# Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee 

# San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure 

Evaluation of Request for Funding: Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) Contract Renewal<br>Prepared By: Scott Madden<br>Loan Committee Date: April 7, 2017<br>Sponsor Name: Community Housing Partnership<br>Project Name:<br>Project Address:<br>Number of Units/Beds :<br>Amount of Funds Requested:<br>Arnett Watson Apartments<br>650 Eddy Street (Polk \& Larkin)<br>83 units<br>Up to \$946,930 Year One budget<br>Up to $\$ 19,018,559$ for $151 / 2$ years<br>Amount of Funds Recommended: $\quad \$ 19,018,559$

## 1. SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

650 Eddy, L.P., a California limited partnership, an affiliate of Community Housing Partnership ("CHP"), is requesting \$19,018,559 in General Funds from the Local Operating Subsidy Program ("LOSP") to subsidize the continuing operations of 79 out of a total of 83 units of permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless individuals and families at Arnett Watson Apartments ("AWA") for a period of 15 years, six months.

CHP, along with Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation as development partner, developed AWA beginning in 2004. The project was a newly constructed, 9-story building and consists of a mixture of studios, 1BRs and 2BRs (see below for unit mix). It also includes front desk, manager's office, a community room (with kitchen), garden courtyard, tenant services offices, tenant lounge, children’s activity room and outdoor play area and a roof-deck garden. The project began operations in February 2009, and TNDC exited the partnership in 2010 per the development plan. It was the first project that serves formerly homeless families to be funded under LOSP. CHP provides both property management and supportive services to the project.

| Unit Type | \# of Units | \% of Total Units |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio | 36 | $43 \%$ |
| 1BR | 33 | $40 \%$ |
| 2BR | 14 | $17 \%$ |

The project serves extremely low-income, formerly homeless households-36 individuals and 47 families-with high social, behavioral health or physical needs. Through HCD's MHP Supportive program, all households must have at least one adult who is physically, mentally or developmentally disabled, or who is elderly or in recovery from physical abuse or substance abuse. HSA funds supportive services under Tier V (the highest HSA services funding tier) as a LOSP Project. In 2015, the average household income was $\$ 11,000$, or $13 \%$ AMI. The property housed around 140 people, including over 50 children under 18 years of age.

The requested funds would renew an existing, 9 -year contract for $\$ 9,979,865$, which started in January 2009 and will expire at the end of this year. Funds under the existing contract are expected to be fully expended by October 2017. If the requested funds are approved, a new contract for a period of 15 years and 6 months will start on 7/1/17 in order to overlap with the current contract and avoid any disruptions in operations at the project. This new term will cover the remaining 7 years of the 15-year tax credit compliance period and continue for another 8 years through calendar year 2032.

The amount of funds requested was determined by using the current calendar year's operating budget and then applying MOHCD's standard underwriting assumptions over a $151 / 2$-year projection period. If approved, funds would be disbursed under the contract on a fiscal-year basis in accordance with the attached schedule (see Exhibit A-1), while also taking into account any surplus reported from the previous years. A total of \$973,477 in assistance is budgeted for the first fiscal year (FY17/18). This equates to a monthly per unit subsidy of $\$ 969$ for studios, $\$ 983$ for 1BRs and $\$ 985$ for 2BRs. This amount will increase from $3.1 \%-4.2 \%$ each year during the contract. Though all requested funds would be provided under a single, long-term contract, disbursements thereunder would be subject to annual appropriations by the Board of Supervisors, as is standard for LOSP contracts.

## 2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE COMPARED WITH MOHCD SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PORTFOLIO AND LOSP PROJECTS

### 2.1. 2015 Operating Expenses

To evaluate AWA’s financial performance, operating expenses from 2015, the most recent year for which actual operating expenses have been reported, were compared with the operating expenses of projects in MOHCD's supportive housing portfolio and of LOSP projects as a subset of supportive housing.

## Compared to All Supportive Housing

During 2015, MOHCD’s portfolio had 91 supportive housing projects in operations. Average total operating expenses (before replacement reserve deposits and hard debt service), averaged about \$9,700 per unit per year. PUPY operating expenses varied by project size, with PUPY operating expenses higher for smaller buildings and lower for larger buildings. With 83 units, PUPY operating expenses for AWA were $\$ 12,567$, which was $22 \%$ above the average for supportive housing projects with 50-99 units.

Average Operating Expenses Per Unit Per Annum, Supportive Housing Projects, 2015

| \# Units | \# Projects | Average PUPY Operating Expenses |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $100+$ | 33 | $\$ 9,212$ |
| $50-99$ | 41 | $\$ 10,285$ |
| $1-49$ | 17 | $\$ 11,672$ |
| All | $\mathbf{9 1}$ | $\$ 9,741$ |
| 83 | AWA | $\$ 12,567$ |

## Compared to LOSP Projects Only

Within MOHCD's LOSP portfolio of 27 projects, operating expenses PUPY ranged from a low of $\$ 6,100$ to a high of $\$ 19,600$ and an average of $\$ 11,300$. AWA's 2015 operating expenses of $\$ 12,567$ were $11 \%$ above the average.
(intentionally blank)

## 2015 PUPY Operating Expenses



Compared to Projects with Similar Percentages of LOSP Units
Within the LOSP portfolio, some projects have just 20\% LOSP units, while others are $100 \%$ LOSP. Average PUPY operating expenses vary by the percentage of LOSP units within the building. Buildings with a higher percentage of LOSP units were found to cost more to operate.

Ninety-five percent (95\%) of the units at AWA are LOSP units. (The remaining 5\% are supported by Shelter Plus Care rental subsidies and serve the same target population, making AWA a $100 \%$ formerly homeless project.) The per unit per year operating cost of $\$ 12,567$ at this project is $2.6 \%$ above the average for projects with $66 \%$ or more LOSP units.

## Average Operating Expenses Per Unit Per Annum <br> by \% of LOSP Units, 2015

| \% of LOSP Units | \# Projects | Average PUPY Operating Expenses |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 66\% or more LOSP Units | 11 | $\$ 12,251$ |
| $20 \%-66 \%$ LOSP Units | 12 | $\$ 11,049$ |
| $20 \%$ or less LOSP Units | 4 | $\$ 9,487$ |
| All | 27 | $\$ 11,307$ |
| 83 | AWA | $\$ 12,567$ |

## Compared to LOSP Projects that Serve Families

When its per unit per year operating costs are compared only with projects that serve families, AWA ranks $6^{\text {th }}$ out of 8 projects and $4.6 \%$ above the average of these projects.


Overall, AWA's per unit per year operating costs in 2015 compare favorably to

- projects with a similar percentage of LOSP units and
- LOSP projects that serve families.


### 2.2. 2015 LOSP Subsidy

In 2015, the LOSP assistance for AWA on a per unit basis was $\$ 10,613$, which was $20 \%$ above the average per unit amount of assistance $(\$ 8,858)$ across all 27 LOSP projects.

|  | 2015 PUPY LOSP Assistance |
| :--- | ---: |
| AWA | $\$ 10,613$ |
| Average - All LOSP Projects | $\$ 8,858$ |

When compared just to other LOSP projects that serve families, the per unit LOSP subsidy at AWA was second highest among 8 projects and was $21 \%$ above the average. The incongruity between this high PUPY LOSP subsidy and the close-to-average PUPY operating costs of AWA relative to the other projects that serve families and projects with similar percentages of LOSP units can be attributed to the following:

- LOSP household incomes in some of the comparison projects were higher than AWA, thus revenue from tenant rents was higher,
- several of the comparison projects have higher numbers of Shelter Plus Care units relative to the number of LOSP units and thus a higher offset of the LOSP deficit,
- greater economy of scale in some of the comparison projects, which have $65 \%-$ 80\% more units than AWA.



## 3. PROJECT OPERATIONS

The following is an evaluation of the $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget (Attachment B) and 20Year Operating Pro Forma (Attachment C) that are the basis for the overall request for LOSP funds.

### 3.1. Annual Operating Income Evaluation

Tenant Rent: Under the current LOSP contract, all 83 units are restricted at 50\% AMI. Tenants that are qualified under these restrictions pay the lesser of $30 \%$ of household income or $30 \%$ of $50 \%$ AMI as rent. As of $12 / 31 / 15$, the most recent year for which MOHCD has data, the average income of the tenants was $13 \%$ AMI, significantly below the 50\% AMI income restriction.

The Year 1 (2017) operating budget shows tenant rental income of $\$ 237,084$, which is an average of \$236-\$240 per unit per month, depending on unit size, and reflects an average
rent of $15 \%$ AMI. This number reflects the rent roll of the tenants currently in place at the project and is consistent with the target population of extremely low-income people on fixed incomes such as TANF, Social Security, SSI or General Assistance. The proforma assumes that tenant rent payments will escalate by $1.4 \%$, which is equal to the historic average increase from 2010-2015. The projected vacancy rate is $5 \%$ and more conservative than the historic average of $1.9 \%$, but it conforms with MOHCD's underwriting guidelines and will provide the project with a modest cushion in the event that actual vacancy is higher.

LOSP Subsidy: The LOSP subsidy in the Year 1 Operating Budget is $\$ 946,930$ ( $\$ 11,409 /$ PUPY and $\$ 951 /$ PUPM). This is a $13 \%$ increase above the LOSP subsidy from 2015 and is sized to fund a break-even budget, including operating expenses, debt service, replacement and operating reserve deposits and a partnership management fee. (See Section 3.2 below for analysis.)

Shelter Plus Care Rental Assistance: 4 SPC subsidies, 2 1BRs and 2 2BRs. The proforma shows contract rents that are equal to 2017 FMRs, though current contract rents are significantly below these levels. On the lease anniversaries of the current tenants, CHP must request increases in the contract rents to at least the current FMRs or up to the SFHA payment standard if market rents in the vicinity of AWA support this.

Total Residential Revenue Stream: Between tenant rents, the LOSP subsidy and Shelter Plus Care rental assistance, total residential rental revenue for Year 1 is $\$ 1.3$ million. This represents monthly revenue per unit as follows:

| Unit Type | Per Unit Monthly Revenue | AMI \% <br> Equivalent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio | $\$ 1,290$ | $68 \%$ |
| 1BR | $\$ 1,309$ | $61 \%$ |
| 2BR | $\$ 1,312$ | $54 \%$ |
|  | Weighted Average |  |

It should be noted that MOHCD's underlying capital financing agreements restrict all units in the project at $50 \%$ AMI, which means that if the LOSP contract were terminated, CHP would be able to serve none-homeless, higher income people and charge rents only up to $50 \%$ AMI. However, for the project to be feasible in that event, CHP would have to lower operating expenses to within a $50 \%$ AMI revenue stream and/or seek project-based based Section 8 subsidies or applicants with Section 8 vouchers.

Commercial Income: $\$ 18,000$ is budgeted in Year 1 for one small, ground-floor commercial space, which the Partnership rents to CHP for use as office space. This amount is the same as was charged in 2015. It represents a monthly rent of $\$ 1.91$ for 785 square feet. By comparison, CHP is charging an average of $\$ 2.23$ per square foot for the 4 commercial spaces at the Hotel Essex, which have an average size of 575 square feet. The

20-year proforma assumes annual escalation of $2.5 \%$. It also assumes a vacancy rate of $0 \%$ in light of the fact that CHP is the tenant and has made a long-term commitment to the space.

### 3.2. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation

The annual operating expenses in Year One, before debt service and reserves, are projected at $\$ 1,198,218$ or $\$ 14,436$ PUPY. This is a $14.9 \%$ increase above 2015 operating expenses. MOHCD would not expect to see these costs budgeted much more than 7\% above 2015 actuals ( $3.5 \%$ escalation over 2 years). CHP attributes this budget increase to increased minimum wage requirements that will take effect on $7 / 1 / 17$ and $7 / 1 / 18$. These will benefit the front desk and janitorial staff at the project, a total of 6.4 FTE, who will see a $15.3 \%$ increase in their wages this year and another $8.4 \%$ increase next year. CHP also attributes the increase to employee benefits that are now available to part-time janitors, which they hope will reduce turnover in these positions and ultimately reduce costs.

Staffing: Staffing is anticipated to remain the same as current staffing levels. The staffing plan covers 10 FTE, including a full range of property management services from custodial, maintenance, reception, on-site management, compliance and various levels of supervision. This represents a staff to unit/household ratio of 1 to 8.3.

| Title | FTE | Salary |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total |  |  |  |
| Property Manager Salaries |  |  |  |
| Property Manager | 1 | $\$ 52,522$ | $\$ 52,522$ |
| Assistant Property Manager | 1 | $\$ 44,193$ | $\$ 44,193$ |
|  | 2 |  | $\$ 96,715$ |
| Payroll Janitorial |  |  |  |
| Janitor PT | 0.8 | $\$ 29,120$ | $\$ 23,296$ |
| Janitor FT | 1 | $\$ 29,120$ | $\$ 29,120$ |
|  | 1.8 |  | $\$ 48,672$ |
| Payroll Maintenance |  |  |  |
| Operations Manager | 0.1 | $\$ 58,292$ | $\$ 11,658$ |
| Maintenance Supervisor | 0.5 | $\$ 53,310$ | $\$ 26,655$ |
| Maintenance Technician | 1 | $\$ 31,775$ | $\$ 31,775$ |
|  | 1.6 |  | $\$ 74,073$ |
| Security salaries |  |  | $\$ 36,084$ |
| Desk Clerk-LPT | 0.2 | $\$ 30,420$ | $\$ 12,168$ |
| Desk Clerk-FT | 0.4 | $\$ 30,420$ | $\$ 30,420$ |
| Desk Clerk-FT | 1 | $\$ 30,420$ | $\$ 30,876$ |
| Desk Clerk-FT | 1 | $\$ 30,876$ | $\$ 30,876$ |
| Desk Clerk-FT | 1 | $\$ 30,876$ | $\$ 310$ |
| Lead Desk Clerk | 1 | $\$ 31,310$ | $\$ 31,310$ |
|  | 4.6 |  | $\$ 141,735$ |
| Total Expense and FTE's | 10 |  | $\$ 361,195$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Management Fees: Management fee is budgeted in Year 1 at $\$ 78$ per unit per month, which is the current maximum allowed by HUD for Northern California for multifamily rental properties. In accordance with MOHCD's underwriting guidelines the fee is escalated at 3.5\% annually.

Asset Management Fee: $\$ 15,000$ is budgeted in Year 1, which is within MOHCD's maximum fee of $\$ 19,750$. A $3.5 \%$ annual escalation is budgeted.

Salaries and Benefits: Salaries and benefits are budgeted at $\$ 178,445$ or $\$ 2,150$ per unit per year, and covers the salaries and benefits of the Property Manager and Assistant Manager.

Administration: Administration line items are budgeted at $\$ 152,324$, or $\$ 1,835$ per unit per year, and cover typical functions such as legal, office supplies and equipment, bookkeeping and accounting, audit, computers and telephones. There is no resident manager or administrative rent-free unit because the front desk is staffed 24/7.

Utilities: Utilities (gas, water/sewer, common electric) in Year 1 are budgeted at \$172,160, or $\$ 2,074$ per unit per year and are based on 2015 actuals with increases based on recent trending, including electricity, which has seen higher than expected increases. These numbers include all utility expenses in the residential units, as all utilities are included in the rent, as well as common areas. CHP reports they will be performing energy/gas/water audits of this property to seek to identify savings.

Taxes: Taxes are budgeted at $\$ 38,424$, or $\$ 463$ per unit per year. Costs assume $100 \%$ of units receive welfare tax exemption. Payroll taxes are $8 \%$ of salaries, and various miscellaneous fees.

Insurance: Insurance is budgeted at $\$ 95,560$, or $\$ 1,151$ per unit per year, for property and liability and worker's compensation insurance. CHP has been able to reduce their property insurance cost by singling out AWA from its overall portfolio. Although worker's compensation insurance was higher in 2015, they expect to see savings going forward due to 3 successive years of lower claims.

Maintenance and Repair: Maintenance and repair costs in Year One are budgeted at $\$ 468,617$, or $\$ 5,646$ per unit per year. This line item includes payroll for 1.80 FTE janitor, a full-time maintenance technician, 0.50 FTE maintenance supervisor and a small portion of the operations manager's salary; contracts for some maintenance, supplies, exterminating, grounds, flooring and elevator; garbage and trash removal. This also includes 24/7 front desk staff under the Security Payroll/Contract line item. Overall, projected expenses in this category are reasonable.

Replacement Reserve Deposits: \$49,800 (\$600/unit) for Year 1, in accordance with HCD's requirement. This complies with the City's requirement of $\$ 32,004$ per year. The 20-year proforma shows withdrawals that are consistent with a recently completed CNA, approved by MOHCD. With $0 \%$ escalation on annual deposits, ending balances each year are projected to range from $\$ 2,800$ to $\$ 5,400$ per unit during the term of the LOSP agreement. Current industry standard is to maintain a minimum balance equal to $\$ 1,000$ per unit.
Operating Reserve Deposits: Annual deposits are sized to maintain MOHCD's required balance of $25 \%$ of the prior year's operating expenses.

Debt Service: Mandatory debt service to HCD in the amount of $\$ 25,585$ for the MHP loan, which is \$308 PUPY

Partnership Management: The project pays $\$ 15,000$ for an annual partnership management. This is within the current maximum fee of $\$ 19,750$ allowed by MOHCD policy. This fee will terminate in Year 8, when the 15 -year tax credit compliance period will end. MOHCD policy does not allow it to be paid beyond this point.

### 3.3. 20-Year Cash Flow

- The LOSP subsidy funds a break-even budget, thus no cash flow would be generated and available for soft loan repayments or distributions.
- Tenant rental income is escalated at $1.4 \%$.
- Commercial income is trended at $2.5 \%$.
- Resident vacancy rate is $5 \%$. Commercial vacancy rate is assumed at $0 \%$.
- All operating expenses are escalated at 3.5\%.
- Partnership management fee is escalated $3.5 \%$ and will end in Year 8 when tax credit compliance period ends.


## 4. SUPPORT SERVICES EVALUATION

Through a direct contract with HSH, CHP Arnett Watson Apartments provides supportive services to 83 formerly homeless adults ( 36 units) and families ( 47 units). The current contract term is $7 / 1 / 14-6 / 30 / 18$ in the amount of $\$ 414,730$. The goals of services is to empower tenants to become more self-sufficient, retain their housing or move to other appropriate housing, promote community building and tenant participation, and maintain a safe, supportive and stable environment that fosters independence. Support services include but are not limited to tenant outreach, intake and assessment, case management, benefits advocacy and assistance, offsite service referrals, mediation with property management, conflict resolution, support groups, social events and organized tenant activities, monthly community meetings, and clinical consultation.

HSH is pleased with the quality of services provided at AWA as well as coordination between services and property management and the quality of services, which has improved significantly with the addition of a new onsite Support Services manager last year. The program is meeting service and outcome objectives.

## 5. CONCLUSION

I recommend approval of the request in full. Arnett Watson Apartments is a well-staffed, well-run, highly supportive, permanent housing project for 83 disable, extremely lowincome, formerly homeless individuals and families. It is an important resource in the City's array of homeless services and programs, and under CHP's ownership and management, it merits renewed LOSP funding so that it may continue to serve homeless people well into the future.

## 6. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

none

## 7. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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


Mayor's Office of Housing
[ APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.


Date: $4-7-17$
Kerry Abbott, Deputy Director fer Programs
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
[4 APPROVE.


Nadia Sesay, Interim Director
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Attachments: A. LOSP Program Description
B. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year Operating Budget
C. 20-Year Operating Pro Forma
D. LOSP Funding and Disbursement Schedules A-1 and A-2

## Attachment A: LOSP Program Description

As part of the City and County of San Francisco’s effort to address the needs of the growing homeless population, the City has prioritized the development of non-profit owned and operated permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless individuals and families. While capital financing can be leveraged for this population, stakeholders realized these units cannot be feasibly operated at the scale needed if they rely solely on scarce federal or state operating subsidies.

In June 2004, the City launched its Ten Year Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness (the 2004 10-Year Plan), a multifaceted approach that included a locally funded operating subsidy as a key element and established the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) in 2006 to support the creation of permanent supportive housing at a large scale. The operating subsidy leverages capital financing by integrating homeless units into Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects without burdening them with operating deficits. LOSP was created by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) in partnership with the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Human Services Agency (HSA).

On July 1, 2016, the City’s diverse programs addressing homelessness were brought under the new Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), which combines key homeless-serving programs and contracts previously located across several City departments. The new department consolidates the functions of DPH Direct Access to Housing (DAH) and HSA Housing \& Homeless programs. San Francisco is developing a Coordinated Entry System (CES) for all homeless populations to best match households to the appropriate intervention and ensure those with the highest needs are prioritized.

Through grant agreements with MOHCD, which are subject to annual appropriations by the Board of Supervisors, LOSP pays the difference between the cost of operating housing for homeless persons and all other sources of operating revenue for a given project, such as tenant rental payments, commercial space lease payments, or other operating subsidies. HSH refers homeless applicants to the housing units as well as provides services funding to the projects under a separate contract.

This request is a contract renewal of the initial 9-year LOSP grant agreement for Arnett Watson Apartments. As discussed in the Loan Evaluation, MOHCD and HSH have evaluated the Project's performance during the initial contract period and have determined that the property has been well run, and that services provided address the needs of the tenants. Accordingly, MOHCD staff is recommending a renewal of the LOSP grant agreement for a 15-year, six-month period, beginning in July 2017, through the end of 2032.

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



## Attachment C: 20-year Operating Proforma
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## Attachment D: LOSP Funding Schedule A

Arnett Watson Apartments
7/1/2017

Exhibit A-2: LOSP Funding By Calendar Year

|  | n/a | 7/1-12/31 | TOT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Months } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | \$0.00 | \$473,465.00 | \$473,465.00 | 6 |
|  | 1/1-6/30 | 7/1-12/31 | TOT | Total Months |
| 2018 | \$500,012.40 | \$500,012.40 | \$1,000,024.81 | 12 |
| 2019 | \$513,154.39 | \$513,154.39 | \$1,026,308.77 | 12 |
| 2020 | \$532,837.17 | \$532,837.17 | \$1,065,674.35 | 12 |
| 2021 | \$553,258.87 | \$553,258.87 | \$1,106,517.74 | 12 |
| 2022 | \$574,447.00 | \$574,447.00 | \$1,148,894.00 | 12 |
| 2023 | \$596,429.03 | \$596,429.03 | \$1,192,858.05 | 12 |
| 2024 | \$619,232.89 | \$619,232.89 | \$1,238,465.79 | 12 |
| 2025 | \$633,013.49 | \$633,013.49 | \$1,266,026.98 | 12 |
| 2026 | \$657,206.80 | \$657,206.80 | \$1,314,413.60 | 12 |
| 2027 | \$682,303.40 | \$682,303.40 | \$1,364,606.80 | 12 |
| 2028 | \$708,335.10 | \$708,335.10 | \$1,416,670.19 | 12 |
| 2029 | \$735,335.82 | \$735,335.82 | \$1,470,671.64 | 12 |
| 2030 | \$763,340.71 | \$763,340.71 | \$1,526,681.43 | 12 |
| 2031 | \$792,385.63 | \$792,385.63 | \$1,584,771.27 | 12 |
|  | 1/1-6/30 | n/a |  |  |
| 2031 | \$822,508.23 | n/a | \$822,508.23 | 6 |
|  |  |  | \$19,018,558.65 | 180 |

Exhibit A-1: LOSP Disbursement Schedule By Fiscal Year

|  |  | n/a | TOT | Total Months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n/a |  | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0 |
|  | 7/1-12/31 | 1/1-6/30 | TOT | Total Months |
| 2017-18 | \$473,465.00 | \$500,012.40 | \$973,477.40 | 12 |
|  | 7/1-12/31 | 1/1-6/30 |  |  |
| 2018-19 | \$500,012.40 | \$513,154.39 | \$1,013,166.79 | 12 |
| 2019-20 | \$513,154.39 | \$532,837.17 | \$1,045,991.56 | 12 |
| 2020-21 | \$532,837.17 | \$553,258.87 | \$1,086,096.04 | 12 |
| 2021-22 | \$553,258.87 | \$574,447.00 | \$1,127,705.87 | 12 |
| 2022-23 | \$574,447.00 | \$596,429.03 | \$1,170,876.03 | 12 |
| 2023-24 | \$596,429.03 | \$619,232.89 | \$1,215,661.92 | 12 |
| 2024-25 | \$619,232.89 | \$633,013.49 | \$1,252,246.39 | 12 |
| 2025-26 | \$633,013.49 | \$657,206.80 | \$1,290,220.29 | 12 |
| 2026-27 | \$657,206.80 | \$682,303.40 | \$1,339,510.20 | 12 |
| 2027-28 | \$682,303.40 | \$708,335.10 | \$1,390,638.50 | 12 |
| 2028-29 | \$708,335.10 | \$735,335.82 | \$1,443,670.92 | 12 |
| 2029-30 | \$735,335.82 | \$763,340.71 | \$1,498,676.54 | 12 |
| 2030-31 | \$763,340.71 | \$792,385.63 | \$1,555,726.35 | 12 |
|  | 7/1-12/31 | 1/1-6/30 |  |  |
| 2031-32 | \$792,385.63 | \$822,508.23 | \$1,614,893.86 | 12 |
|  | n/a |  |  |  |
| n/a | n/a |  | n/a | 0 |
|  |  |  | \$19,018,558.65 | 180 |

