## Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee

# San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing <br> Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure <br> Evaluation of Request for Funding: Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) Contract Renewal 

Prepared By: Lourdes Chang

Loan Committee Date: March 3, 2017

| Sponsor Name: | Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | 990 Polk Senior Apartments |
| Project Address (w. cross street): | 990 Polk, San Francisco, CA 94109 |
| Number of Units/Beds (specify): | 110 units, including 50 units set aside for formerly <br> homeless seniors and 60 units for very low income <br> seniors |
| Funding Request: | Up to $\$ 561,852$ for Year 1 <br> Up to a Total $\$ 13,131,321$ for the full 15 year and 6 <br> month contract |

## 1. SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation ("TNDC") is requesting \$13,131,321 in General Funds from the Local Operating Subsidy Program ("LOSP") to subsidize continuing operations for 50 units set aside for formerly homeless seniors at 990 Polk Senior Apartments for a period of 15 years and 6 months.
Completed in August 2008, 990 Polk Senior Apartments (the "Project") consists of 110 units of senior housing with 50 units of supportive housing targeted to formerly homeless seniors. The Project serves very low-income seniors (ages 62 and older) at incomes of 50\% of City AMI or below. The 50 supportive housing units are supported by LOSP, including10 units that must be set aside for formerly homeless seniors with a serious mental illness. This set-aside is a requirement under the Mental Health Housing Services Act (MHSA). The Project received a $\$ 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ MHSA award to pay for capital cost overruns and to leverage the City's capital contribution to the Project. The 50 households pay $50 \%$
of their income on rent under the LOSP program. The remaining 60 units are not subsidized, and are available to seniors who are earn up to $50 \%$ of AMI.

Supportive services for the 50 LOSP tenants are provided through a contract between Lutheran Social Services (LSS) and Direct Access to Housing (DAH), the Adult Housing Programs section of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) of the City and County of San Francisco.
The general partner of 990 Polk Senior Apartments is Polk Senior Housing Associates, L.P. TNDC is the General Partner of the partnership.

The current LOSP grant agreement with 990 Polk Senior Apartments covers a 9-year term, beginning in July 2008 for a total contract amount of $\$ 5,485,349$. The contract expires in June 2017 and TNDC is requesting a renewal of the LOSP contract to support the continuation of the homeless program at the site. The Project received its last disbursement under the initial 9-year contract for the period of January 1 to June 30, 2017, and is requesting a new 15 -year, 6 -month LOSP contract beginning on July 1, 2017, and ending January 1, 2032.

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

### 2.1. 2015 Operating Expenses

To evaluate the Project's financial performance, operating expenses from 2015, the most current year for which actual operating expenses have been reported, were compared with the operating expenses of projects in MOHCD's supportive housing and LOSP portfolios.
During 2015, MOHCD's portfolio had 91 supportive housing projects. The average total operating expenses across all supporting housing projects (before replacement reserve deposits and hard debt service) was $\$ 9.7 \mathrm{k}$ per unit per year. PUPA operating expenses varied by project size, with PUPA operating expenses higher for smaller buildings and lower for larger buildings. The Project's 2015 operating expenses of $\$ 10.7 \mathrm{k}$ PUPA is slightly higher than the average for projects with 50-99 units.

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

| \# Units | \# Projects | Average PUPA <br> Operating Expenses |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $100+$ | 33 | $\$ 9,212$ |
| $50-99$ | 41 | $\$ 10,285$ |
| $1-49$ | 17 | $\$ 11,672$ |
| All | 91 | $\$ 9,741$ |

Within MOHCD's LOSP portfolio of 27 projects, operating expenses PUPA ranged from a low of $\$ 6.1 \mathrm{k}$ to a high of $\$ 19.6 \mathrm{k}$, and an average of $\$ 11.3 \mathrm{k}$. The Project's 2015 operating expense PUPA, at $\$ 10,750$, is ranked $11^{\text {th }}$ and is slightly below the average PUPA for all LOSP projects.


Within the LOSP portfolio, some projects have just 20\% LOSP units, while others are $100 \%$ LOSP. Average PUPA operating expenses also varies by the percentage of LOSP units within the building. Buildings with a higher percentage of LOSP units were found to cost more to operate.

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

| \% of LOSP Units | \# Projects | Average PUPA <br> 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 | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\$ 11,307$ |

With $45 \%$ of the units designated as LOSP units, the Project's 2015 PUPA operating expenses of $\$ 10.7 \mathrm{k}$ falls within the average of $\$ 11 \mathrm{k}$ for projects with a similar percentage of LOSP units.

Drilling down to the general expense categories - management, administration, utilities, taxes/licenses, insurance, and maintenance - 990 Polk's 2015 expenditures are within the average, with the exception of management, office salaries and related expenditures such as benefits and payroll taxes which are higher than the average across the LOSP portfolio. This higher than average per unit expenditure is due to the need for more intensive oversight and day-to-day management of the homeless units. The need is even greater for the 10 MHSA units that house homeless seniors who have serious mental illness.

The need for constant monitoring and preventive maintenance is greater for these units. This is documented in a survey completed by TNDC in 2013 where they found $75 \%$ of incident reports were attributed to LOSP-assisted units. The incident reports included guest violations, where visitors stayed longer than what is allowed under the lease; acting out and screaming at other tenants and staff creating an unsafe living environment; and property damage, such as leaving trash in common areas, staining carpet from spills and damaging walls when operating wheelchairs and moving furniture and appliances. This led to staffing increases in maintenance and property management. As evidenced in the chart below, staffing makes up the largest expense in the Project's operating budget.

Operating Expenses by Expense Categories, 2015

| 2015 PUPA <br> Expenses | Mgmt | Salaries/ <br> Benefits | Admin | Utilities | Taxes/ <br> Licenses | Insurance | Maintenance/ <br> Repairs |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 990 Polk | $\$ 996$ | $\$ 3,597$ | $\$ 722$ | $\$ 1,396$ | $\$ 466$ | $\$ 695$ | $\$ 2,095$ |
| LOSP <br> Portfolio <br> Average | $\$ 927$ | $\$ 2,369$ | $\$ 1,297$ | $\$ 1,568$ | $\$ 365$ | $\$ 964$ | $\$ 3,412$ |

### 2.2. 2015 LOSP Subsidy

The Project's per unit 2015 LOSP subsidy of $\$ 9,234$ ranks the highest across all the Senior LOSP projects at \$7,178 (See chart below, 2015 PUPA LOSP Subsidy, Senior LOSP Projects). This is due in part to the higher percentage of homeless units at the site. Compared to the other LOSP senior projects which have $3 \%-36 \%$ LOSP units, the Project's homeless component is $45 \%$, or 50 units. In addition, the Project is required under an MHSA agreement to set aside 10 of the 50 LOSP units to homeless seniors with serious mental illness. This adds to the cost of operating the homeless program at the Project and requires additional LOSP subsidy to make it work. Also, because seniors are typically on fixed incomes, the Project does not see much growth in rental income beyond $1.5-2 \%$ for both the LOSP and non-LOSP units.
The average 2015 household income of non-LOSP tenants was $22 \%$ AMI and the average tenant paid rent was $\$ 601$, which translates to an average rent of $34 \%$ AMI. In order to not rent-burden their tenants to a point where they cannot afford the rent and pay for other basic needs, TNDC has not charged rents at the maximum rent limit of $50 \%$ AMI. At least $75 \%$ of non-LOSP tenants have rent burden over $30 \%$, and almost half, or $42 \%$ of the nonLOSP tenants, have rent burdens greater than $50 \%$. The LOSP units target households at even deeper affordability. In 2015, the average household income of LOSP tenants was $17 \%$ AMI and the average tenant paid rent was $\$ 465$ per month. The LOSP tenants pay $50 \%$ of their income on rent and the rental subsidy makes up for the difference.


## 3. PROJECT OPERATIONS

### 3.1. Annual Operating Income Evaluation

The Project's 20-year proforma is based on projections using 2015 actuals and assumes Year One starts in 2017.

Tenant Rent: Tenant paid rents are projected to generate $\$ 723,491$ in 2017, during the first year of the new proposed LOSP contract. Tenant rents are comprised of rents collected from the 60 non-subsidized units targeted to senior households up to $50 \%$ AMI and the 50 LOSP households who pay $50 \%$ of their income on rent.

The 2015 gross rent from the 60 non-subsidized units average $\$ 601$ per month, which translates to $34 \%$ AMI. Initial incomes average at $31 \%$ AMI and current incomes average at $27 \%$ AMI. In order to not rent-burden their tenants to a point where they cannot afford the rent and pay for other basic needs, TNDC has not charged rents at the maximum rent limit of $50 \%$ AMI.

LOSP units are deeply affordable: the average 2015 AMI for LOSP units was 17\% AMI and the average tenant-paid rent in the LOSP units was $\$ 465$.

LOSP Subsidy: The first year LOSP subsidy requested for the 50 LOSP units is $\$ 561,852$ ( $\$ 11,237 /$ PUPA and $\$ 936 / \mathrm{PUPM}$ ) and is shown in the attached operating budget. This is a reduction of $24 \%$, or $\$ 174,123$, in the amount of the LOSP subsidy requested for 2017 under the current contract. This reduction is attributable to the revised approach that is being used to split the expenses between the LOSP and non-LOSP units (See Section 3.2 below of additional information)

Other Income: Approximately $\$ 18 \mathrm{k}$, is anticipated to be generated from laundry, various tenant charges and miscellaneous rent income. Laundry is to be split pro-rata among the LOSP and non-LOSP units while $100 \%$ of miscellaneous rent income and tenant charges will be allocated to the non-LOSP side.

Commercial Income: Commercial income, which is also split 45-55\%, supports both the LOSP and non-LOSP components of the project. Approximately $\$ 80 \mathrm{k}$ is anticipated to be generated from the commercial space, including $\$ 15 \mathrm{k}$ in CAM costs. The commercial rent is $\$ 21.98$ per square foot and is projected to increase by $3 \%$ annually. The operating budget assumes a $5 \%$ vacancy. The current tenants, a café and market, are long-term tenants whose leases expire in 2019. It is anticipated these tenants will renew their leases and will continue to provide a stable source of income for the project.

Vacancy: The operating budget assumes a 5\% vacancy on the LOSP and non-LOSP units. Historically, vacancy rates on the non-LOSP units are less than 5\%, but the proforma budgets $5 \%$ to be conservative and consistent with MOHCD underwriting standards.

### 3.2. Annual Operating Expenses Evaluation

The annual operating expenses in Year One, before debt service and reserves, are projected at $\$ 1,261,482$ or $\$ 11,468$ PUPA. This is a $7 \%$ increase above 2015 operating expenses, in part due to increases in electricity and water utility rates, an increase in janitorial and maintenance staffing costs, and other maintenance/repair costs such as furnishings, maintenance staff uniforms, appliances and carpet. With the exception of these increases, the other expenses in the operating budget are in line with prior years' performance.

## Allocation between LOSP/Non-LOSP Units

In buildings where less than $100 \%$ of the affordable units are LOSP, the LOSP budget allocates income and expenses pro-rata across LOSP/Non-LOSP units.

In recognition that the share of income or expense for some budget items may not happen according to the pro-rata split, and especially in recognition that LOSP tenancies may cost the project more than the pro-rata split provides, MOHCD allows the use of alternative splits. Sponsors must provide rationale for any alternative or project splits that are proposed.
At the time when the Project's current LOSP budget and contract was approved, MOHCD allowed project sponsors to use an alternative split for all operating budget line items.
MOHCD staff agreed to the sponsor's request to allocate a larger percentage of operating costs to the homeless units and sized the LOSP subsidy according to a $64 \%-36 \%$ LOSP v . non-LOSP split.
In 2013, TNDC provided a report which compiled data of incident reports from November 2008 through November 2012 where they found LOSP units do cost more to manage. At least $75 \%$ of incident reports, which included lease violations and property damage, involved LOSP units, and 8 of 9 eviction actions in 2010-2012 were against LOSP tenants. TNDC has increased staffing in property management and janitorial and maintenance staff to help monitor and provide routine preventive maintenance for the LOSP units. TNDC's
staff also coordinates with support services staff available through a contract with HSH and Lutheran Social Services (LSS), who provides supportive services to the 50 DAH residents. LSS Support Services and TNDC's Property Management are working closely to address any issues that would negatively impact housing retention.

While it is documented that LOSP units at this site cost more to manage, the initial contract's LOSP allocation of $64 \%$ turned out to be more excessive than necessary. The $64-36 \%$ split resulted in program years where there was a LOSP surplus of about $\$ 200 \mathrm{k}$ annually.
MOHCD policy now requires sponsors to seek approval for alternative splits for specific line-items. Some items are allowed either an alternative split, or a projected split based on actuals, which is allowed if the sponsor's accounting system is able to track income and expenses at the program level. The use of alternative splits is a recognition that LOSP tenancies may cost the project more than the pro-rata split provides. Sponsors must provide rationale for any alternative or project splits that are proposed.
For the new contract period, the pro-rata allocation will be $45 \%$ LOSP units and $55 \%$ nonLOSP, with the exception of certain line items, primarily related to office salaries and maintenance staff/contracts, for which a split of $70 \%-30 \%$ will be used. The sections below will further discuss alternative splits of specific expense line items.

Staffing: Staffing is anticipated to remain the same as current staffing levels with the exception of increasing the janitor from 0.4 to 1.0 FTE. Over the years, maintenance staff have taken on some janitorial duties; thus, maintenance staffing increased from 1.5 to 2.5 FTEs, increasing the total janitorial/maintenance staffing to 3.5 FTEs. The overall staffing plan includes 9.7 FTE's:

| Position | $\underline{\text { FTE }}$ | $\underline{\text { Notes }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Desk Clerk | 4.2 | $\$ 158,820$ covers 3 FTE and 2 part-time desk clerks |
| General Manager | 1.0 | $\$ 61,248$ for 1 FTE |
| Assistant Manager | 1.0 | $\$ 42,111$ for 1 FTE |
| Janitor | 1.0 | $\$ 61,248$ for 1 FTE |
| Maintenance | 2.5 | $\$ 108,387$ for 1 part-time Maintenance Supervisor, 2 FTE Maintenance <br> Staff |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{9 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ staff per 11.34 residents |

## Management Fees:

The Sponsor proposes to collect $\$ 74$ per unit per month in property management fees, and will escalate at $3.5 \%$ annually. This is below HUD's maximum limit for property management fee of $\$ 78$ PUPM.

## Asset Management Fee:

The Sponsor proposes an above the line General Partner Asset Management fee of $\$ 19,752$, and will escalate at $3.5 \%$, per MOHCD policy.

Salaries and Benefits: Salaries and benefits are budgeted at $\$ 353,418$ or $\$ 3,213$ per unit per year, and covers the salary and benefits of the 24 -hour Desk Clerk, Property Manager and Assistant Manager. The position of the 24 -hour Desk Clerk is present for security reasons: screening entrants and incidence response and reporting related to the LOSP tenants. But for the LOSP tenants, TNDC would not need front desk staffing. For this reason, MOHCD staff agreed to the allocation of $95 \%$ of Desk Clerk costs to LOSP.
MOHCD staff also agreed with the 70-30\% split for Property Management and related administrative costs. In 2013, TNDC documented an evaluation of incident reports from November 2008 to November 2012 and found that $75 \%$ of incident reports could be attributed to LOSP tenants. Some of the common incidents included guest violations, acting out and property damage. These incidents would often lead to eviction proceedings and move-outs if the violations were not addressed. TNDC concluded that from 20102012, eight of nine eviction actions were against LOSP tenants and eight of twelve moveouts have been LOSP tenants. Although vacancy loss is covered by LOSP, turnover will drive maintenance costs and consume manager time.
Administration: Administration line items are budgeted at $\$ 85,056$, or $\$ 773$ per unit per year, and cover typical functions such as legal, office supplies and equipment, bookkeeping and accounting, computers and telephones. Legal Expenses and Bad Debts are allocated directly to LOSP units. For projection purposes, the operating budget forecasts these expenses as being split pro-rata.

Utilities: Utilities (gas, water/sewer, common electric) are budgeted at $\$ 195,504$, or $\$ 1,777$ per unit per year and are based on 2016 actuals. As the building is individually metered for electricity, electricity costs are allocated directly to LOSP and non-LOSP units respectively.
Taxes: Taxes are budgeted at $\$ 42,979$, or $\$ 391$ per unit per year. Real Estate taxes assume $100 \%$ of units receive welfare exemption. Payroll taxes are based on blended rate of all salary allocations, and various miscellaneous fees.
*For Commercial Real Estate Taxes - see Commercial Expenses below.
Insurance: Insurance is budgeted at $\$ 77,349$, or $\$ 703$ per unit per year, for property and liability and worker's compensation insurance.

Maintenance and Repair: Maintenance and repair costs in Year One are budgeted at $\$ 287,658$, or $\$ 2,615$ per unit per year. This line item includes payroll for one full-time janitorial staff, 0.5 FTE maintenance supervisor and 2.0 maintenance staff; contracts for a janitorial contract, supplies, grounds contract, exterminating, fire alarm and elevator; garbage and trash removal. Overall, projected expenses in this category are reasonable. Notably, the cost of janitorial and maintenance contracts accounts for nearly $75 \%$ of all maintenance and repair costs. TNDC has documented the maintenance needs are higher for the homeless units and requested a $75 \%-25 \%$ split for these costs. Under the previous alternate split scenario, $64 \%$ of these costs were allocated to LOSP units. MOHCD staff recommends increasing the allocation slightly to $70 \%$ to better reflect the real costs associated with managing the LOSP units.

Supportive Services: Supportive services is budgeted at $\$ 81,757$ in Year One and covers TNDC's service coordination provided under the contract with Lutheran Social Services
(LSS) through the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH). LSS has the capacity to provide group and community building activities where all 110 residents at the site are encouraged to participate. However, the focus of the contract is to provide intensive case management services to the site's 50 DAH residents. Because the services are targeted primarily to the LOSP tenants, MOHCD agreed with TNDC's proposed 95\%$5 \%$ split for supportive services. HSH provides an annual supportive services contract of approximately $\$ 231 \mathrm{k}$.
Replacement Reserve Deposits: Replacement reserve deposits are shown at $\$ 418$ per unit per year. This annual deposit amount is slightly higher than MOHCD's underwriting standard of $\$ 350$ PUPA for SRO projects with more than 100 units and is the amount recommended by the most current CNA. TNDC prepares the report in-house. The CNA, or Remaining Useful Life Analysis, was last updated in October 2013 and includes a 20year capital improvement reserves analysis. In 2013, the report identified a total of $\$ 553,477$ in capital improvement costs through 2032, including exterior repairs, upgrades to the building's security system, plumbing upgrades and elevator improvements. Current projections now show the Project has over $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$ in capital needs in the next 15 years.
The Project will have sufficient replacement reserves to cover capital improvement costs through Year 12 (2028) when the fund balance starts going negative. The shortfall in reserves averages about $\$ 115 \mathrm{k}$ in Years 12 through 20, and in year 16 the shortfall is the highest at $\$ 223 \mathrm{~K}$. TNDC will need to plan for refinancing around the time the tax credit compliance period ends in 2023, to address future capital needs.
Operating Reserve Deposits: The project has a capitalized operating reserve account, with a 2017 beginning balance of $\$ 295,108$. The operating reserve balance satisfies MOHCD's required annual balance. The Project will continue to make deposits required to maintain the minimum required balance of $25 \%$ through Year 20.
Debt Service: The Project financing includes only soft debt and consists of the City's residual receipts loan, a CalHFA-MHSA capital loan and a Mechanics Bank AHP loan. The CalHFA-MHSA loan is a $0 \%$ residual receipts loan on which TNDC makes a minimum payment of $\$ 4200$ annually. The Mechanics Bank AHP loan is a $0 \%$ deferred loan. The City's loan is a $3.5 \%$ residual receipts loan where the Project is required to make payments of $2 / 3$ of residual receipts after expenses and debt service. The proforma shows the Project can support payments on MOHCD's loan until Year 6 (2022).

Partnership Management: The Project is collecting annual Partnership Management fees which is paid out according to the CalHFA schedule and terminates in 2023, at the end of the tax credit compliance period.

Commercial Expenses: Taxes and Fees for the commercial component of the Project is budgeted at $\$ 17,000$. Other commercial expenses include $\$ 4,649$ for third party commercial management fee. Commercial real estate taxes are projected to increase by $1.2 \%$. The third party commercial management fee remains at $\$ 4,649$ through Year 20 and is projected to increase $3.5 \%$ annually.

### 3.3. 20-Year Cash Flow

The attached 20-Year Cash Flow Projection shows the estimated amount of annual LOSP subsidy that will be needed for the new grant period. The projection was made using

MOHCD's standard underwriting guidelines, with certain adjustments made based on prior trends.

- Tenant rental income trends at $2 \%$ per year for both LOSP and non-LOSP tenants. The cost of living increase for SSI is historically low at $1.5 \%$. TNDC proposed a $.5 \%$ boost from non-LOSP turnover which is about 2 households per year. At turnover, the rents are increased to maximum rent limit allowed.
- Operating expenses trend at 3.5\% per year, per MOHCD Underwriting Guidelines, with the exception of:
- Health Insurance and Employee Benefits are budgeted to increase by $7 \%$ annually: This is consistent with historical trends. For instance, in the last three years employee benefits, including health and disability insurance, increased by an average of $8 \%$ per year.
- Water is projected to increase by $5 \%$ per year. This is consistent with historical trends. In the last four years, water increased by $4.5 \%$.
- Real Estate Taxes are projected to increase by $1.9 \%$ per year ( $1.2 \%$ for commercial real estate taxes).

With the above assumptions, the proforma shows that the non-LOSP component of the Project will run a deficit by Year 7 (2023) of the LOSP contract. By this time, the Project will have been operating for 15 years. While expenses will have been steadily increasing at a rate of $3.5 \%$ per year, the Project will only have seen modest growth in income of about $1.5-2 \%$. As expenses continue to increase at a rate that is higher than the increase in rental income, the gap between income and expenses will continue to grow. With the tax credit compliance period ending in Year 7, or 2023, the Project will have an opportunity to refinance or re-syndicate tax credits to raise additional funds to address its major capital needs and operating deficits. Restructuring of the Project's financing will be necessary if the Project is to remain viable in later years.

## 4. SUPPORT SERVICES EVALUATION

Support services at 990 Polk are provided through a contract between Lutheran Social Services and DAH, the Adult Housing Programs section of HSH. LSS provides on-site services to the 50 LOSP households in the building. This includes the 10 units specifically earmarked for clients through MHSA who have serious mental illness.

LSS provides a variety of services, including educational classes, health and wellness programs, organized tenant activities, and case management and benefits assistance for the 50 households referred from the DAH Program. LSS also has the capacity to provide community building activities to all residents in the building and invite non-LOSP tenants to participate in organized group activities. However, the focus of the contract is to provide intensive case management services to the Project's 50 DAH residents.

The contract with LSS is currently in year 1 of a 5 year contract expiring June 30, 2021. The current level of funding is $\$ 231,333$ per contract year. Funding provides for 2.5 FTE's and supports intensive case management, such as benefits, program supplies, client assistance and staff training. Case Management has been an integral and effective tool to keep tenants stably housed. DAH tenants tend to be on the more medically/psychiatrically complex side and are also often frail due to age and often neglected medical care prior to being housed. The model of active engagement with these tenants has proven to enhance quality of life and ensures that tenants can avail themselves of primary care and other needed services like Homebridge or IHSS.

The Project is monitored annually by DHSS and has consistently scored well throughout the years. Support Services and Property Management are working closely together to address any issues that would negatively impact housing retention.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Compared to the other LOSP projects in MOHCD's portfolio, the operating expenses at 990 Polk is well within the average, suggesting that the Project is well-run and efficient. However, given the higher percentage of homeless units at the site, the Project requires a larger per unit LOSP subsidy to offset the demands on maintenance of the units and management of the homeless clientele.

On the non-LOSP side, the Project serves low income senior households at 50\% AMI but historically has targeted households at deeper affordability; TNDC also has not charged the maximum rent allowable for these units. Unlike some of the other LOSP projects whose non-LOSP units receive extra support via additional rental subsidies, 990 Polk relies mainly on tenant paid rental income and LOSP subsidy to support operations. Because most seniors live on fixed incomes, like SSI, the Project has seen only a modest growth in rental income, and this trend will continue in the future as cost of living increases for SSI has also been limited. The Project brings in commercial income that has helped to offset some of the operating costs. However, even with the additional income from commercial rents, the non-LOSP component of the Project will have a deficit beginning in Year 7 (2023). Refinancing will be necessary if the Project is to remain viable in future years.

In 2023, when the tax credit compliance period comes to an end, 990 Polk will have the opportunity to restructure its financing, which may include a re-syndication of low income housing tax credits. In the meantime, the Project will need the LOSP subsidy to support the homeless component at 990 Polk.
If the proposed new 15 -year, 6 -month LOSP contract is approved, the remainder of the $\$ 561,852$ LOSP subsidy requested for calendar year 2017, in the amount of $\$ 280,926$, is anticipated to be disbursed in July 2017. All disbursements moving forward would be on a calendar year basis beginning in 2018. The new LOSP contract will begin July 1, 2017, and end December 31, 2031 for a 15-year, 6-month period.

## 6. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

As a condition of financing, MOHCD requires the following:

- TNDC will continue to maximize rents for non-LOSP tenants. Upon vacancy, TNDC will rent the units to income-eligible tenants at the maximum rents allowed ( $50 \%$ AMI rent) and will implement a minimum income limit of $50 \%$ AMI as an eligibility requirement.
- TNDC will make best efforts to raise commercial rents at turnover or at the lease renewal date for existing tenants.
- In Year 5 of the LOSP contract, or 2021, TNDC will consult with MOHCD on their plan to restructure project financing, which may include re-syndication of low income housing tax credits, to address the anticipated shortfalls in the operating budget and replacement reserve fund, beginning in Year 8 (2024) and Year 12 (2029).


## 7. LOAN COMMITTEE MODIFICATIONS

## LOAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

[ ] DISAPPROVE.

[ ]
Olson Lee, Director Mayor's Office of Housing
[1) APPROVE.
[ ] DISAPPROVE.
[ ]
TAKE NO ACTION.


Kerry Abbott, Deputy Director for Programs
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing


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 Schedule A
[ 1 APPROVE. [ ] DISAPPROVE. [ ] TAKE NO ACTION.

Date:

$$
3-3-1
$$ Date: $3 / 3 / 17$

## 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 15-year 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 990 Polk Senior 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 6- month period, beginning in July 2017 through December 2032.

Contract periods for LOSP contract renewals will transition from a fiscal year basis to a calendar year basis. The remainder of the $\$ 561,852$ LOSP subsidy requested for calendar year 2017, in the amount of $\$ 280,926$, is anticipated to be disbursed in June 2017, and all disbursements moving forward would be on a calendar year basis beginning in 2018.

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



## Attachment C: 20-year Operating Proforma



 Sos Project have a MoHCD Residual Receeit O obigation


| MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS <br> MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount Due <br> Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan RepaymentPropos <br> Lease <br> NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE esidual Receipts Amount DueLender 4 Residual Receipts Due <br> Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 





| O. |
| :--- |

OTHER REOURED RESERVE 1 - RUNNNGG BALANCE
Other Resenve I Starting Baance










| MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICE <br> Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Loan Repayment <br> Proposed MOHCD Residual Receipts Amount to Residual Ground <br> NON-MOHCD RESIDUAL RECEIPTS DEBT SERVICEHCD Residual Receipsts Amount <br> Lender 4 Residual Receipts DueLender 4 Residual Receipts Due <br> Lender 5 Residual Receipts Due <br> Total Non-MOHCD Residual Receipts Debt Servic <br> REMAINDER (Should be zero unless there are distributions <br> Owner Distributions/Incentive Management Fee <br> Final Balance (should be zero) <br> REPLACEMENT RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE <br> Replacement Reserve Starting Balance <br> Replacement Reserve Deposits <br> Replacement Reserve Withdrawals (ideally tied to CNA) <br> RR Running Balanc <br> OPERATING RESERVE - RUNNING BALANCE <br> Operating Reserve Starting Balance <br> Operating Reserve Deposits <br> Operating Reserve Withdrawals <br> Operating Reserve Interest <br> OR Running Balanc <br> OTHER REQUIRED RESERVE 1 - RUNNING BALANCE <br> Other Reserve 1 Starting Balance <br> Other Reserve 1 Deposits <br> Other Reserve 1 Withdrawals <br> Other Reserve 1 Interest <br> Other Required Reserve 1 Running Balance <br> OTHER RESERVE 2 - RUNNING BALANCE <br> Other Reserve 2 Starting Balance <br> Other Reserve 2 Withdrawals <br> Other Reserve 2 Interest <br> Other Required Reserve 2 Running Balance |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |







## OPRRATING EXPENSE Nanagement


 Does Project have a MOHCD Residual Receipto Oligation



REPLACEMENT RESERVE-RUUNNG BALANCE
eophacement Resene Siating beannce BALANCE


jepating Resenve Depositis



-

| $\square$ | $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\square$ | $\square$ |
| $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 兂 |  |
| $\square$ | $\square$ |
|  |  |
| (223.051) | (128,208) |
| - 46.0001 |  |
| (218,28) | ${ }^{(19,447)}$ |
| ${ }^{\frac{579,384}{17,655}}$ | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | $\square$ |
| $5_{597,059}$ | ${ }_{614,734}$ |
| 2528\% | ${ }^{25.07 \%}$ |
| $\square$ | $\because$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\square$ : | $\square$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Attachment D: LOSP Funding Schedule A

## MOHCD Proforma - Exhibit A

| LOSP FUNDING SCHEDULE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Project Address: | 990 Polk Senior Apartments |  |
|  | Project Start Date: | $7 / 1 / 2017$ |  |

## Exhibit A

|  |  | Full Year <br> Calendar Year <br> Funding Amount | \# Months <br> to Fund | Disbursement <br> for <br> Calendar Year | Estimated <br> Disbursement <br> Date |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| CY-1 | 2017 | $\$ 561,852$ | 6 | $\$ 280,926$ | $6 / 1 / 2017$ |
| CY-2 | 2018 | $\$ 596,826$ | 12 | $\$ 596,826$ | $1 / 1 / 2018$ |
| CY-3 | 2019 | $\$ 627,859$ | 12 | $\$ 627,859$ | $1 / 1 / 2019$ |
| CY-4 | 2020 | $\$ 660,178$ | 12 | $\$ 660,178$ | $1 / 1 / 2020$ |
| CY-5 | 2021 | $\$ 693,839$ | 12 | $\$ 693,839$ | $1 / 1 / 2021$ |
| CY-6 | 2022 | $\$ 728,903$ | 12 | $\$ 728,903$ | $1 / 1 / 2022$ |
| CY-7 | 2023 | $\$ 761,605$ | 12 | $\$ 761,605$ | $1 / 1 / 2023$ |
| CY-8 | 2024 | $\$ 799,800$ | 12 | $\$ 799,800$ | $1 / 1 / 2024$ |
| CY-9 | 2025 | $\$ 839,592$ | 12 | $\$ 839,592$ | $1 / 1 / 2025$ |
| CY-10 | 2026 | $\$ 881,054$ | 12 | $\$ 881,054$ | $1 / 1 / 2026$ |
| CY-11 | 2027 | $\$ 924,263$ | 12 | $\$ 924,263$ | $1 / 1 / 2027$ |
| CY-12 | 2028 | $\$ 969,299$ | 12 | $\$ 969,299$ | $1 / 1 / 2028$ |
| CY-13 | 2029 | $\$ 1,016,247$ | 12 | $\$ 1,016,247$ | $1 / 1 / 2029$ |
| CY-14 | 2030 | $\$ 1,065,198$ | 12 | $\$ 1,065,198$ | $1 / 1 / 2030$ |
| CY-15 | 2031 | $\$ 1,116,244$ | 12 | $\$ 1,116,244$ | $1 / 1 / 2031$ |
| CY-16 | 2032 | $\$ 1,169,486$ | 12 | $\$ 1,169,486$ | $1 / 1 / 2032$ |
|  | Total Contract Amount: |  |  |  |  |

