-executed HAP showing SFHA approved VASH rents is received, the remaining 39 non-VASH rents will be increased to 2022 and the entire first-year operating budget and 20-year cash flow will be updated and finalized. The entire first-year operating budget and 20-year cash flow will be re-evaluated by MOHCD, and the commercial permanent loan will be resized. Any increases to the permanent loan will reduce the City loan by the equivalent amount. If the loan has been approved by the Mayor, unreimbursed amounts will be disencumbered by the City. If the loan has been fully disbursed, the Sponsor will return any savings to the City at the conversion and paid through conversion escrow.
3. Once 95% occupancy is achieved, Sponsors are required to provide the stabilized occupancy calculation to MOHCD.
4. Sponsors must allow MOHCD to verify all costs and sources prior to permanent loan conversion. All Project cost including insurance must be finalized with the MOHCD loan amounts finalized with all cost and sources verified before payment At Risk Developer Fee of \$1,069,184.00, as defined in the Developer Fee Agreement between MOHCD and Sponsors dated February 1, 2020.

6. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

7. LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

APPROVE. DISAPPROVE. TAKE NO ACTION.

Eric D. Shaw, Director
Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development

Date: _____

APPROVE. DISAPPROVE. TAKE NO ACTION.

Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Date: _____

APPROVE. DISAPPROVE. TAKE NO ACTION.

Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Date: _____

APPROVE. DISAPPROVE. TAKE NO ACTION.

Anna Van Degna, Director
Controller’s Office of Public Finance

Date: _____

- Attachments:
- A. Summary of Treasure Island, TICD, One-TI, and Development Agreement
 - B. Permanent Sources and Uses
 - C. Operating Budget & Cash Flow with 2019 rents and 2019 VASH FMRs

Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From: Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 11:56 AM
To: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
Subject: Request for Additional Gap Financing Treasure Island C3.2

Approve

Eric D. Shaw
Director/ Interim Director HopeSF

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

Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From: Menjivar, Salvador (HOM)
Sent: Tuesday, November 8, 2022 10:20 AM
To: Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Cc: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
Subject: Treasure Island Parcel C3.2 ("Maceo May")

I approve the request by Maceo May Apt, L.P. (a partnership formed by Chinatown Community Development Center and Swords to Plowshares) for an additional gap loan funds in the amount of up to \$14,983,000 for a revised loan totaling \$39,238,000 for Treasure Island Parcel C3.2 ("Maceo May"), a 105-unit new affordable housing development that will include 39 replacement units available for current Treasure Island residents and 65 new units for formerly homeless veterans, plus one manager's unit and 19 parking spaces.

salvador



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

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: [@SF_HSH](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://twitter.com/SanFranciscoHSH)

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

Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From: Colomello, Elizabeth (CII)
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 11:56 AM
To: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
Cc: Shaw, Eric (MYR); Kaslofsky, Thor (CII)
Subject: Updated Request for Additional Financing for additional gap financing for Treasure Island Parcel C3.2

Hi Rosie-
I approve the subject request on behalf of OCII.
Thanks-
Elizabeth



Elizabeth Colomello
Housing Program Manager

📍 One South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
☎ 415.749-2488, Cell 415.407-1908
🏠 www.sfocii.org

Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)

From: Katz, Bridget (CON)
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 11:56 AM
To: Chavez, Rosanna (MYR)
Cc: Shaw, Eric (MYR)
Subject: Request for Additional Gap Financing Treasure Island C3.2

Approve

Bridget Katz

Development Finance Specialist, Office of Public Finance

Controller's Office | City & County of San Francisco

Office Phone: (415) 554-6240

Cell Phone: (858) 442-7059

E-mail: bridget.katz@sfgov.org

Attachment A:
Summary of Treasure Island Development Authority,
Treasure Island Development Corporation, LLC, One Treasure Island,
Development Agreement and Existing Treasure Island Households

The purpose of this Attachment A is to summarize and contextualize the history of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and its key stakeholders, specifically to contextualize certain underwriting assumptions in the MOHCD loan evaluation. This attachment is comprised of the following sections: Background, Vision/Equity, Public Private Partnership, Horizontal Development, Community Planning and Amenities, Authorizing Agreements, and Existing Treasure Island Households.

I. BACKGROUND

Treasure Island ("TI") was constructed as one of the most visible of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Works Progress Administration projects and was host to the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1939 and 1940. Treasure Island was activated as a United States Naval Base in 1940 and played a substantial role in both World War Two and the Korean War. TI was used as a center for receiving, training and dispatching personnel. After the war, the Island was used as a training and administrative center.

In 1993 the Federal Government placed the Naval Station Treasure Island ("NSTI") on its Base Realignment and Closure list, and the United States Department of Defense subsequently designated the City and County of San Francisco (the City) as the Local Reuse Authority ("LRA") responsible for the conversion of the Base to civilian use under the federal disposition process per the Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994 (the "Act"). In 1994, the City began to conduct hearings and community meetings which informed the redevelopment plan that would eventually result in a new San Francisco neighborhood incorporating residents of all socio-economic backgrounds. NSTI was formally decommissioned in 1997.

In 1997, the City formed the Treasure Island Development Authority ("TIDA") as a redevelopment agency under California law and designated it as the new Local Reuse Authority.

After formation in 1997, TIDA initiated formal negotiations with the Navy. The Navy contracted with the City (and subsequently TIDA) to manage the property pending negotiations for its transfer and redevelopment. As part of managing TI on behalf of the Navy, TIDA began subleasing at market rates a portion of the former military housing now known as The Villages at Treasure Island ("The Villages") through a master lease with The John Stewart Company, and directly leasing space to a variety of commercial tenants.

In 2003, TIDA selected Treasure Island Community Development LLC ("TICD") for exclusive negotiations for the master redevelopment of TI.

The Board of Supervisors approved the development plan in 2006 (and amended its approval in 2010), which was conditioned on completion of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”).

The Development Agreement (“DA”), dated June 28, 2011, vests the master plan’s entitlements for thirty years and any vertical project is then approved by the Planning department under a process outlined in the DA. The DA, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, forms the basis for the Disposition and Development Agreement (“DDA”) between TIDA and TICD, and governs respective rights and obligations for the redevelopment of portions of TI and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) and calls for the development of up to 8,000 residential units in a series of Major Phases and Sub-Phases.

As of the signing of the DDA between TIDA and TICD there were approximately 600 existing former Navy housing units occupied by households living in both affordable units for formerly homeless households and market rate units. These households have certain rights and benefits and are described in detail below.

A CEQA lawsuit was filed against the project but was unsuccessful. It did serve to delay the project.

Portions of Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands were formally transferred from the Navy to TIDA in May 2015. Land for the first two sub phases of the redevelopment plan was transferred to TICD in February 2016.

Initial market rate home construction began on YBI in June 2019 and is scheduled for completion in Q2 2022. The first vertical construction on Treasure Island began in 2020 with Maceo May Apartments, an affordable housing development for homeless and low-income veterans by Swords to Plowshares in partnership with Chinatown CDC and is scheduled for completion in Q4 2022.

In 2019, TICD submitted its application and approvals to complete horizontal work for the second sub-phase. The Street Improvement Permit is expected later this year.

On March 1, 2021, MOHCD and TIDA executed an MOU defining roles and responsibilities for development, marketing, and compliance monitoring all affordable, inclusionary and Transition Units.

By 2025 it is projected that 1,171 units in 11 projects will be completed. This includes 243 affordable units in affordable housing developments ground leased by TIDA and 928 market rate units (including 64 inclusionary units) on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Islands.

II. VISION/EQUITY

The overall development plan calls for approximately 8,000 homes (with 2,173 homes/27.2% affordable), 300 hotel rooms, 550,000 square feet of retail and commercial space, and 290 acres of public open space representing 75% of the geographic area.

Treasure Island will be a model for sustainability and is the largest and highest scoring project to target Platinum rating under the LEED Neighborhood Development program.

The Transportation Plan for Treasure Island promotes pedestrian and bicycle mobility, provides strong public transit options and de-emphasizes vehicle use. New privately subsidized ferry service is commencing Q1 2022 and is expected to be privately subsidized for 2-3 years when the WETA will assume operations. As additional residents move to TI and YBI, MUNI bus service will be enhanced, new AC Transit bus service to the East Bay will commence and an on-island shuttle from the transit hub to the new neighborhoods will begin service.

The island will have congestion-pricing to encourage transit usage and discourage peak-time auto travel. Subsidized transit passes and discounts to services like car- and bike-share will make transit affordable and accessible to longtime residents and people living in below market-rate housing.

The redevelopment of Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands creates a brand-new neighborhood for existing and new residents with equity principles baked into its core. From inception, the plan has included over 27% of housing units to be affordable, with units reserved for homeless households integrated into the affordable units and the affordable units integrated throughout the market rate units. All janitorial and landscaping in TIDA operated spaces, such as Building One and most of the public open space, are performed by One Treasure Island members Toolworks and Rubicon landscaping, which provide job training and work opportunities for economically disadvantaged people and/or people with disabilities. Twenty five percent of all new construction jobs and 25% of all new permanent jobs are set-aside for economically disadvantaged San Franciscans that face barriers to employment per the DDA. Parks, open space, community facilities and retail strategies are conscientiously being developed to foster inclusion and integration. From inception, equity has been at the heart of Treasure Island redevelopment planning and implementation.

III. PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

There are three key entities leading the development process.

Treasure Island Development Authority

The Treasure Island Development Authority (“TIDA” or the “Authority”) was formed in 1997 as a non-profit, public benefit agency dedicated to the economic development of the former NSTI and the administration of municipal services thereon. It is governed by its own Board of Directors.

Treasure Island Community Development, LLC (principal developer)

The Treasure Island Development Corporation LLC (“TICD”) is a joint venture between Lennar Urban and KSWM and is the principal developer. Members of KSWM include: Stockbridge Capital Group; Wilson Meany Sullivan LLC; and Kenwood Investments, LLC.

One Treasure Island

One Treasure Island (One TI) (formerly known as the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative or TIHDI), is a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that was formed in June 1994 for the purpose of utilizing the structural and economic development resources of the former NSTI to create a vibrant, inclusive community that provides pathways for economic advancement for lower-income and formerly homeless San Franciscans. One TI achieves its mission through affordable housing, jobs, community building, and advocacy. One Treasure Island is a membership organization committed to fostering an equitable, inclusive, and thriving community for all Treasure Island residents, employees, businesses, and visitors emphasizing inclusion by lower-income households and those who have experienced homelessness.

IV. HORIZONTAL DEVELOPMENT

Yerba Buena Island is a natural island and Treasure Island is man-made. Before vertical construction can begin significant infrastructure, improvements were needed and will continue.

TICD’s application for Major Phase I development was submitted in 2014 and approved by TIDA in May 2015. TIDA oversees the delivery of infrastructure and geotech work, supported by the City’s Public Works Task Force and construction inspections through the City’s Department of Building and Inspection.

Demolition of the existing buildings in Stage 1 (the area including the affordable parcels) and infrastructure work for new water tanks that serve Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and Phase I geotechnical mitigation work has all been completed and street infrastructure is underway. The infrastructure and geotechnical scope is described below.

Infrastructure and Geotechnical Work

The Geotechnical Conceptual Design Report for Treasure Island, completed February 2, 2009, describes soils comprised of 30-50 ft of sand fill and 20-120 feet of young bay mud, underlain by firmer soils. It also states that the island perimeter could be destabilized by liquefaction. The geotechnical improvement program for Treasure Island has four primary components and each component will be completed within a phase of infrastructure improvements. The four primary components are:

- Reconstruction of the causeway connecting Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The causeway is almost complete and has been reconstructed

in its entirety – excavated to near sea level, cement deep soil mixing (“CDSM”) employed to strengthen soils below sea level and then reconstructed using appropriate engineered fill to the intended finished elevation.

- Improvement of Island Perimeter – the perimeter of the island will be strengthened employing a combination of stone columns and CDSM walls to mitigate lateral spread of the island following the subsidence of off-shore materials in a seismic event.
- Vibratory Compaction – Throughout the area of vertical development, including the street areas, the fill materials and underlying naturally deposited sands on which the island rests will be consolidated through vibratory compaction through their 50’-70’ depth. This is intended to mitigate the potential for liquefaction during future seismic events by pre-consolidating these fill materials.
- Surcharging – following compaction of the materials from which the island was constructed, imported soil will be stockpiled on the development areas to simulate the dead weight of the future buildings and other improvements. This weight will induce the consolidation of the bay mud which underlies the sandy fill materials to mitigate settlement that would otherwise occur after the future buildings are constructed. After surcharging, the imported soil will be removed from the site to achieve the desired finished site elevation.
- Increasing the soil capacity also allows buildings up to 7-stories to be supported on conventional foundations. Taller buildings will require deep foundations.

Sea Level Rise Mitigations

The redevelopment of Treasure Island has been designed to account for sea level rise. Our adaptive management strategy includes:

- Raising the island to guard against sea level rise, including wave run-up.
- All streets will be at least 36 inches higher than the Base Flood Elevation. All ground floors will be 42 inches higher than the FEMA Base Flood Elevation.
- The perimeter of the island will be geotechnically improved. The crest elevation of shoreline structures will be 16-32 inches higher than currently required to mitigate any extreme events, such as tsunamis, high tides and storm surges.
- All residential buildings on the West and North side will be set back at least 350 feet from the shoreline so that the island buffer perimeter can be improved if sea levels continue to rise beyond current projections. This will be financed by a Community Facilities District that will raise \$1.2 billion over 99 years for improvements to mitigate against future sea-level rise.

In June 2020, TIDA was awarded a \$30 million State of California Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (“IIG”) funds to conduct a portion of the infrastructure work. The grant is sitewide for Treasure Island

and requires affordable housing to be constructed, but none of the IIG funds will be applied to individual TI affordable housing developments.

V. COMMUNITY PLANNING AND ISLAND AMENITIES

When the Navy vacated Treasure Island in 1997, all community services such as childcare, recreation, and youth programming ceased to operate, and non-code compliant playgrounds were removed. One TI developed a Services Plan that included the reuse of existing facilities to provide community services. The Community Services and Facilities Plan is updated regularly, most recently in 2021. These services were and are seen as critical in both supporting island residents while building opportunities to create a new neighborhood through shared experiences and mutual needs. As part of actively planning for community services and facilities, One TI has also worked with Triple Aim/National Initiative on Mixed Income Communities for strategic guidance, is developing Equity Indicators research and monitoring and working with TIMMA/SFCTA to conduct a Supplemental Transportation Needs Assessment for current TI residents.

The purpose of this section is to describe current amenities on Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands as well as the amenities that are expected to be complete by the time that TI-C3.1 is projected for completion, with a focus on amenities and facilities that are family friendly.

Parks, Playgrounds, Open Space

Approximately ½ mile from the project site (across the street from the restaurant MerSea, at 9th street) is a public playground, picnic area, and dog park.

Residents also enjoy the Perimeter Path - a walking trail along the Bay and a beloved community feature for TI residents.

A portion of Waterfront Plaza in front the Ferry Terminal is expected to open in March 2022 with the entire park scheduled for completion by October 2022. The causeway stormwater garden and associated pedestrian facility including access to the Clipper Cove beach at the east Causeway is also near completion.

On Yerba Buena Island Hilltop Park, a new dog park, and Pier E-2 (at the end of Northgate Road at the east of YBI) are all scheduled to open in April 2022

In addition to the formal parks, pocket parks are planned all around the Shared Public Way which is a car-free bike and pedestrian corridor and many of these improvements will be close to completion by the time the Treasures Island Parcel C3.1 is occupied.

Today, residents have access to baseball, soccer and rugby fields. In addition, a new soccer / sports facility at 9th Street and Avenue M is underway by SF Glens and SF Little league is constructing a replacement baseball field at 8th Street and Avenue M.

Future parks include a Cultural Park by the Chapel and Cityside Park on the western shore, and The Wilds on the northern portion of Treasure Island but no timetable is available for these parks at this time.

Childcare

Catholic Charities runs the current childcare facility on the Island, with 18 enrolled students and a waitlist. The center has capacity for 100 children, but staff capacity currently constrains enrollment. The center will also be available to TI-C3.1 residents.

Schools

Currently, the Life Learning Academy operates a charter high school with 50 students and including 24 students living in the dorm. At this time SFUSD is not operating the existing school facility but SFUSD intends to open a school on Treasure Island in the future.

The YMCA

The Treasure Island Y offers recreation, integrated programs and partnerships throughout the community. The fitness center serves 1,000 members and is free to all Treasure Island residents. Programs and classes respond to community health and wellness needs. Youth programs operate 7 days per week and include a K-8 summer program with excursions. The YMCA currently operates out of the gymnasium facility's basketball courts, three built- out rooms and kitchen.

Ship Shape Community Center

The community center has been operated by One TI for over 20 years and is used for community events and meetings, trainings, a weekly food pantry (serving an average of 200 households a week with staples and fresh produce during COVID-19), a free tax preparation site and a free computer lab.

Library

The San Francisco Public Library operates a weekly bookmobile that parks in front of Ship Shape and YMCA 1-2 days per week. Planning is currently under way for a library kiosk that is projected to be in operation by the time Treasure Island C3.1 is occupied.

Sailing Center

The Sailing Center has been in operation since 1999. The center offers pro-bono programs and scholarships for underserved youth; it serves the Life Learning Academy students, among others. The facility provides services both for elite athletics programs and for local, low-income populations who may not have basic water safety skills.

Grocery Store

Island Cove Market, is a full service grocery store (excluding alcohol) totaling approximately 10,000 square feet in Building 201, 800 Avenue H. Island Market & Deli is a convenience store totaling approximately 410 sq. ft and is located in Building 1.

Community Clinic

The San Francisco Department of Public Health's (DPH) Treasure Island Community Clinic is administered by DPH's Maxine Hall Health Center and is located in a portion of the YMCA. The clinic is staffed by a nurse who provides advice, referrals and drop-in treatment of minor urgent issues. The service is intended for low-income families in order to refer and connect them to primary care if they are not already connected.

Treasure Island Museum

This is a small museum in Building 1 with plans underway for a new and bigger space in Building 1. It envisions having a responsibility to communicate Treasure Island's continuous role in innovation, arts and architecture and to help knit together the residential community. The Museum's place of prominence means it is in a position to introduce visitors to Treasure Island and can also build a sense of place and tell the story of Treasure Island.

VI. AUTHORIZING AGREEMENTS

The purpose of this section is to summarize the authorizing legislation that governs redevelopment. This section also describes enforcement mechanisms to ensure that the principal developer meets its obligations as well as describes revenue sources for affordable housing that are generated by the project. This section first focuses on the Disposition and Development Agreement and then The Amended and Restated Base Closure Homeless Assistance Agreement.

Disposition and Development Agreement

TIDA oversees the redevelopment of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The Disposition and Development Agreement (the "DDA") dated June 29, 2011 is central to the development of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and guides the work of TIDA. The DDA addresses the obligations of the Treasure Island Community Development, LLC ("Principal Developer") and TIDA with regard to developing infrastructure, housing, commercial and open spaces on Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island. The DDA also establishes that TIDA will sell or ground lease developable lots to vertical developers in accordance with land use documents including a General Plan Amendment, Development Agreement, and Design for Development. Salient features of the DDA with respect to affordable housing are described below.

Housing Plan. The DDA contains a Housing Plan that specifies the opportunities and obligations for the development and construction of affordable housing units that have been agreed upon by TIDA and the Principal Developer. The Housing Plan in the DDA allows for the development and construction of up to 1,866 Authority Housing Units including 435 units reserved for homeless households and up to 307 Inclusionary Units, for a total of up to 2,173 Affordable Housing Units representing over 27% of all residential homes when Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are fully developed.

The TIDA Housing Projects include affordable units that will be rented to low-income households spanning a wide range of affordability and may include

Transition Units. A detailed description of the rights and benefits of Legacy Households are described below in the next section of this Attachment.

TIDA Housing Projects will be developed by Qualified Housing Developers (as defined in the DDA), and minimally the 435 units for homeless households will be developed by One TI member organizations.

Approximately 21.7% of the acreage of the developable residential pads will be available in 20 parcels to be used for the development of these affordable housing units.

Treasure Island Investment and Principal Developer enforcement mechanisms.

The DDA governs enforcement mechanisms to ensure development completion by the Principal Developer. TICD provided Payment and Performance Bonds to TIDA for the infrastructure, utilities, geotechnical improvements and other obligations under the DDA. Further assurances for performance are also provided through the DDA via a Right of Reversionary Quitclaim deed which is recorded on title in the event that TICD were to fail to make the improvements required in each sub phase.

While any undertaking of this infrastructure and geotechnical scope, depth and breadth carries risk, it's worth acknowledging the deep investments that have already been made by the City and TICD, the most significant being the City's approval of an equity and construction loan guarantee of Parcel 3.2 - Maceo May, a 100% affordable housing development for homeless and low-income veterans. While this loan guarantee will not be available to other commercial lenders of the affordable housing developments, the guarantee demonstrates the City's commitment to TI affordable housing development.

Other deep City and TICD investments are Treasure Island's creation of its own transportation management agency, the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA), which has successfully achieved State legislation authorizing congestion toll pricing. TIDA has also created its Infrastructure Financing District in order to start accruing tax increment and the first tranche of IRFD proceeds for affordable housing is expected by Q3 2022.

TICD has invested well over \$100 million into the approval process for the DDA and its Major Phase and Sub-phase plans. The Principal Developer continues to deliver Payment & Performance bonds totaling several million dollars for the various scope of work for which it its responsible. The Principal Developer has invested heavily and would lose the right to develop if it does not deliver on the horizontal and then the vertical improvements.

Treasure Island-specific revenue opportunities. Per the DDA, TICD is required to provide a payment of \$17,500 per market-rate unit at the transfer of a market rate lot to a vertical developer to subsidize the affordable units. These funds, as well as tax increment financing generated by a new infrastructure financing district, and typical Jobs-Housing Linkage fees related to commercial space

development, will help finance the affordable units. However, these funds were not available for the first affordable housing development, Maceo May, which was funded by City affordable housing sources. It is anticipated that Treasure Island Parcel C3.1, developed by Mercy, will receive some of the first tax increment financing. Depending when the funds are available, the funding will either be an upfront commitment or made through an amendment allowing the funds to replace committed City funds.

TIDA intends to request a forward commitment from TICD if needed in order to accelerate the development of future projects. The ability to request a forward capital commitment from TICD was contemplated in the DDA Section 8.4(e) of the Housing Plan in order to help transition Legacy Households (described below).

The Amended and Restated Base Closure Homeless Assistance Agreement

One Treasure Island (“One TI”) (formerly the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (“TIHDI”) was formed in 1994 and is a non-profit membership organization committed to developing the homeless component of the land use plan for redevelopment.

The Amended and Restated Base Closure Homeless Assistance Agreement (“Base Closure Agreement”) dated June 28, 2011, outlines all TIDA obligations with respect to housing and services for current and formerly homeless individuals and families to be provided by One TI and also governs certain new housing, employment and economic development opportunities that are managed by One TI in four broad categories:

- **Housing for homeless households:** At least 435 units (total including replacement units)
- **Employment:** 25% hiring goal for construction and permanent jobs
- **Economic Development:** Service Contracts and social enterprises that hire and train people with barriers to employment
- **Services:** Spaces for community center, youth services and administrative offices

The Agreement also describes replacement unit obligations for current residents and is described in detail below.

VII. EXISTING TREASURE ISLAND RESIDENTS

As of the signing of the DDA between TIDA and TICD in 2011, there were 250 existing affordable housing units for formerly homeless households and approximately 350 existing market rate housing units on all of TI. There is no physical distinction between the market rate units and the affordable units. The former Navy housing is comprised of a scattered site of 2-to-4-bedroom units in predominantly 6-to-8-unit buildings. This section describes current Treasure Island demographics (no residents currently live on YBI) and the rights and benefits of both the market rate households and the formerly homeless households living in One Treasure Island units.

Demographics

In May 2020, an audit provided a count of residents currently residing within Treasure Island's housing units, including those who reside at the Job Corps Center. According to U.S. Census Bureau data since base closure, the age profile of Island residents has skewed younger (median age of 26.2 during the 2010 census) than San Francisco as a whole (median age of 36.3) and the greater San Francisco/Oakland/Hayward Metro area (median age of 38.8). The population on the Island has included 50% more children and a higher percentage of young adults than in greater San Francisco.

Also, according to 2010 census data, higher percentages of Treasure Island residents identified as Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaska Native than in San Francisco as a whole and the Metro area. Much higher percentages of Treasure Island residents also selected the categories of "Other" and "Two or More Races", and twice as many Island residents identified as Hispanic or Latino than in San Francisco citywide.

The 2010 data set also showed that Island residents have lower incomes than the Metro area and significantly lower incomes than San Francisco as a whole. According to the data, median household income for Island residents was 44% lower than for the City as a whole, and more than 48% of Island residents were below the poverty level, compared to about 11% citywide.

At the time of the audit, Treasure Island had 117 businesses with approximately 888 employees, working in a variety of sectors: manufacturing, transportation, construction, real estate, healthcare, and public administration sectors. Employment was disrupted in 2020 with the COVID-19 pandemic. The effect of the pandemic on Island businesses is not yet known.

At buildout, Treasure Island overall compared to San Francisco as a whole is projected to be more diverse, with a smaller percentage of residents identifying as white, a higher percentage identifying as Black and a slightly higher percentage identifying as two or more races. The income levels expected on the island will also be different from San Francisco as a whole, with most residents at the higher and lower ends of the income spectrum and a small amount of moderate- and middle- income residents. This is a direct result of the commitment to inclusionary and affordable housing.

The Villages at Treasure Island Households and Transition to New Housing

Market rate housing on Treasure Island is operated by the John Stewart Company and the development is called The Villages at Treasure Island (The Villages). As of the signing of the DDA between TIDA and TICD in 2011, there were approximately 350 existing market rate housing units. As of January 2022, 167 households (or household members) were living at The Villages at the time the DDA was executed.

The DDA contains a Housing Plan that specifies the opportunities and obligations for the development and construction of affordable housing units that have been agreed

upon by TIDA and TICD. The Housing Plan also includes the Transition Housing Rules and Regulations (the “Transition Regulations”; Attachment C of the Housing Plan), which defines the replacement unit obligations and other benefits that apply to market rate tenants living at The Villages at the time the DDA was executed. TIDA is solely responsible for coordinating and providing benefits and services to eligible households and residents per the Transition Regulations, and TIDA will ensure that Transition Units are provided as needed within Authority Housing Projects in order to meet its replacement housing obligations under the Housing Plan. (“Authority Housing Project” is defined in the DDA and includes affordable units that will be rented to low-income households spanning a wide range of affordability and may include Transition Units.) Transition Units are apartments that are not income restricted at initial occupancy and are designated for Legacy Households only. Transition Units become income restricted after all Legacy Households have received a Transition Benefit. Rent for the Transition Unit is based on current rent adjusted annually per rent increases allowed by the Rent Board.

The Transition Regulations were modified as requested by Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 476-19 and as approved by the TIDA Board Resolution no. 19-28-1211 to provide an affordable housing preference for new Treasure Island affordable units to income qualifying market rate residents who moved into The Villages subsequent to June 30, 2011 and were still residents in good standing on December 11, 2019.

In sum, TIDA recognizes three categories of household and individual eligibility for new Authority Housing Units, Transition Units, and Inclusionary Units broadly summarized below:

- 1) “**Legacy Household**” (formerly referred to as “Pre-DDA Household”) is a current household in good standing that has continuously rented and occupied an apartment at The Villages prior to the execution of the DDA. Only Legacy Households can occupy a **Transition Unit**.
- 2) “**Legacy Resident**” is a current resident in good standing living in a Legacy Household that has continuously rented and occupied an apartment at The Villages prior to the execution of the DDA.
- 3) “**Vested Resident**” (formerly referred to as “Post-DDA Household”) is a current resident who has rented and occupied an apartment at The Villages whose tenancy began after June 29, 2011, and before December 11, 2019. All households that moved to TI after the DDA was approved in June 2011 were made aware of the temporary nature of their tenancy and that they are ineligible for transition benefits.

All existing residents living at The Villages will eventually be obligated to move as existing housing is demolished over time.

As of February 2022 TIDA, estimates that 310 households fall into the categories above representing approximately 820 individuals. Most notably, 164 households living at The Villages today are eligible for a Transition Unit.

The Legacy Households, regardless of income, will receive transition benefits from TIDA in the form of a Transition Unit and moving services or lump sum payment or down payment assistance. Legacy Residents and Vested Residents also receive a preference for affordable housing units if they income qualify via DAHLIA that can be used for new affordable units and inclusionary units. Vested Resident preferences are subordinate to Legacy Residents.

Significant collaboration has already occurred between MOHCD and TIDA to establish the Treasure Island Resident preference on DAHLIA. The first opportunity for Legacy and Vested Residents to use this preference is for 14 for-sale inclusionary units at the Bristol on Yerba Buena Island. The Bristol lottery occurred February 2022 and 9 applicants entered the lottery using their Treasure Island Resident preference number.

As mentioned, Legacy Households are entitled to replacement units per the conditions described as described in the Transition Regulations section of the DDA. MOHCD and TIDA will regularly monitor the delivery of development fees for the affordable projects throughout the build-out of Treasure Island.

One Treasure Island Households and Transition to New Housing

One TI member organizations currently operate 260 units of housing on Treasure Island. The specific member organizations and number of current units occupied by One TI members include: Catholic Charities (71 units), HomeRise (formerly Community Housing Partnership) (114 units), Swords to Plowshares (31 units) and HealthRIGHT 360 (44 units used to operate housing residential treatment and transitional housing beds).

One TI units are supported by Continuum of Care contracts or other federal, state, or local operating subsidy. Existing operating subsidy contracts of these units will be transferred to the owner of the affordable housing development directly or through a MOU and/or letter between the nonprofit who is the recipient of the operating grant agreement and owner of the new affordable development. Existing One TI households in good standing are guaranteed a new replacement unit in a new affordable building.

One TI Units are guided by the Base Closure Agreement. The Base Closure Agreement outlines all TIDA obligations with respect to housing and services for current and formerly homeless individuals and families to be provided by One TI and also governs certain new housing, employment and economic development opportunities that are managed by One TI. Replacement unit obligations are detailed in Exhibit E to the Base Closure Agreement, the One TI Transition Housing Plan.

The One TI Transition Housing Plan establishes the rights and benefits of One TI households to a new unit and to moving benefits and services. Households and residents who reside in One TI Units are not eligible for benefits under the Transition Regulations within the Housing Plan of the DDA.

One TI unit replacement is planned to be completed within the first five Authority Housing Projects in order to meet the terms of the Agreement. The first 5 affordable projects on Treasure Island assume replacement units for the existing 260 One TI units.

One TI worked with all its member housing service providers (Swords to Plowshares, Catholic Charities, HomeRise, Healthright 360) to determine the order of replacement units which is also informed by available funding sources at the time the land is available for construction.

Swords was the first project selected to proceed, with Chinatown Community Development Corporation as its development partner. Catholic Charities was the second project to proceed, with One TI member Mercy Housing California as its development partner. The third and fourth projects will include replacement of HR360 and HomeRise (formerly Community Housing Partnership) units. TIDA and MOHCD both approved the order and process. Below is a chart showing the One TI housing services providers, the selected housing development partner, estimated number of units and the percent of each existing pre-DDA household by unit type living on Treasure Island in comparison to the first five affordable housing developments on TI.

Unit Type by Bedroom	EXISTING LEGACY UNITS		AFFORDABLE DEVELOPMENTS WITH DEVELOPMENT STATUS & LEGACY UNITS BY UNIT MIX FOR EACH AFFORDABLE DEVELOPMENT				
	All Current Legacy Units by Unit Mix as of 12.29.20	% of Legacy Units to total Legacy Units	In Construction	In Construction	Proposed	In Planning	In Planning
			C3.2 Maceo May Sword + CCDC	C3.1 Star View Court Mercy + CC	E1.2 TBD HR360 + Mercy (a)	IC3.4 TBD CHP - TBD Developer (b)	IC3.4 TBD TBD Developer (c)
0	0	0%	24	0	50	TBD	TBD
1	0	0%	47	23	49	TBD	TBD
2	32	17%	33	60	0	TBD	TBD
3	85	45%	0	40	0	TBD	TBD
4	72	38%	0	14	0	TBD	TBD
Mgr's Unit	Unknown	N/A	1	1	1	TBD	TBD
Total	189	100%	105	138	100	150	155

Notes:

(a) 10% of units in MHC portion of parcel will be for Legacy Households and up to 20% will be for homeless households.

(b) No Legacy Units assumed on this parcel.

(c) It is anticipated that any Legacy Household that has not taken an in-lieu payment, or an inclusionary unit, or a Transition Unit in an Authority building will be housed in this development.

One TI Services Fee. Pursuant to the One TI Member Organization Policy dated January 1, 2019, participating Member Organizations must agree to provide any of the following services for activities for persons living or working on Treasure Island: affordable housing development, affordable housing operations, supportive services, community services, job referrals, job placements, or job training in furtherance of One TI's mission on Treasure Island and in accordance with One TI's Agreement with TIDA.

For Member Organizations that are housing developers, a One TI services fee of \$3,000 per year in 2019 ("Housing Services Fee") is expected to be paid annually from project operations of new affordable housing developments. The Housing Services Fee will increase 3.5% per year. On January 29, 2021, MOHCD and TIDA agreed that the Housing Services Fee would be disbursed from the operating budget prior to reserves, ground lease rent, and bond fees. The obligation to pay the Housing Services Fee will commence once a housing developer's affordable housing property obtains its certificate of occupancy and is available for rent. The Housing Services Fee will support One TI's ongoing

efforts to foster a thriving, mixed-income community, including, by way of example these types of activities:

- One TI convenes and/or supports meetings by TIDA and other TI stakeholders operating on Treasure Island whose purpose is to troubleshoot practical issues, plan/coordinate joint activities (such as Back to School and Black History Month) and to communicate and implement policies in a consistent and coordinated manner to all Treasure Island tenants, regardless of housing provider;
- One TI facilitates bi-monthly community-wide meetings for tenants, clients and other Treasure Island residents hosted by One TI, TIDA and/or the Property Management Agent (currently, The John Stewart Company);
- Increase Treasure Island residents' opportunities for island-based job placement and participation in financial health programs;
- Plan, coordinate and ensure a range of social, educational and recreational opportunities for children and youth, such as, childcare spaces, after school and summer school programming;
- Coordinate community-wide events; and
- Develop and implement a community building plan

As of January 1, 2019, the Housing Services Fee specifically supports the One TI activities listed below.

- Access to weekly food pantry
- Job training and placement opportunities
- Access to free computer lab
- Access to free financial literacy & education services
- Access to free tax preparation site
- Community building events such a Halloween and Black History Month, community meetings and leadership trainings

For affordable housing developments not built by Member Organizations, One TI anticipates that those housing developers will join One TI.

Attachment B:
Permanent Sources & Uses

Application Date: # Units: 105
Project Name: Maceo May Apartments # Bedrooms: 138
Project Address: 55 CRAVA TH
Project Sponsor: Chinatown CDC, Swords to Plowshares # Beds:

SOURCES	24,255,000	14,983,000	1,987,768	10,000,000	1,040,000	800,000	-	-	1,100,000	27,525,002	28,587,290	110,276,000	Comments
Name of Sources:	MOHCD/OCH	New City Loan #3	TE Perm Bond	HCD VHPH	AHP Loan	Deferred Dev Fee			GP Equity	LP Equity	Insurance Proceeds		

USES

ACQUISITION

Acquisition cost or value													0
Legal / Closing costs / Broker's Fee													0
Holding Costs													0
Transfer Tax													0
TOTAL ACQUISITION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

CONSTRUCTION (HARD COSTS)

Unit Construction/Rehab	17,843,607	12,350,542		5,431,809	1,040,000				0	18,952,128	26,857,756	82,475,842	Water intrusion Damage Repars (hard cost) \$31.5MM
Commercial Shell Construction													0
Demolition													0
Environmental Remediation													0
Onsite Improvements/Landscaping													0
Office Improvements													0
Infrastructure Improvements													0
Parking													0
GC Bond Premium/GC Insurance/GC Taxes													0
GC Overhead & Profit	1,612,832		356,655									1,969,687	2.3%
GC General Conditions			27,397	2,424,195								2,451,592	2.8%
Sub-total Construction Costs	19,456,439	12,350,542	384,252	7,856,004	1,040,000	0	0	0	0	18,952,128	26,857,756	86,897,121	
Design Contingency (remove at DD)													0
Bid Contingency (remove at bid)													0
Plan Check Contingency (remove/reduce during Plan Review)													0
Hard Cost Contingency										2,762,188		2,762,188	5% up to \$30MM HC, 4% \$30-\$45MM, 3% \$45MM+
Sub-total Construction Contingencies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,762,188	0	2,762,188	0.0%
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS	19,456,439	12,350,542	384,252	7,856,004	1,040,000	0	0	0	0	21,714,316	26,857,756	89,659,309	3.2%

SOFT COSTS

Architecture & Design

Architect design fees	2,290,488	9,094	478,007							54,600	2,832,189	\$63k arch design + subs soft cost water intrusion add
Design Subconsultants to the Architect (incl. Fees)	242,485										242,485	
Architect Construction Admin												0
Reimbursables												0
Additional Services	0											0
Sub-total Architect Contract	2,532,973	9,094	478,007	0	0	0	0	0	0	54,600	3,074,674	
Other Third Party design consultants (not included under Architect contract)	50,023	32,000	391,014								473,037	\$32k Water intrusion testing/inspection soft cost add
Total Architecture & Design	2,582,996	41,094	869,021	0	0	0	0	0	0	54,600	3,547,711	

Engineering & Environmental Studies

Survey	1,500									16,500		18,000	
Geotechnical studies	66,628											66,628	
Phase I & II Reports	18,240											18,240	
CEQA / Environmental Review consultants												0	
NEPA / I06 Review												0	
CNA/PNA (rehab only)												0	
Other environmental consultants												0	Name consultants & contract amounts
Total Engineering & Environmental Studies	86,368	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,500	0	102,868	

Financing Costs

Construction Financing Costs													
Construction Loan Origination Fee	15,000		203,520									218,520	
Construction Loan Interest		979,295							1,791,468	654,886	3,425,650	\$1.6MM add for water intrusion construction delay add	
Titls & Recording			100,000								100,000		
CDLAC & CDIAAC fees			20,296								20,296		
Bond Issuer Fees		79,044								261,986	341,030	\$79k increase cost for Issuer and Trustee fees	
Other Bond Cost of Issuance	27,999									54,184	82,183	Lender Expenses \$13k, COI Contingency \$22k, Trustee fee \$13k	
Other Owner's Rep, Misc. Syndication Cost, City FA	4,400										4,400		
Sub-total Const. Financing Costs	47,399	1,058,339	323,816	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,107,639	654,886	4,192,079	
Permanent Financing Costs													
Permanent Loan Origination Fee			87,720									87,720	
Credit Enhance. & Appl. Fee			10,000									10,000	
Titls & Recording												0	
Sub-total Perm. Financing Costs	0	0	97,720	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97,720	
Total Financing Costs	47,399	1,058,339	421,536	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,107,639	654,886	4,289,799	

Legal Costs

Borrower Legal fees	38,363	140,000								53,887	20,000	252,250	\$160k legal water intrusion add
Land Use / CEQA Attorney fees												0	
Tax Credit Counsel										35,000		35,000	
Bond Counsel			82,350									82,350	
Construction Lender Counsel			150,000									150,000	
Permanent Lender Counsel												0	
City Attorney/Issuer Counsel												20,000	
Total Legal Costs	38,363	140,000	262,350	0	0	0	0	0	0	88,887	20,000	549,600	

Other Development Costs

Appraisal	6,500									8,500		15,000	
Market Study	5,000									1,500		7,500	
Insurance	1,072,184	1,297,928	50,609							831,952	3,252,673	5,454,644	BDP policy extended after exp. 2/28/22 (52 1MM)
Property Taxes												0	
Accounting / Audit		5,000								50,000		55,000	\$5k for add'l audit related to water intrusion
Organizational Costs												0	
Entitlement / Permit Fees	425,770			1,529,146								1,954,916	
Marketing / Rent-up										179,021		179,021	
Furnishings			0	614,850								614,850	\$2,000/unit. See MOHCD LIIW Guidelines on: http://mohcd.org/documents-reports-and-forms
PGE / Utility Fees												0	
TCAC App / Alloc / Monitor Fees	33,333	216								35,187		68,736	\$216 added TCAC fees
Financial Consultant fees	46,300									58,300		105,600	
Construction Management fees / Owner's Rep	142,453	5,000							75,957	30,000	254,450	\$35k water intrusion add	
Security during Construction												0	
Relocation												0	
Services Set-Up										68,987		68,987	
Other (specify: 50% of Total) MEP Peer Review	160,895											160,895	
Other (specify)												0	
Total Other Development Costs	1,893,435	1,308,144	50,609	2,143,996	0	0	0	0	0	479,492	861,952	6,737,628	

Soft Cost Contingency

Contingency (Arch, Eng, Fin, Legal & Other Dev)		65,604								441,900	138,096	645,600	Soft cost contingency Water intrusion add \$203k
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	4,648,561	2,613,181	1,603,516	2,143,996	0	0	0	0	0	3,134,418	1,729,534	15,873,206	42%

RESERVES

Distilling Reserves		19,277									546,268	565,545	\$19.2k increase due to perm int. rate
Replacement Reserves												0	
Tenant Improvements Reserves												0	
Subsidy Transition Reserve											680,000	680,000	
Other (specify)												0	
TOTAL RESERVES	0	19,277	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,226,268	0	1,245,545	

DEVELOPER COSTS

Developer Fee - Cash-out Paid at Milestones	150,000									500,000		650,000	
Developer Fee - Cash-out At Risk										950,000		950,000	
Commercial Developer Fee												0	
Developer Fee - GP Equity (also show as source)									1,100,000			1,100,000	
Developer Fee - Deferred (also show as source)									800,000			800,000	
Development Consultant Fees												0	Need MOHCD approval for this cost, N/A for most projects
Other (specify)												0	
TOTAL DEVELOPER COSTS	150,000	0	0	0	0	800,000	0	0	1,100,000	1,450,000	0	3,500,000	

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST

Development Cost/Unit by Source	24,255,000	14,983,000	1,987,768	10,000,000	1,040,000	800,000	0	0	1,100,000	27,525,002	28,587,290	110,276,000	
Development Cost/Unit as % of TDC by Source	231,000	142,696	18,931	95,238	9,905	7,619	0	0	10,478	262,143	272,260	1,050,267	
	22.0%	13.6%	1.8%	9.1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	25.0%	25.9%	100.0%	

Acquisition Cost/Unit by Source

Acquisition Cost (inc Const Contingency)/Unit by Source	185,299	117,624	3,680	74,819	9,905	0	0	0	0	206,803	255,783	853,898	
Construction Cost (inc Const Contingency)/SF	167.04	106.03	3.30	67.45	8.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	186.43	230.58	789.76	

*Possible non-eligible GO Bond/COP Amount:

City Subsidy/Unit: 231,000

Tax Credit Equity Pricing: 0.98%

Construction Bond Amount: 43,704,000

Construction Loan Term (in months): 48 months

Construction Loan Interest Rate (as %): 2.82%

Attachment C:
1st Year Operating Budget & 20-Year Cash Flow
With 2019 rents and 2019 VASH FMRs

Application Date: **105** Project Name: **Maceo May Apartments**
 Total # Units: **105** Project Address: **55 CRAVATH**
 First Year of Operations (provide data assuming that Year 1 is a full year, i.e. 12 months of operations): **2024** Project Sponsor: **Chinatown CDC, Swords to Plowshares**

INCOME	Total	Comments
Residential - Tenant Rents	1,418,712	Links from 'New Proj - Rent & Unit Mix' Worksheet
Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments (Non-LOSP)	1,076,184	Links from 'New Proj - Rent & Unit Mix' Worksheet
Commercial Space	0	from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100%
Residential Parking	0	Links from 'Utilities & Other Income' Worksheet
Miscellaneous Rent Income	0	Links from 'Utilities & Other Income' Worksheet
Supportive Services Income	0	
Interest Income - Project Operations	0	Links from 'Utilities & Other Income' Worksheet
Laundry and Vending	5,569	Links from 'Utilities & Other Income' Worksheet
Tenant Charges	0	Links from 'Utilities & Other Income' Worksheet
Miscellaneous Residential Income	0	Links from 'Utilities & Other Income' Worksheet
Other Commercial Income	0	from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100%
Withdrawal from Capitalized Reserve (deposit to operating account)	0	
Gross Potential Income	2,500,465	
Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Rents	(83,645)	Vacancy loss is 5.9% of Tenant Rents.
Vacancy Loss - Residential - Tenant Assistance Payments	(53,809)	Vacancy loss is 5% of Tenant Assistance Payments.
Vacancy Loss - Commercial	0	from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100%
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME	2,363,011	PUPA: 22,505

OPERATING EXPENSES		
Management		
Management Fee	81,900	1st Year to be set according to HUD schedule.
Asset Management Fee	22,670	
Sub-total Management Expenses	104,570	PUPA: 996
Salaries/Benefits		
Office Salaries	56,015	1 FTE Assistant Property Manager
Manager's Salary	64,200	1 FTE Property Manager
Health Insurance and Other Benefits	63,048	All staff except services and desk clerks; 24% Health Insurance & Benefits; 2.5% 403(b)
Other Salaries/Benefits	0	
Administrative Rent-Free Unit	0	
Sub-total Salaries/Benefits	183,263	PUPA: 1,745

Administration		
Advertising and Marketing	825	
Office Expenses	18,900	Office supplies, phone & computer services
Office Rent	0	
Legal Expense - Property	9,600	
Audit Expense	14,000	
Bookkeeping/Accounting Services	15,750	
Bad Debts	400	
Miscellaneous	54,250	\$47,250 TIDG HOA fee
Sub-total Administration Expenses	113,725	PUPA: 1,083

Utilities		
Electricity	71,000	
Water	42,000	
Gas	0	All Electric
Sewer	54,600	
Sub-total Utilities	167,600	PUPA: 1,596

Taxes and Licenses		
Real Estate Taxes	0	
Payroll Taxes	19,033	All staff except services and desk clerks
Miscellaneous Taxes, Licenses and Permits	900	
Sub-total Taxes and Licenses	19,933	PUPA: 190

Insurance		
Property and Liability Insurance	415,000	Gallager quote updated 10/5/22
Fidelity Bond Insurance	0	
Worker's Compensation	14,275	
Director's & Officers' Liability Insurance	0	
Sub-total Insurance	429,275	PUPA: 4,088

Maintenance & Repair		
Payroll	117,700	2.0 FTEs
Supplies	13,200	\$3k cleaning; \$10k repairs & unit turns
Contracts	128,400	\$78k janitorial; \$12k pest; \$7k landscape; \$27k elevator
Garbage and Trash Removal	33,600	
Security Payroll/Contract	264,746	lerks, includes benefits
HVAC Repairs and Maintenance	41,000	
Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment Operation and Repairs	0	
Miscellaneous Operating and Maintenance Expenses	0	
Sub-total Maintenance & Repair Expenses	596,646	PUPA: 5,682

Supportive Services	213,343	Per HCD-required services
Commercial Expenses	0	from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100%

TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES 1,828,355 PUPA: 17,413

Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees		
Ground Lease Base Rent	15,000	Ground lease with TIDA Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Bond Monitoring Fee	16,465	\$11k MOHCD; \$3k TIDHDI Annual Services Fee/ \$2.5k Trustee Fee
Replacement Reserve Deposit	52,500	500 PUPY, per HCD requirements
Operating Reserve Deposit	0	
Other Required Reserve 1 Deposit	0	
Other Required Reserve 2 Deposit	0	
Required Reserve Deposits, Commercial	0	from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100%
Sub-total Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees	83,965	PUPA: 800

TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES (w/ Reserves/GL Base Rent/ Bond Fees) 1,912,320 PUPA: 18,213

NET OPERATING INCOME (INCOME minus OP EXPENSES) 450,691 PUPA: 4,292

DEBT SERVICE/MUST PAY PAYMENTS ("hard debt"/amortized loans)		
Hard Debt - First Lender	200,000	Tax-Exempt Perm Loan Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Hard Debt - Second Lender (HCD Program 0.42% pymt, or other 2nd Len)	42,000	HCD VHHP Program Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Hard Debt - Third Lender (Other HCD Program, or other 3rd Lender)	0	Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Hard Debt - Fourth Lender	0	Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Commercial Hard Debt Service	0	from 'Commercial Op. Budget' Worksheet; Commercial to Residential allocation: 100%
TOTAL HARD DEBT SERVICE	242,000	PUPA: 2,305

CASH FLOW (NOI minus DEBT SERVICE) 208,691

USES OF CASH FLOW BELOW (This row also shows DSCR) 1.88

USES THAT PRECEDE MOHCD DEBT SERVICE IN WATERFALL		
"Below-the-line" Asset Mgt fee (uncommon in new projects, see policy)	0	
Partnership Management Fee (see policy for limits)	22,650	2; MOHCD 2021 Amt.
Investor Service Fee (aka "LP Asset Mgt Fee") (see policy for limits)	5,000	1; Annual Amt
Other Payments	0	
Non-amortizing Loan Pmt - Lender 1 (select lender in comments field)	0	Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Non-amortizing Loan Pmt - Lender 2 (select lender in comments field)	0	Provide additional comments here, if needed.
Deferred Developer Fee (Enter amt <= Max Fee from cell I130)	90,520	Def. Develop. Fee split: 50% Provide additional comments here, if needed.
TOTAL PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD	118,170	PUPA: 1,125

RESIDUAL RECEIPTS (CASH FLOW minus PAYMENTS PRECEDING MOHCD) 90,521

Residual Receipts Calculation
 Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipt Obligation? **Yes** Project has MOHCD ground lease? **No**
 Will Project Defer Developer Fee? **Yes**
 Max Deferred Developer Fee/Borrower % of Residual Receipts in Yr 1: 50% Max Deferred Developer Fee Amt (Use for data entry above. Do not link.): **90,520**
 % of Residual Receipts available for distribution to soft debt lenders in 50%

Soft Debt Lenders with Residual Receipts Obligations	(Select lender name/program from drop down)	Total Principal Amt	Distrib. of Soft Debt Loans
MOHCD/OClI - Soft Debt Loans	All MOHCD/OClI Loans payable from res. recs	\$39,218,237	79.44%
MOHCD/OClI - Ground Lease Value or Land Acq Cost	Ground Lease Value	\$150,000	0.30%
HCD (soft debt loan) - Lender 3	HCD VHHP Program	\$10,000,000	20.26%
Other Soft Debt Lender - Lender 4			0.00%
Other Soft Debt Lender - Lender 5			0.00%

MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE		
MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due	72,185	50% of residual receipts, multiplied by 79.74% - MOHCD's pro rata share of all soft debt
Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment	72,185	Enter/override amount of residual receipts proposed for loan repayment
Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground Lease	0	If applicable, MOHCD residual receipts amt due LESS amt proposed for loan repaymt.

REMAINING BALANCE AFTER MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE 18,336

NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE		
HCD Residual Receipts Amount Due	18,336	50% of residual receipts, multiplied by 20.26% - HCD VHHP Program's pro rata share of all sc
Lender 4 Residual Receipts Due	0	
Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due	0	
Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Service	18,336	

REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions below)		
Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee	0	
Other Distributions/Uses	0	
Final Balance (should be zero)	0	

Maceo May Apartments

Total # Units: 105

Table with columns for Year 1-10 (2024-2033) and rows for INCOME, OPERATING EXPENSES, Reserves/Ground Lease Base Rent/Bond Fees, DEBT SERVICE, CASH FLOW, and REMAINDER. Includes sub-totals and detailed expense breakdowns.

Maceo May Apartments

Total # Units: 105

Table with 12 columns (Year 11-20) and multiple rows for INCOME, OPERATING EXPENSES, RESERVES, DEBT SERVICE, CASH FLOW, and RECEIPTS. Includes sub-totals and detailed comments for various categories like Salaries, Utilities, and Taxes.