


CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-9292
 FAX (415) 252-0461

May 31, 2019

TO: Budget and Finance Sub-Committee

FROM: Budget and Legislative Analyst 

SUBJECT: June 5, 2019 Budget and Finance Sub-Committee Meeting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Item | File | | Page |
|-------|---------|--|------|
| 1 | 19-0516 | Agreement Amendment - Regents of the University of California - Behavioral Health Services - Not to Exceed \$49,275,951 | 1 |
| 2 & 3 | 19-0482 | Accept and Expend Grant - Federal Aviation Administration - Voluntary Airport Low Emissions Grant - \$6,750,000 | |
| | 19-0483 | Accept and Expend Grant - Federal Aviation Administration - Noise Insulation Program Grant - \$15,600,000 | 6 |
| 6 | 19-0488 | Contract Amendment - Instituto Familiar de la Raza - Behavioral Health Services - Not to Exceed \$28,795,895..... | 13 |
| 7 | 19-0486 | Professional Services Agreement - AECOM Technical Services, Inc. - Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project - Not to Exceed \$24,500,000..... | 18 |
| 8 | 19-0575 | Loan Documents - Small Sites Program and Preservation and Seismic Safety Loans for Affordable Housing - 1201 Powell Street, 462 Green Street, 4830 Mission Street, 3280-17th Street, 1411 Florida Street, 65 Woodward Street - Not to Exceed \$48,656,000..... | 24 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| Item | File | | Page |
|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|
| 9 | 19-0576 | Authorizing Expenditures - SoMa Community Stabilization Fund - \$919,954 | 32 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Item 1 File 19-0516 | Department: Department of Public Health (DPH) |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Legislative Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would approve the first amendment to the contract between the Department of Public Health (DPH) and UCSF for behavioral health services for high-risk clients (1) increasing the contract amount by \$39,659,443 from \$9,616,508 to \$49,275,951; and (2) extending the term by three years and six months, to commence July 1, 2019, for a total contract term of July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2022. <p style="text-align: center;">Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In June 2017, the Department of Public Health (DPH) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit providers for intensive case management modality services in five subpopulation categories: (1) Adult Intensive Case Management, Full Services Partnerships (FSP) programming or Non-FSP programming, or both (2) Older Adult Intensive Case Management, (3) Forensic Full Service Partnership Program, (4) Intensive Hospital to Community Linkage Program; and (5) Assisted Outpatient Treatment Full Service Partnership Program. The University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) was selected under this solicitation for four subpopulation categories: (a) approval of the contract for two categories, Adult Intensive Case Management Non-FSP programming and Forensic FSP programming, is the subject of this resolution; and (b) the contract for two categories, Intensive Hospital to Community Linkage and Assisted Outpatient Treatment, was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors. • DPH awarded a contract to UCSF for an initial one-year term from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 in an amount not to exceed \$9,616,508. Under this contract, UCSF provides full-service integrated outpatient behavioral services to 575 transitional age youth, adult, and/or older-adult clients identified by DPH each year. UCSF provides services to these clients as they transition from hospitals, jails, residential facilities, and other institutional settings to the community. <p style="text-align: center;">Fiscal Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would increase the not-to-exceed amount of the contract by \$39,659,443, for a total not to exceed \$49,275,951. According to DPH, the increased contract amount is necessary to allow for the continued provision and payment of services, as authorized under the original RFP, for the unduplicated 575 clients enrolled in the program. The average cost per client per year is \$16,724 in FY 2018-19, increasing to \$17,870 in FY 2021-22. <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the proposed resolution. | |

MANDATE STATEMENT

City Charter Section 9.118(b) states that any contract entered into by a department, board or commission that (1) has a term of more than ten years, (2) requires expenditures of \$10 million or more, or (3) requires a modification of more than \$500,000 is subject to Board of Supervisors approval.

BACKGROUND

In June 2017, the Department of Public Health (DPH) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit providers for intensive case management modality services in five subpopulation categories: (1) Adult Intensive Case Management, Full Services Partnerships (FSP) programming or Non-FSP programming, or both (2) Older Adult Intensive Case Management, (3) Forensic Full Service Partnership Program, (4) Intensive Hospital to Community Linkage Program; and (5) Assisted Outpatient Treatment Full Service Partnership Program. Three agencies responded to the RFP. A panel reviewed the proposals and scored them as shown in Table 1 below. The University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) was selected under this solicitation for four subpopulation categories: (a) approval of the contract for two categories, Adult Intensive Case Management Non-FSP programming and Forensic FSP programming, is the subject of this resolution; and (b) the contract for two categories, Intensive Hospital to Community Linkage and Assisted Outpatient Treatment, was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Table 1: Proposals and Scores in RFP

| Proposer | Score (out of 255) |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1. Adult Intensive Case Management Programs, FSP Programming | |
| Family Services Agency of San Francisco | 221.67 |
| Hyde Street Community Services, Inc. | 188.00 |
| 1. Adult Intensive Case Management Programs, Non-FSP Programming | |
| Family Services Agency of San Francisco | 221.67 |
| UCSF Citywide Case Management | 215.50 |
| 2. Older Adult Intensive Case Management Programs, FSP & Non-FSP Programming | |
| Family Services Agency of San Francisco | 211.25 |
| 3. Forensic FSP Programming | |
| UCSF Citywide Case Management | 203.00 |
| 4. Intensive Hospital to Community Linkage, Non-FSP Programming | |
| UCSF Citywide Case Management | 185.42 |
| 5. Assisted Outpatient Treatment FSP Programming | |
| UCSF Citywide Case Management | 188.50 |

According to Mr. Mario Moreno, DPH Office of Contracts Management and Compliance Director, all responders to the RFP were selected in the categories for which proposals were submitted, and there was no minimum score required. According to Mr. Moreno, the RFP stated that DPH may award multiple top scoring qualified applicants in each category depending on the needs of the community and the needs of the project. The RFP also allowed for applicants to submit proposals in one or more of the five categories, and for DPH to select more than one applicant in each category. According to Mr. Moreno, UCSF has met the monitoring report objectives in FY 2016-17 for the Citywide Forensics FSP¹ program and Citywide Focus² program, achieving an overall score equal to Commendable/Exceeds Standards level.

DPH awarded a contract to UCSF for an initial one-year term from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 in an amount not to exceed \$9,616,508. Under this contract, UCSF provides full-service integrated outpatient behavioral services to 575 transitional age youth, adult, and/or older-adult clients identified by DPH each year. UCSF provides services to these clients as they transition from hospitals, jails, residential facilities, and other institutional settings to the community.

Outpatient services include:

- Case Management Brokerage: Services that assist a beneficiary to access needed medical, educational, social, prevocational, vocational, rehabilitative, other community services, including treatment planning and monitoring of client's progress.
- Mental Health Services: Individual or group therapies and interventions to provide reduction of mental disability and improvement or maintenance of functioning consistent with the goals of learning, development, independent living and enhanced self-sufficiency, and that are not provided as a component of adult residential services, crisis residential treatment services, crisis intervention, crisis stabilization, day rehabilitation or day treatment. Service activities may include but are not limited to assessment, plan development, therapy, rehabilitation and collateral service activities.
- Medication Support Services: Prescribing, administering, dispensing and monitoring of psychiatric or biological medications necessary to alleviate the symptoms of mental illness. This may include evaluation of the need for medication, evaluating of clinical effectiveness and side effects, obtaining informed consent, medication education and plan development.
- Crisis intervention Services: Emergency (unplanned) services, provided as an immediate therapeutic response, which includes a face-to-face contact when an individual exhibits acute psychiatric symptoms to alleviate problems, which, if untreated, present an imminent threat to the individual or others.

¹ The Citywide Forensics program serves 150 adults referred from the San Francisco Behavioral Health Court (BHC) partners. Clients suffer from serious mental illness, made more complicated with substance abuse and have long histories of felony level criminal justice involvement. The goal of the BHC is to engage clients in treatment under court supervision, as a way to resolve current criminal charges, reduce the likelihood for recidivism, and improve mental health outcomes.

² The Citywide Focus program serves 400 of the highest consumers of San Francisco Community Behavioral Health Services (CBHS) acute services with four culturally-focused Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) model teams.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would approve the first amendment to the contract between the Department of Public Health (DPH) and UCSF for behavioral health services for high-risk clients (1) increasing the contract amount by \$39,659,443 from \$9,616,508 for a total not to exceed \$49,275,951; and (2) extending the term by three years and six months, to commence July 1, 2019, for a total contract term of July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2022. The scope of work will not change, as services will be consistent with the scope of work outlined in the original RFP.

The proposed first amendment would allow for a total contract term of four years and six months from July 1, 2018 through December 31, 2022. The original RFP currently grants authority for options of up to 10 years to extend this contract until December 31, 2027. According to Mr. Moreno, the initial one-year contract term was planned in order to provide an initial review period for DPH to work with the contractor to ensure that their services aligned with City, department, and funding goals. This initial period also allowed both parties to finalize contract boilerplate terms and negotiations between UCSF and SFDPH.

FISCAL IMPACT

The amount of the existing contract between DPH and UCSF during the initial one-year term between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019 is \$9,616,508. According to Mr. Moreno, contract expenditures will be fully expended through the end of the initial term because the contract reimbursement method is based on a capitated rate, in which the contractor is paid a fixed, pre-arranged monthly payment for each enrolled client. DPH states that UCSF is at full capacity with an unduplicated 575 clients enrolled in the program.

The proposed resolution would increase the not-to-exceed amount of the contract by \$39,659,443, for a total not to exceed \$49,275,951. According to Mr. Moreno, the increased contract amount is necessary to allow for the continued provision and payment of services, as authorized under the original RFP, for the unduplicated 575 clients enrolled in the program. The average cost per client per year is \$16,724 in FY 2018-19, increasing to \$17,870 in FY 2021-22.

The sources and uses of funds are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Sources and Uses of Funds in UCSF Contract

| Sources | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 | FY 2021-22 | FY 2022-23 (through 12/31/22) | Total |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Federal Short Doyle Medi-Cal Federal Financial Participation ³ | \$4,453,520 | \$4,453,520 | \$4,453,520 | \$4,453,520 | \$2,226,760 | \$20,040,840 |
| State Adult 1991 Mental Health Realignment (Adults) ⁴ | 2,276,680 | 2,276,680 | 2,276,680 | 2,276,680 | 1,138,340 | 10,245,060 |
| County General Funds (Adults) | 1,884,792 | 2,099,608 | 2,319,222 | 2,543,742 | 1,386,639 | 10,234,003 |
| Mental Health Services Act Match (Adults) | 1,001,516 | 1,001,516 | 1,001,516 | 1,001,516 | 500,757 | 4,506,822 |
| <i>Total Sources of Funds</i> | <i>\$9,616,508</i> | <i>\$9,831,324</i> | <i>\$10,050,938</i> | <i>\$10,275,458</i> | <i>\$5,252,497</i> | <i>\$45,026,725</i> |
| Contingency (12%) | | 1,179,759 | 1,206,113 | 1,233,055 | 630,300 | 4,249,226 |
| Total Not-to- Exceed Amount | | | | | | \$49,275,951 |
| Uses | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 | FY 2021-22 | FY 2022-23 | Total |
| Citywide Focus | \$6,947,822 | \$6,947,822 | \$6,947,822 | \$6,947,822 | \$3,473,911 | \$31,265,199 |
| Citywide Forensics | 2,458,564 | 2,458,564 | 2,458,564 | 2,458,564 | 1,229,282 | 11,063,538 |
| General Fund Cost of Doing Business | 210,122 | 424,938 | 644,552 | 869,072 | 549,303 | 2,697,988 |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | <i>\$9,616,508</i> | <i>\$9,831,324</i> | <i>\$10,050,938</i> | <i>\$10,275,458</i> | <i>\$5,252,497</i> | <i>\$45,026,725</i> |
| Contingency (12%) | | 1,179,759 | 1,206,113 | 1,233,055 | 630,300 | 4,249,226 |
| Total Not-to- Exceed Amount | | | | | | \$49,275,951 |

The contract budget provides for an annual Cost of Doing Business for projected cost escalation, which is subject to appropriation by the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget. The funding escalation of 2.5 percent is already in the FY19-20 City budget, due to the City's two-year budgeting. As such, the portion subject to future appropriation begins in FY20-21.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed resolution.

³ This is Federal Medi-Cal funding, in which for every dollar billed, DPH is reimbursed 50 cents for eligible clients. In this program, every client is Medi-Cal eligible. To be reimbursed by Federal Medi-Cal, DPH submits a claim representing 100 percent of the cost, of which Federal Medi-Cal will reimburse 50 percent and DPH must provide an equal 50 percent of matching funds.

⁴ This is State Realignment funding provided to DPH, and used as a match to draw down the Federal Medi-Cal funding (i.e. the other 50 cents).

| | |
|--|---|
| Items 2 and 3 Files 19-0482 and 19-0483 | Department: San Francisco International Airport (Airport) |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | |
| Legislative Objectives | |
| <p><u>File 19-0482</u>: Resolution authorizing the Airport Commission to (1) accept and expend a grant for the Voluntary Airport Low Emissions Program under the Airport Improvement Program in the amount of \$5,026,871 and any additional amounts up to 15% of the original grant, that may be offered from the Federal Aviation Administration for the purchase and installation of electrical ground service equipment infrastructure and charging stations for the period of September 1, 2019, through March 31, 2021; (2) commit to providing \$1,675,624 in matching funds; and (3) affirm the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. The resolution should be amended to correctly state that the grant amount is \$5,026,871, rather than \$6,750,000 as written in the resolution.</p> | |
| <p><u>File 19-0483</u>: Resolution authorizing the Airport Commission to (1) accept and expend a grant in the amount of \$15,600,000 and any additional amounts up to 15 percent of the original grant, that may be offered from the Federal Aviation Administration for the continuation and expansion of the Noise Insulation Program for the period from October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2023; and (2) commit to providing \$3,906,709 in matching funds. The Airport Commission approved acceptance of the proposed grant in April 2019. Although the grant period began at the beginning of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2018, according to the Airport, the actual grant start date is anticipated in approximately September 2019.</p> | |
| Key Points | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2004, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) created the Voluntary Airport Low Emissions (VALE) Program under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). The purpose of the grant program is to encourage airport implementation of clean technology projects that improve air quality. The VALE Program helps airports meet their state-related air quality responsibilities under the Clean Air Act. (File 19-0482) • In October 2017, the Airport Commission approved the implementation of the Replacement and Second Chance Initiative, which provides for the replacement of failed noise insulation of properties, and the acoustic treatment of properties not previously insulated because owners did not participate in the Noise Insulation Program in previous phases. (File 19-0483) | |
| Recommendations | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend File 19-0482 to correctly state that the grant amount is \$5,026,871. • Approve the proposed resolution as amended (File 19-0482). • Approve the proposed resolution (File 19-0483). | |

MANDATE STATEMENT

City Administrative Code Section 10.170-1 states that accepting Federal, State, or third-party grant funds in the amount of \$100,000 or more, including any City matching funds required by the grant, is subject to Board of Supervisors approval.

BACKGROUND**Voluntary Airport Low Emission Program Grant (19-0482)**

In 2004, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) created the Voluntary Airport Low Emissions (VALE) Program under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP)¹. The purpose of the grant program is to encourage airport implementation of clean technology projects that improve air quality. The VALE Program helps airports meet their state-related air quality responsibilities under the Clean Air Act². The AIP VALE Program provides for reimbursement by the FAA of up to 75 percent of the allowable VALE project costs.

The San Francisco International Airport (Airport) applies for AIP VALE grants when there are AIP VALE eligible projects planned for the applicable federal fiscal year³. The Airport's proposed VALE project is for electrical ground service equipment (eGSE)⁴ infrastructure and charging stations. The project is the first phase of an Airport-wide strategy to equip all gates with the electrical infrastructure necessary to operate eGSE in order to reduce fuel use and diesel emissions.

Noise Insulation Program Grant (19-0483)

In October 2017, the Airport Commission approved the implementation of the Replacement and Second Chance Initiative, which provides for the replacement of failed noise insulation of properties, and the acoustic treatment of properties not previously insulated because owners did not participate in the Noise Insulation Program in previous phases. In July 2018, the Airport Commission authorized the acceptance and expenditure of Federal Fiscal Year 2018 FAA grant funds for the continuation and expansion of the Airport's Noise Insulation Program in the amount of \$20,000,000, which was later modified to \$15,600,000 to reflect a more realistic estimate of the funds that can be expended during the four-year period of the grant. Subsequent phases of the program will be planned with future grants.

¹ The Airport Improvement Program (AIP) provides grants to public agencies — and, in some cases, to private owners and entities — for the planning and development of public-use airports that are included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS).

² The Clean Air Act, codified at 42 United States Code. § 7401 et seq, is a comprehensive federal response to address air pollution.

³ Federal fiscal year begins on October 1 and ends on September 30.

⁴ Ground Service Equipment includes service vehicles that provide service to the aircraft between flights. These service vehicles provide a support function to the operations of aircraft when parked at the terminal gates of an airport. These vehicles provide for services such as cargo and baggage loading/unloading, pushback for aircrafts, tugs, food and beverage catering, potable water, aircraft refueling, lavatory waste tank drainage, engine/fuselage examination and maintenance, etc.

Under the Noise Insulation Program, properties are considered if they are located within the minimum thresholds (defined as 65 decibels Community Noise Equivalent Level) on the Noise Exposure Map or are part of contiguous neighborhoods partially within certain areas around the Airport. The Airport has identified approximately 300 potential properties that could be eligible for noise insulation work. For planning purposes, the Airport is assuming approximately 150 to 180 of these 300 properties will actually be insulated through 2023⁵.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolutions would authorize the Airport to accept and expend the following grants:

File 19-0482: Resolution authorizing the Airport Commission to (1) accept and expend a grant for the Voluntary Airport Low Emissions Program under the Airport Improvement Program in the amount of \$5,026,871 and any additional amounts up to 15% of the original grant, that may be offered from the Federal Aviation Administration for the purchase and installation of electrical ground service equipment infrastructure and charging stations for the period of September 1, 2019, through March 31, 2021; (2) commit to providing \$1,675,624 in matching funds; and (3) affirm the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. The resolution should be amended to correctly state that the grant amount is \$5,026,871, rather than \$6,750,000 as written in the resolution.

The total VALE project budget of \$6,702,495 (\$5,026,871 in FAA funds, \$1,675,624 in required local matching funds) will be used to purchase and install 125 eGSE charging ports with supporting electrical infrastructure in Boarding Areas D (Terminal 2) and G (International Terminal). These eGSE ports will enable Phase I of the Airport's Ground Service Equipment electrification strategy, which aims to equip all gates with the electrical infrastructure necessary to operate eGSE to reduce fuel and diesel emissions.

The FAA's AIP grant program requires participating airports to provide a local match. The federal share of project costs on an AIP grant varies by airport size and is generally 75 percent for large hub airports. Since the San Francisco International Airport is a large hub airport, the federal share is up to 75 percent, and the Airport will need to provide a local match of 25 percent.

File 19-0483: Resolution authorizing the Airport Commission to (1) accept and expend a grant in the amount of \$15,600,000 and any additional amounts up to 15 percent of the original grant, that may be offered from the Federal Aviation Administration for the continuation and expansion of the Noise Insulation Program for the period from October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2023; and (2) commit to providing \$3,906,709 in matching funds.

⁵ According to the Airport, between the early 1980s and early 2000s, more than 15,200 properties were insulated under the Noise Insulation Program. In the most recent phases (between 2008 and 2016), the Noise Insulation Program has included insulation of 58 properties. The current phase (to be completed in the fall of 2019) will involve insulation of nine properties.

The Airport Commission approved acceptance of the proposed grant in April 2019. Although the grant period began at the beginning of the federal fiscal year on October 1, 2018, according to the Airport, the actual grant start date is anticipated in approximately September 2019.

The purpose of the grant is to provide funding to support the Airport's Noise Insulation Program, which provides sound insulation to properties located within certain areas around the Airport to reduce the interior noise levels caused by aircraft activity. The properties will be considered for the program if located inside the current 65-decibel Noise Exposure Map (NEM) developed by the Airport and accepted by the FAA, or are part of contiguous neighborhoods adjacent to the NEM. According to the Airport, as of May 2019, it is estimated that about 150-180 properties will be included in the 2019-2023 Phase of the Noise Insulation. These properties are in San Bruno, South San Francisco, and Daly City. Owners of the uninsulated properties will have their properties acoustically treated, reducing the interior noise level by 5 decibels or more. The Airport states that it is expected that this phase of the program will benefit approximately 450-540 people.

The FAA's AIP grant program requires participating airports to provide a local match. The federal share of project costs on an AIP environmental/noise grant is 80 percent. Therefore, the Airport will need to provide a local match of 20 percent.

FISCAL IMPACT

Voluntary Airport Low Emissions Program Grant (19-0482)

The total budget for the VALE project is approximately \$6,702,495. The FAA grant will fund \$5,026,871, and the Airport will fund \$1,675,624 of the total project costs. The source of the local matching funds is General Airport Revenue Bonds. Table 1 below summarizes grant funding for the VALE project.

Table 1. VALE Project Grant Budget

| | FAA Grant Funds (75%) | Airport/Local Match Funds (25%) | Total Project Cost |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Engineering (design and construction of the project) | \$300,000 | \$100,000 | \$400,000 |
| Project Management (planning, executing, controlling of the project teams, schedule, and budget) | \$150,000 | \$50,000 | \$200,000 |
| Construction Services (support for project planning, procurement, inspection, safety, quality control, document control, payment) | \$300,000 | \$100,000 | \$400,000 |
| Airfield Operations (Airfield safety officers to escort construction crew, inspectors, etc. onto the airfield operations area where access is limited and controlled) | \$112,500 | \$37,500 | \$150,000 |
| San Francisco Police Department (police stationed at the airfield checkpoints) | \$37,500 | \$12,500 | \$50,000 |
| Specialized Services (support for independent cost estimate) | \$37,500 | \$12,500 | \$50,000 |
| Reprographics (support for documentation needs) | \$1,500 | \$500 | \$2,000 |
| Construction Contract (contract for electrical infrastructure, eGSE charging stations and cloud software) | \$3,716,246 | \$1,238,749 | \$4,954,995 |
| 10% Contingency (allowances for unknown risks associated with a project) | \$371,625 | \$123,875 | \$495,500 |
| Total Cost | \$5,026,871 | \$1,675,624 | \$6,702,495 |

According to the Airport, approximately \$176,530 has been expended towards the project on internal design and project management costs. No grant funds have been encumbered or expended. If the grant is approved by the Board of Supervisors and awarded, eligible internal design and project management support services costs incurred after the grant award may be submitted to the FAA for reimbursement. The Airport does not anticipate incurring any ongoing costs once the project is complete and grant funds expire.

Noise Insulation Program Grant (19-0483)

The total budget for the Noise Insulation Program grant project is \$19,506,709. The FAA grant will fund \$15,600,000, and the Airport will fund \$3,906,709 of the total project costs. The source of the local matching funds is General Airport Revenue Bonds. Table 2 below summarizes grant funding for the Noise Insulation Program project.

Table 2. Noise Insulation Program Grant Budget

| Category | FAA Grant Funds (80%) | Airport/Local Match Funds (20%) | Total Project Cost |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Project Start-Up | \$472,852 | \$118,214 | \$591,066 |
| Homeowner Selection Process | \$534,100 | \$133,526 | \$667,626 |
| Pre-Design Process | \$590,109 | \$147,528 | \$737,637 |
| Plans and Specifications | \$459,215 | \$114,804 | \$574,019 |
| Bid, Award, and Contractor Selection | \$43,659 | \$10,915 | \$54,574 |
| Pre-Construction Process | \$188,977 | \$47,245 | \$236,222 |
| Construction Process | \$1,159,237 | \$289,810 | \$1,449,047 |
| Project Completion | \$354,204 | \$88,552 | \$442,756 |
| General Project Tasks | \$809,152 | \$202,288 | \$1,011,440 |
| Scheduling | \$195,888 | \$48,972 | \$244,860 |
| Reimbursable Expenses | \$689,969 | \$172,493 | \$862,462 |
| <i>Subtotal Consulting Services</i> | <i>\$5,497,362</i> | <i>\$1,374,347</i> | <i>\$6,871,709</i> |
| Construction Cost (\$65,000 x 180 units) | \$9,360,000 | \$2,340,000 | \$11,700,000 |
| Architectural/Engineering Fees (SFO internal labor) | \$742,638 | \$192,362 | \$935,000 |
| Total Project Budget | \$15,600,000 | \$3,906,709 | \$19,506,709 |

According to the Airport, the Noise Insulation Program grant funds will be used to provide for the noise insulation of properties to minimize the impact of aircraft noise in neighboring communities. The scope of work includes outreach and analysis to confirm each property's eligibility, acoustical testing, and design and construction of noise insulation improvements.

According to the Airport, approximately \$5,000 - \$10,000 of necessary preliminary work has been expended towards the project on planning costs. No grant funds have been encumbered or expended. If the grant is approved by the Board of Supervisors and awarded, eligible planning costs incurred after the grant award may be submitted to the FAA for reimbursement. The Airport does not anticipate incurring any ongoing costs once the project is complete and grant funds expire.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Amend File 19-0482 to correctly state that the grant amount is \$5,026,871.
- Approve the proposed resolution as amended (File 19-0482).
- Approve the proposed resolution (File 19-0483).

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Item 6 File 19-0488</p> | <p>Department: Department of Public Health (DPH)</p> |
| <p>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Legislative Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would approve the first amendment to the contract between the Department of Public Health (DPH) and Instituto Familiar de la Raza for behavioral health services to (1) increase the contract amount by \$18,912,545 from \$9,883,350 for a total not to exceed amount of \$28,795,895; and (2) extend the term by five years, for a total contract term of seven years from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2025. <p style="text-align: center;">Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contract is for 16 behavioral health programs serving adults, children, and families. These programs include adult outpatient, integration of primary care and behavioral health, children’s outpatient services, Medi-Cal Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment program, State Mental Health Services Act prevention and early intervention programs with children and youth, and programs targeted to transitional age youth. • DPH entered into a one-year contract with Instituto Familiar de la Raza from July 18, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Instituto Familiar de la Raza was selected through competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for 15 of the programs, and selected as a sole source provider for one program. The respective RFPs/RFQs advertised different end dates between 2020 and 2027. The contract, which extends to 2025, provides for end dates of the various programs that are consistent with the respective RFPs/RFQs. <p style="text-align: center;">Fiscal Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would increase the not-to-exceed amount of the contract by \$18,912,545, for a total not to exceed amount of \$28,795,895. The sources and uses of funds are shown in Table 2 below. Total base contract funding (not including potential contingencies) is approximately 51 percent federal and State funds, and 49 percent City General Fund. <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the proposed resolution. | |

MANDATE STATEMENT

City Charter Section 9.118(b) states that any contract entered into by a department, board or commission that (1) has a term of more than ten years, (2) requires expenditures of \$10 million or more, or (3) requires a modification of more than \$500,000 is subject to Board of Supervisors approval.

BACKGROUND

The proposed resolution would approve the first amendment to the contract between the Department of Public Health (DPH) and Instituto Familiar de la Raza for behavioral health services to (1) increase the contract amount by \$18,912,545 from \$9,883,350 for a total not to exceed amount of \$28,795,895; and (2) extend the term by five years, for a total contract term of seven years from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2025.

The programs covered by the contract, and the respective solicitations, are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Requests for Proposals/Qualifications for Instituto Familiar de la Raza Contract

| Program | RFP/RFQ | Potential Contract Term Under RFP/RFQ |
|--|--|--|
| Adult Outpatient-Behavioral Health Clinic | RFP 8-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2027 |
| Behavioral Health Primary Care Integration | RFP 8-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2027 |
| Indigena Health & Wellness Collaborative | RFP 18-2016 | 1/1/2017 – 12/31/2022 |
| Child Outpatient Behavioral Health Services | RFP 1-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2027 |
| Child Outpatient Behavioral Health Clinic-EPSDT ^a | RFP 1-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2027 |
| Early Intervention - Childcare Mental Health Consultation Initiative | RFQ 16-2018 | 1/1/2019 – 6/30/2024 |
| Intensive Supervision and Clinical Services (ISCS)/EPSDT Services | DCYF 2018-2023 | 7/1/2018 – 6/30/2023 |
| ISCS/Families First | DCYF 2018-2023 | 7/1/2018 – 6/30/2023 |
| MHSA Prevention & Early Intervention-School-Based Youth-Centered Wellness ^b | RFQ 17-2016 | 7/1/2017 – 6/30/2023 |
| MHSA Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) | RFQ 16-2018 | 1/1/2019 – 6/30/2024 |
| Transitional Age Youth (TAY) Engagement & Treatment - Latino | RFQ 15-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2024 |
| TAY Engagement & Treatment - Latino | RFQ 15-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2023 |
| MHSA PEI ECMHC Training | RFQ 16-2018 | 1/1/2019 – 6/30/2024 |
| Semillas de Paz | Sole source approved by Health Commission June 6, 2018 | |
| Full Service Partnership - Strong Parents And Resilient Kids (SPARK) | RFQ 14-2015 | 7/1/2015 – 6/30/2020 |
| Day Laborer | RFP 8-2017 | 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2027 |

^a EPSDT is the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment, funded by federal Medicaid

^b MHSA is the State Mental Health Services Act

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would approve the first amendment to the contract between the Department of Public Health (DPH) and Instituto Familiar de la Raza for behavioral health services to (1) increase the contract amount by \$18,912,545 from \$9,883,350 for a total not to exceed amount of \$28,795,895; and (2) extend the term by five years, for a total contract term of seven years from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2025. The scope of work will not change, as services will be consistent with the scope of work outlined in the original competitive solicitations.

As shown in Table 1 above, contracting authority under six of the eight competitive solicitations¹ will expire before the proposed end of the contract term on June 30, 2025, so funding for the programs covered by these solicitations would expire prior to the end of the contract term. DPH anticipates that RFPs will be issued before the current RFP expiration date per contract to ensure continuity of services, contingent on funding availability.

FISCAL IMPACT

According to Mr. Mario Moreno, Director of Contract Management & Compliance at DPH, actual contract expenditures as of May 29, 2019 total \$4,455,631, and DPH projects total expenditures for FY 2018-19 of \$4,797,725.

The proposed resolution would increase the not-to-exceed amount of the contract by \$18,912,545, for a total not to exceed amount of \$28,795,895. The sources and uses of funds are shown in Table 2 below. Total base contract funding (not including potential contingencies) is approximately 51 percent federal and State funds, and 49 percent City General Fund.

As shown in Table 2 below, the annual contract amounts decrease as RFP/RFQs expire. According to Mr. Moreno, it has not yet been determined whether a new solicitation will be issued to extend the programs and services for the RFPs that have end dates as early as 2020.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed resolution.

¹ RFP 18-2016, RFQ 16-2018, DCYF 2018-2023, RFQ 17-2016, RFQ 15-2017, and RFQ 14-2015.

Table 2: Sources and Uses of Funds for Proposed Contract Amendment

| Sources | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 | FY 2021-22 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2024-25 | Total |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Federal and State Funds</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Federal Financial Participation Medi-Cal | \$805,258 | \$825,390 | \$571,540 | \$585,827 | \$600,472 | \$467,680 | \$442,053 | \$4,298,220 |
| 1991 Mental Health Realignment | 104,442 | 107,053 | 109,729 | 112,472 | 115,284 | 118,166 | 121,120 | 788,266 |
| State MH Child Wellness Center | 50,000 | 51,250 | 52,531 | 53,844 | 55,190 | 56,570 | 57,984 | 377,369 |
| State Mental Health Services Act - Prevention and Early Intervention Match | 12,500 | 12,812 | 13,132 | 13,460 | 13,797 | 7,071 | -- | 72,772 |
| State Mental Health Services Act | 1,209,888 | 1,240,135 | 850,889 | 872,163 | 742,036 | 250,576 | -- | 5,165,687 |
| Early & Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, Treatment/Public Safety Realignment | 562,210 | 576,265 | 316,187 | 324,091 | 332,195 | 214,592 | 197,133 | 2,522,673 |
| <i>Federal and State Funds Subtotal</i> | <i>\$2,744,298</i> | <i>\$2,812,905</i> | <i>\$1,914,008</i> | <i>\$1,961,857</i> | <i>\$1,858,974</i> | <i>\$1,114,655</i> | <i>\$818,290</i> | <i>\$13,224,987</i> |
| <i>City General Fund</i> | | | | | | | | |
| General Fund | \$807,412 | \$827,597 | \$783,278 | \$802,861 | \$822,931 | \$656,416 | \$659,260 | \$5,359,755 |
| General Fund – Cost of Doing Business | 5,246 | 5,377 | 5,510 | 5,648 | 5,789 | 2,101 | -- | 29,671 |
| HSA Work Order – Childcare Mental Health Consultation | 380,366 | 389,875 | 399,622 | 409,613 | 419,853 | 430,349 | -- | 2,429,678 |
| HSA Work Order – 0-5 | 155,000 | 158,875 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 313,875 |
| HSA Work Order – Pre-School for All | 440,432 | 451,443 | 462,729 | 474,297 | 486,154 | 498,308 | -- | 2,813,363 |
| DCYF Work Order – Child Care | 77,181 | 79,111 | 81,089 | 83,116 | 85,194 | 87,324 | -- | 493,015 |
| DCYF Work Order – Violence Prevention | 135,477 | 138,864 | 142,336 | 145,894 | 149,541 | -- | -- | 712,112 |
| CFC Work Order – School Readiness | 52,313 | 53,621 | 54,962 | 56,336 | 57,744 | 59,188 | -- | 334,164 |
| <i>General Fund Subtotal</i> | <i>\$2,053,427</i> | <i>\$2,104,763</i> | <i>\$1,929,526</i> | <i>\$1,977,765</i> | <i>\$2,027,206</i> | <i>\$1,733,686</i> | <i>\$659,260</i> | <i>\$12,485,633</i> |
| Total Sources of Funds | \$4,797,725 | \$4,917,668 | \$3,843,534 | \$3,939,622 | \$3,886,180 | \$2,848,341 | \$1,477,550 | \$25,710,620 |
| Contingency (12%) | 575,727 | 590,120 | 461,224 | 472,755 | 466,342 | 341,801 | 177,306 | 3,085,275 |
| Total Not-to-Exceed Amount | \$5,373,452 | \$5,507,788 | \$4,304,758 | \$4,412,377 | \$4,352,522 | \$3,190,142 | \$1,654,856 | \$28,795,895 |

| Uses | FY 2018-19 | FY 2019-20 | FY 2020-21 | FY 2021-22 | FY 2022-23 | FY 2023-24 | FY 2024-25 | Total |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Adult Outpatient-Behavioral Health Clinic | \$618,571 | \$634,035 | \$649,886 | \$666,133 | \$682,786 | \$699,856 | \$717,352 | \$4,668,619 |
| Behavioral Health Primary Care Integration | 98,468 | 100,930 | 103,453 | 106,039 | 108,690 | 111,407 | 114,192 | 743,179 |
| Indigena Health & Wellness Collaborative | 275,287 | 282,169 | 289,223 | 296,454 | 151,933 | | | 1,295,066 |
| Child Outpatient Behavioral Health Services | 119,250 | 122,231 | 125,287 | 128,419 | 131,629 | 134,920 | 138,293 | 900,029 |
| Child Outpatient Behavioral Health Clinic-EPSTD | 386,601 | 396,266 | 406,173 | 416,327 | 426,735 | 437,403 | 448,338 | 2,917,843 |
| Early Intervention - Childcare Mental Health Consultation Initiative | 1,003,210 | 1,028,290 | 1,053,997 | 1,080,347 | 1,107,356 | 1,135,040 | -- | 6,408,240 |
| Intensive Supervision and Clinical Services (ISCS)/EPSTD Services | 386,898 | 396,570 | 406,484 | 416,646 | 427,062 | -- | -- | 2,033,660 |
| ISCS/Families First | 146,747 | 150,416 | 154,176 | 158,030 | 161,981 | -- | -- | 771,350 |
| MHSA Prevention & Early Intervention-School-Based Youth-Centered Wellness | 194,380 | 199,240 | 204,221 | 209,327 | 214,560 | -- | -- | 1,021,728 |
| MHSA Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) | 81,410 | 83,445 | 85,531 | 87,669 | 89,861 | 92,108 | -- | 520,024 |
| Transitional Age Youth (TAY) Engagement & Treatment - Latino | 250,000 | 256,250 | 262,656 | 269,222 | 275,953 | 141,426 | -- | 1,455,507 |
| TAY Engagement & Treatment - Latino | 25,000 | 25,625 | 26,266 | 26,923 | 27,596 | 14,143 | -- | 145,553 |
| MHSA PEI ECMHC Training | 21,311 | 21,844 | 22,390 | 22,950 | 23,524 | 24,112 | -- | 136,131 |
| Semillas de Paz | 479,000 | 490,975 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 969,975 |
| Full Service Partnership - Strong Parents And Resilient Kids (SPARK) | 660,393 | 676,903 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,337,296 |
| Day Laborer | 51,199 | 52,479 | 53,791 | 55,136 | 56,514 | 57,927 | 59,375 | 386,421 |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | <i>\$4,797,725</i> | <i>\$4,917,668</i> | <i>\$3,843,534</i> | <i>\$3,939,622</i> | <i>\$3,886,180</i> | <i>\$2,848,342</i> | <i>\$1,477,550</i> | <i>\$25,710,620</i> |
| Contingency (12%) | 575,727 | 590,120 | 461,224 | 472,755 | 466,342 | 341,801 | 177,306 | 3,085,275 |
| Total Not-to-Exceed Amount | \$5,373,452 | \$5,507,788 | \$4,304,758 | \$4,412,377 | \$4,352,521 | \$3,190,143 | \$1,654,856 | \$28,795,895 |


| | |
|---|---|
| Item 7 File 19-0486 | Department: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | |
| Legislative Objectives | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would authorize the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to execute a professional services agreement with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. to provide construction management services for the proposed Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project for a total not to exceed of \$24,500,000 with the duration of eight years, approximately July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2027. | |
| Key Points | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mountain Tunnel is currently used to deliver water from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir into the Priest Reservoir in Tuolumne County, as part of the SFPUC complex water supply system from Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park to the San Francisco Bay Area. In 2012, SFPUC conducted a needs assessment and preliminary screening of options for the Mountain Tunnel. In 2013, the SFPUC evaluated alternative projects for the Mountain Tunnel, and concluded that a new bypass tunnel would be more cost effective than repairs on the existing 11-mile long lined section of the tunnel. In 2016, the City's Technical Advisory Panel advised the City to reconsider a tunnel repair alternative. In response, SFPUC conducted a more comprehensive inspection of the tunnel. Between 2016 and 2019, the SFPUC completed three projects to complete interim repairs on the Mountain Tunnel and improve access to the tunnel to allow for increased inspection. • SFPUC selected AECOM through a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) in November 2018 to provide construction management services for the proposed Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project. The SFPUC is currently completing the project design and environmental documentation, and expects finalization in the late fall of 2019. According to the proposed resolution, the authorization of the contract is not approval of the project, as the City retains sole and absolute discretion to terminate the contract for any reason, including as a result of any decision that the SFPUC may make separately about the proposed project. The City will separately consider approval of the project following completion of the environmental review. | |
| Fiscal Impact | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Mountain Tunnel project budget is \$238,218,951, funded by Hetch Hetchy Power bonds and Hetch Hetchy Water bonds, previously approved by the Board of Supervisors. According to SFPUC, the construction management contract of \$24,497,476, equal to approximately 21.7 percent of the construction budget of \$162,199,631 (which is part of the total project budget of \$238,218,951) is equal to industry standards for such costs. | |
| Recommendation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the proposed resolution. | |

MANDATE STATEMENT

City Charter Section 9.118(b) states that any contract entered into by a department, board or commission that (1) has a term of more than ten years, (2) requires expenditures of \$10 million or more, or (3) requires a modification of more than \$500,000 is subject to Board of Supervisors approval.

BACKGROUND

The Mountain Tunnel is currently used to deliver water from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir into the Priest Reservoir in Tuolumne County, as part of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s (SFPUC) complex water supply system from Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park to the San Francisco Bay Area.



Mountain Tunnel
 Completed in 1925
 18.9 miles long
 From Early Intake to Priest Reservoir

Constructed between 1917 and 1925, the Mountain Tunnel has been in service for more than 90 years. In 2008, a comprehensive inspection of the Mountain Tunnel concluded that certain

sections of the lining had deteriorated significantly, making the Tunnel vulnerable to seismic events, rock falls, diminished water quality and decreased hydroelectric generation capacity.

Mountain Tunnel Inspections and Interim Repairs

In 2012, SFPUC conducted a needs assessment and preliminary screening of options for the Mountain Tunnel. In 2013, the SFPUC evaluated alternative projects for the Mountain Tunnel, and concluded that a new bypass tunnel would be more cost effective than repairs on the existing 11-mile long lined section of the tunnel.

In 2016, the City's Technical Advisory Panel advised the City to reconsider a tunnel repair alternative. In response, SFPUC conducted a more comprehensive inspection of the tunnel. Between 2016 and 2019, the SFPUC completed three projects to complete interim repairs on the Mountain Tunnel and improve access to the tunnel to allow for increased inspection. These three interim projects rehabilitated access roads, improved entryways to allow for larger equipment to enter the tunnel for inspection and repairs, completed physical inspection and mapping of all significant defects in tunnel lining, and repaired critical sections of the tunnel lining to prevent eminent lining collapse. The total cost of these inspections and interim repairs was approximately \$33.4 million. The comprehensive inspection found that the tunnel was still structurally sound but needed repair. SFPUC used the findings of the inspection to design a new project, the Mountain Tunnel Improvements Project.

In October 2018, the SFPUC issued a request for proposals for construction management services for the Mountain Tunnel Improvements Project. These services specifically included pre-construction services, such as review of project design and bidding support assistance, and construction services including construction contract administration, tunnel inspection, civil and environmental inspection, lab testing, start-up and testing assistance, commissioning, construction safety inspection, and document control.

In November 2018, the SFPUC received proposals from five firms: (1) AECOM Technical Services, Inc., (2) EPC Consultants, Inc., (3) Mott MacDonald, (4) Parsons Water & Infrastructure Inc., and (5) Stantec/SchnabelJV. A panel of four, consisting of two SFPUC staff members, one project manager from Santa Clara Valley Water District, and one project manager from the Department of Public Works, reviewed the proposals. Four firms invited to an interview were scored on their written proposal, community benefits, oral interview, and overhead profit score. Due to the size of the contract, the LBE Bonus did not apply. The proposals and scores are shown on Table 1 below.

Table 1: Proposals and Scores

| Proposer | Written Proposal (500) | Community Benefits (50) | Oral Interview (350) | Overhead and Profit (100) | Overall Score (1000) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| AECOM Technical Services, Inc. | 414.235 | 36.288 | 320.540 | 50.000 | 821.063 |
| EPC Consultants, Inc. | 398.888 | 44.369 | 321.260 | 50.000 | 814.516 |
| Mott MacDonald | 422.921 | 29.688 | 330.370 | 35.000 | 817.978 |
| Parsons Water & Infrastructure Inc. | 406.263 | 36.719 | 324.570 | 50.000 | 817.551 |

SFPUC decided that AECOM Technical Services, Inc. was the most qualified and highest ranking proposer and began negotiations.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would authorize the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to execute a professional services agreement with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. to provide construction management services for the proposed Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project for a total not to exceed of \$24,500,000 with the duration of eight years, approximately July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2027.

Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project Timeline

The SFPUC is currently completing the project design and environmental documentation, and expects finalization in the late fall of 2019. According to the proposed resolution, the authorization of the contract is not approval of the project, as the City retains sole and absolute discretion to terminate the contract for any reason, including as a result of any decision that the SFPUC may make separately about the proposed project. The City will separately consider approval of the project following completion of the environmental review. The City retains discretion to modify the project to mitigate significant environmental impacts or reject the project. Construction of the project will not commence prior to the completion of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.

SFPUC expects the construction of the Mountain Tunnel Project to be competitively bid in the fall of 2019, with construction to begin in April 2020. SFPUC expects the construction to be completed in June 2026.

FISCAL IMPACT

Summary budget details for the contract not-to-exceed amount of \$24,500,000 are shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Contract Budget for Construction Management Services
July 2019 to June 2027**

| Expenditure | Amount |
|--|-------------------|
| Labor | 23,268,867 |
| Mark-up on sub-consultant labor costs ^a | 328,609 |
| Other direct costs ^b | 900,000 |
| Total | 24,497,476 |

^a The contract between AECOM and SFPUC provides for \$6,236,056 of the total labor costs of \$23,268,867 to be provided by sub-consultants, of which the total \$6,236,056 is to be provided by Local Business Enterprise (LBE) sub-consultants. SFPUC allows a markup by the prime consultant of 5.0 percent of sub-consultant labor costs, equal to \$328,609.

^b Other direct costs consist of, but not limited to, task-specific out-of-town travel as requested by the SFPUC, specialty printing, specialty computer hardware or software, task related permit fees, and expedited courier services when requested by SFPUC staff.

According to Mr. David Tsztoo, Mountain Tunnel Regional Project Manager, the contract does not include contingency funding.

Of the \$25,000,000 contract not-to-exceed amount, \$23,268,867 will go towards staff members, including LBE sub-consultants, who will be working across six tasks, as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Labor Costs by Task paid by SFPUC to AECOM, Inc. July 2019 to June 2027

| | Approximate Average Rate per Hour | Hours | Total |
|--|---|----------------|-------------------|
| Pre-Construction Services | 215 | 3,121 | 669,705 |
| Construction Contract Administration | 206 | 34,540 | 7,109,205 |
| Change Management | 206 | 12,820 | 2,635,027 |
| Construction Inspection- Civil/Tunnel | 197 | 40,633 | 7,989,832 |
| Construction Inspection- Field, documents control | 150 | 14,359 | 2,149,079 |
| Environmental Compliance | 152 | 17,877 | 2,716,019 |
| Total Labor | 188.64 | 123,350 | 23,268,867 |

The proposed construction management agreement with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. will be funded through Hetch Hetchy Power bonds (55 percent) and Hetch Hetchy Water revenue bonds (45 percent). These bonds were previously approved by the Board of Supervisors (File 18-0047).

The total budget for the Mountain Tunnel Improvements Project of \$238,218,951, including the budgeted \$24,500,000 contract with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. for construction management services, is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Project Total

| Activity | Approved Budget |
|---|----------------------|
| Project Management | \$7,907,685 |
| Planning | 7,337,042 |
| Design (includes bid and award) | 19,472,647 |
| Environmental Review | 6,000,000 |
| Construction Management * (21.7% of construction) | 35,200,00 |
| Right of Way | 100,000 |
| Construction | 162,199,631 |
| Total | \$238,218,951 |

*Includes contingency and closeout

According to Mr. Tsztoo, the construction management budget equal to 21.7 percent of the construction budget is approximately equal to industry standards for construction management costs. According to Mr. Tsztoo, staff from SFPUC is dedicated to inspection and management of

the construction contract to ensure compliance by AECOM Technical, Inc., and that the project remains on scope and schedule.

To date, SFPUC has spent and encumbered \$21,239,514 out of the total \$238,218,951. The SFPUC plans to spend the remaining \$216,979,437 by the end of the project in 2027.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed resolution.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Item 8 File 19-0575</p> | <p>Department: Mayor's Office</p> |
| <p>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Legislative Objectives</p> <p>The proposed resolution would: (1) authorize the Director of the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) to execute documents relating to loans for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or permanent financing of six project sites pursuant to the Small Sites Program and Preservation and Seismic Safety Program for a total loan amount not to exceed \$48,656,000; (2) confirm the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and (3) find that the project loans are consistent with the City’s General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between June and August 2019, MOHCD expects to close loan transactions with Chinatown Community Development Center and Mission Economic Development Agency for six small sites with a total of 69 residential units using funding available through the Small Sites Program, the Preservation and Seismic Safety Program, and the Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund. • The loan documents restrict each project as affordable housing to low- and moderate-income households with annual maximum rent and income established by MOHCD for no less than 75 years. <p style="text-align: center;">Fiscal Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed sources and uses of funds for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and permanent financing of the six project sites total \$45,583,568. • Total development costs per residential unit range from \$474,528 to \$872,353, and the cost per residential square foot ranges from \$680 to \$1,671. <p style="text-align: center;">Policy Consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed subsidies for three of the six small sites exceed program limits set forth in the Notice of Funding Availability for the Small Sites Program and the Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund, but do not exceed the overall \$400,000 per unit cap established by the Small Sites Program. Because the proposed subsidies exceed the limits defined in the Notice of Funding Availability, approval of the proposed resolution is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors. • MOHCD records a deed restriction on each property that requires that the project be operated as affordable housing in perpetuity as a condition of financing, but the City does not own the properties. <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of the proposed resolution is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors. | |

MANDATE STATEMENT

City Charter Section 9.118(b) states that any contract entered into by a department, board or commission that has a term of more than ten years is subject to Board of Supervisors approval by resolution.

BACKGROUND

Small Sites Program

The Small Sites Program is an acquisition and rehabilitation loan program administered by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) for multi-family rental buildings of 5 to 25 dwelling units in San Francisco. The program seeks to protect and establish permanent affordable housing in small properties throughout the city that are vulnerable to market pressure resulting in property sales, increased evictions, and rising tenant rents. The Small Sites Program provides loans to non-profit and for-profit entities to purchase and rehabilitate existing residential buildings and restrict them for the long term as affordable housing. The program goals are to:

- 1) Protect and stabilize housing for current tenants at a range of income levels, as long as at least 75 percent of the building's tenants have an income at or below 80 percent of the area median income (AMI)¹;
- 2) Increasing the supply of permanently affordable rental housing by restricting Small Sites Program properties to serve households with average incomes at 80 percent of AMI;
- 3) Ensure that Small Sites Program properties operate with sufficient cash flow to adequately care for the property and repay debt obligations, including Small Sites Program loans, which the City will reinvest into future Small Sites Program properties.

The Program Guidelines for the Small Sites Program sets the maximum City subsidy including acquisition, rehabilitation, and permanent financing at:

- a. \$300,000 per unit for buildings with 10 to 25 units
- b. \$375,000 per unit for buildings with 3 to 9 units
- c. \$175,000 per bedroom for group or single room occupancy housing

Additional subsidy may be considered on a case-by-case basis, but may not exceed \$400,000 per unit in any case. To calculate the maximum per-unit subsidy, income generating commercial space may be counted as a unit.

Preservation and Seismic Safety Program

The Preservation and Seismic Safety Program (PASS) provides low-cost and long-term financing to fund seismic retrofits, as well as the acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of

¹ The 2019 AMI in San Francisco for a family of four is \$123,150. Eighty percent of AMI for a family of four is \$98,500. The maximum monthly rent for a 1-bedroom unit for a household with 80 percent of AMI is \$1,970 with utilities.

affordable multi-family housing. PASS was created to complement the City's anti-displacement and preservation strategy, including the Small Sites Program. PASS is funded by repurposing \$260.7 million in underutilized bond authority from the 1992 Seismic Safety Loan Program. The initial round of PASS funding was issued in February 2019.

Downtown Neighborhood Preservation Fund

The Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund was established by the Board of Supervisors in 2016 as a result of the sale of City-owned property and approval of a street vacation necessary for the development of the Oceanwide Center located at 50 First Street. The Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund may be used exclusively for the acquisition and preservation of housing within a one-mile radius of the Oceanwide Center. The funding goals include:

- 1) Protect and stabilize housing for residents of the Downtown area at a range of income levels, so long as a majority of the building's tenants have an income at or below 80 percent of AMI;
- 2) Remove existing rental housing properties from the speculative market, while increasing the supply of permanently affordable rental housing;
- 3) Create financially stable, self-sustaining housing that serves multiple generations of low-to moderate-income households by ensuring that properties operate with sufficient cash flow to adequately care for the property and repay debt obligations; and
- 4) Complement the work under the Small Sites Program by giving priority to buildings with 26 or more residential units.

Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund subsidies may not exceed \$250,000 per dwelling unit.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would: (1) authorize the Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to execute documents relating to loans for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or permanent financing of six project sites pursuant to the Small Sites Program and Preservation and Seismic Safety Program for a total loan amount not to exceed \$48,656,000; (2) confirm the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and (3) find that the project loans are consistent with the City's General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.

Between June and August 2019, MOHCD expects to close loan transactions with Chinatown Community Development Center and Mission Economic Development Agency for the following six sites:

- 1) 1201 Powell Street, a 17-unit residential property with one ground floor commercial tenant
- 2) 462 Green Street, a 7-unit residential property

- 3) 4830 Mission Street, a 21-unit residential property with 6 ground floor commercial tenants
- 4) 3280 17th Street, an 11-unit residential property with 5 ground floor commercial tenants
- 5) 1411 Florida Street, a 7-unit residential property
- 6) 65 Woodward Street, a 6-unit residential property

The loan documents will restrict each project as affordable housing to low- and moderate-income households with annual maximum rent and income established by MOHCD as long as all or any portion of the buildings remain on the property, but in no event less than 75 years.

Loan Terms

A summary of the key loan terms for the Small Sites Program, PASS, and the Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Key Loan Terms

| Loan Fund | Term | Interest Rate | Subsidy Limit |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | | \$300,000/unit (10-25 units) \$375,000/unit (3-9 units) |
| Small Sites Program | 40 years | 3% residual receipts ^a | \$175,000/BR (SRO or group) |
| PASS - Market Rate Loan | 40 years | 5.16725% | N/A |
| PASS - Below Market Rate Loan | 40 years | 1.38908% | N/A |
| PASS – Deferred Loan | 40 years | 1.38908% | N/A |
| Downtown Neighborhood Preservation Fund | 40 years | 3% residual receipts ^a | \$250,000/unit |

^a For any year when the replacement reserve balance is less than 1.5 times the original replacement reserve amount, 1/3 is retained by the sponsor, and the other 2/3 is deposited into the replacement reserve. In the event that the replacement reserve balance is greater than 1.5 the original amount, then the City would receive repayment on the loan.

Loan repayment obligations on the Small Sites Program and Downtown Neighborhood Preservation Fund loans are limited to the availability of residual receipts, or annual cash flow after operating costs have been paid. Interest not paid to the City each year due to lack of available residual receipts will be forgiven and will not accrue.

The PASS Market Rate and Below Market Rate loans must be repaid in monthly installments on a 40-year amortization schedule. The PASS Deferred loan is repayable as a balloon due at maturity.

FISCAL IMPACT

Sources and Uses

The proposed sources and uses of funds for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and permanent financing of the six project sites total \$45,583,568, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Sources and Uses of Funds for Six Small Sites

| Sources | 1201 Powell | 462 Green | 4830 Mission | 3280 17th | 1411 Florida | 65 Woodward | Total |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Small Sites Program | | \$2,666,000 | \$7,316,124 | \$4,755,886 | \$2,560,359 | \$2,347,403 | \$19,645,772 |
| PASS - Market Rate Loan | \$1,085,717 | 428,573 | 4,761,726 | 2,765,721 | 883,431 | 717,716 | 10,642,884 |
| PASS - Below Market Rate Loan | 700,055 | 276,338 | 3,070,294 | 1,783,298 | 569,624 | 462,773 | 6,862,382 |
| PASS - Deferred | 114,228 | 45,090 | 500,980 | 290,981 | 92,946 | 75,511 | 1,119,736 |
| Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund | 6,164,000 | | | | | | 6,164,000 |
| <i>Loan Subtotal</i> | <i>\$8,064,000</i> | <i>\$3,416,001</i> | <i>\$15,649,124</i> | <i>\$9,595,886</i> | <i>\$4,106,360</i> | <i>\$3,603,403</i> | <i>\$44,434,774</i> |
| Existing Reserves | 2,970 | | | | | | 2,970 |
| Neighborworks PRN Grant | | 430,000 | | | | | 430,000 |
| Wells Fargo Grant | | 30,000 | | | | | 30,000 |
| Chinatown Community Development Center Advance | | 685,824 | | | | | 685,824 |
| Total | \$8,066,970 | \$4,561,825 | \$15,649,124 | \$9,595,886 | \$4,106,360 | \$3,603,403 | \$45,583,568 |
| Uses | | | | | | | |
| Acquisition | \$4,300,000 | \$1,750,000 | \$13,278,291 | \$7,750,000 | \$2,418,848 | \$2,000,000 | \$31,497,139 |
| Closing Costs | 12,034 | 29,375 | 15,465 | 109,500 | 44,575 | 46,220 | 257,169 |
| PASS Loan Financing | | | 109,163 | | | | 109,163 |
| Rehabilitation | 1,818,852 | 2,582,700 | | 1,515,122 | 1,510,994 | 1,448,425 | 8,876,093 |
| Architect & Engineering | 146,792 | | | | | | 146,792 |
| Reserves | 543,016 | 49,750 | 1,859,167 | 221,264 | 131,943 | 108,758 | 2,913,898 |
| Other Soft Costs | 986,276 | | 114,645 | | | | 1,100,921 |
| Developer Fee | 260,000 | 150,000 | 272,393 | | | | 682,393 |
| Total | \$8,066,970 | \$4,561,825 | \$15,649,124 | \$9,595,886 | \$4,106,360 | \$3,603,403 | \$45,583,568 |

The proposed resolution would authorize a total loan amount not to exceed \$48,656,000, which is \$4,221,226 greater than the proposed loan amount of \$44,434,774. According to Mr. Jonah Lee, Director of Portfolio Management and Preservation at MOHCD, the additional not to exceed authorization reflects a standard contingency of approximately 10 percent across the portfolio of projects to mitigate unforeseen conditions resulting in changes to the project budgets such as emergency repairs related to health and safety, cost overruns, and delays.

Three of the six sites have commercial tenants. According to Ms. Cindy Heavens, Project Manager at MOHCD, the only case in which the proposed loan financing would be used to improve the commercial spaces would be if required seismic safety retrofits or other code-required building improvements must be applied to the entire envelope of the building. Otherwise, the proposed loan financing would not be used to improve the commercial spaces or lower commercial lease payments.

Development Cost and Subsidy per Unit

Total development costs per residential unit² range from \$474,528 to \$872,353, and the cost per residential square foot ranges from \$680 to \$1,671, as shown in Table 2 below.

As discussed above, the maximum Small Sites Program subsidy per unit is \$300,000 for buildings with 10 to 25 units and \$375,000 for buildings with 3 to 9 units. In extreme cases, subsidies up to \$400,000 per unit may be considered. The Small Sites Program subsidy for the six projects ranges from \$0 to \$391,234, as shown in Table 3 below.

² Total development cost per unit does not include commercial units, which are not eligible for subsidies, although commercial lease payments contribute to the property's cash flow used for loan repayments.

Table 3: Cost and Subsidy per Unit

| | 1201 Powell | 462 Green | 4830 Mission | 3280 17th | 1411 Florida | 65 Woodward |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Residential Units | 17 | 7 | 21 | 11 | 7 | 6 |
| Residential & Commercial Units | 18 | 7 | 27 | 16 | 7 | 6 |
| Residential Square Footage (SF) | 6,357 | 3,354 | 23,000 | 5,744 | 4,205 | 4,163 |
| Total Development Cost | \$8,066,970 | \$4,561,825 | \$15,649,124 | \$9,595,886 | \$4,106,360 | \$3,603,403 |
| Cost per Residential Unit | \$474,528 | \$651,689 | \$745,196 | \$872,353 | \$586,623 | \$600,567 |
| Cost per Residential SF | \$1,269 | \$1,360 | \$680 | \$1,671 | \$977 | \$866 |
| Small Sites Program Subsidy | \$0 | \$2,666,000 | \$7,316,124 | \$4,755,886 | \$2,560,359 | \$2,347,403 |
| Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund | \$6,164,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subsidy per unit | \$342,444 ^a | \$380,857 ^b | \$270,968 | \$297,243 | \$365,766 | \$391,234 ^b |

^a The Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund subsidy of \$342,444 exceeds the limit of \$250,000 per unit, due in part to the subsidy limits having been tailored for the average per unit subsidy expected for larger sites (above 25 units).

^b The Small Sites Program subsidies for 462 Green Street and 65 Woodward Street exceed the limit of \$375,000 per unit for buildings with 3 to 9 units, but are below the absolute maximum of \$400,000 per unit. According to MOHCD, the subsidies exceed the limit on 65 Woodward Street due to unforeseen dry rot and essential life and safety repairs that were discovered during the course of construction. On 462 Green Street, the subsidies exceed the limit because the sponsor is pursuing the creation of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), which had timeline and cost impacts on the project.

Fund Balances

The proposed loan amounts represent 15 to 26 percent of the current fund balance for the funding sources, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Small Sites Program and Preservation and Seismic Safety Program Fund Balances

| Fund | Current Balance | Proposed Loan Amount | Percent of Fund | Final Balance |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Small Sites Program | \$80,042,509 | \$19,645,772 | 25% | \$60,396,737 |
| 2019A PASS - Market Rate Loan | 40,248,887 | 10,642,884 | 26% | 29,606,003 |
| 2019A PASS - Below Market Rate Loan | 25,956,870 | 6,862,382 | 26% | 19,094,488 |
| 2019A PASS - Deferred | 4,233,371 | 1,119,736 | 26% | 3,113,635 |
| Downtown Neighborhood Preservation Fund | 39,889,169 | 6,164,000 | 15% | 33,725,169 |
| Total | \$190,370,806 | \$44,343,774 | 23% | \$145,936,032 |

POLICY CONSIDERATION**Subsidy Limits**

The proposed subsidies for three of the six small sites exceed the program limits set forth in the Notice of Funding Availability for the Small Sites Program and the Downtown Neighborhoods Preservation Fund, but do not exceed the overall \$400,000 per unit cap established by the Small Sites Program. The primary driver of the costs in excess of the program limits for 1201 Powell and 65 Woodward was the need to address seismic and other essential life and safety upgrades that the project sponsor discovered during the course of construction. For 462 Green, the project sponsor pursued the creation of an accessory dwelling unit, which had timeline and cost impacts. Therefore, approval of the proposed resolution is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors.

City Loans for Privately-Owned Sites

To preserve affordability long term, the City typically ground leases a City-owned property to a non-profit entity to develop, maintain, and manage the site. Under the Small Sites Program, the City provides permanent financing for the acquisition and rehabilitation of sites that are not owned by the City. According to Mr. Lee, the Small Sites Program must compete with profit-motivated developers to remove properties from the speculative real estate market, so the City uses a public-private partnership model designed to execute transactions quickly. As a condition of receiving the City's Small Sites Program financing, MOHCD records a deed restriction on each property that requires that the project be operated as affordable housing in perpetuity.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the proposed resolution is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Item 9 File 19-0576</p> | <p>Department: Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)</p> |
| <p>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Legislative Objectives</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would authorize the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) to expend \$919,954 from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund to award 18 grants to non-profit organizations from July 2019 through June 2020. | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Key Points</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the City’s Planning Code, developers constructing new residential development in the Rincon Hill Downtown Residential District pay development impact fees of \$10.95 per square foot into the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund, to be used for housing and economic and workforce development. MOHCD administers the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund, and the Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC) advises on the use of funds, subject to Board of Supervisors approval. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In March 2019, MOHCD issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for non-profit organizations interested in seeking grant assistance from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund, in the following 11 categories: (1) Access to Housing; (2) Event-Based Economic Development; (3) Community Action Grants Coordinator; (4) Eviction Defense and Housing Stabilization; (5) Neighborhood Business Coordination; (6) Small Business Acceleration; (7) College Preparatory Program; (8) Community Council; (9) Financial Literacy; (10) School Site Coordinator; and (11) Neighborhood Arts/Culture Project. An evaluation panel reviewed and scored the proposals, and MOHCD awarded 18 grants in the 11 categories. | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Fiscal Impact</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed resolution would authorize MOHCD to expend \$919,954 from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund. After the grant expenditures and setting aside other obligations, the fund would have a remaining balance of \$729,452. | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendation</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the proposed resolution. | |

MANDATE STATEMENT

In accordance with Planning Code Section 418.7, all funds in the South of Market Area (SOMA) Community Stabilization Fund are to be expended to address the effects of destabilization on residents and businesses in SOMA due to new residential development in the Rincon Hill Area. SOMA Community Stabilization Fund expenditures are administered by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), subject to approval by resolution of the Board of Supervisors.

BACKGROUND

In 2005, the Board of Supervisors approved a new Section 418 in the City's Planning Code which, among other provisions, (a) established the Rincon Hill Downtown Residential District; (b) imposed a Rincon Hill Community Infrastructure Fee; (c) created a Rincon Hill Community Improvement Fund for the deposit of the Rincon Hill Community Infrastructure Fees collected; (d) imposed a SOMA Community Stabilization Fee of \$14 per square foot (subsequently amended down to \$10.95 per square foot by the Board of Supervisors under Ordinance 270-10) on developers who build new residential development within the Rincon Hill Downtown Residential District¹; (e) created the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund for the deposit of SOMA Community Stabilization Fees collected; and (f) established the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to advise the MOHCD and the Board of Supervisors on the uses of the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund (File 05-0865, Ordinance 217-05).

The Planning Code stipulates that dollars from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund are to be expended to provide assistance to SOMA residents including affordable housing, community asset building, employment development, job growth and job placement, and other services to address impacts of destabilization.

In 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution (a) approving the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Strategic Plan; (b) authorizing MOHCD to administer the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund in accordance with this strategic plan; and (c) authorizing MOHCD to work with the CAC to issue Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for non-profit agencies to provide services addressing the effects of destabilization on residents and businesses in SOMA, consistent with the Community Stabilization Fund Strategic Plan (File 08-0544, Resolution 216-08).

The CAC revised the Community Stabilization Fund Strategic Plan in 2011 to articulate four goals, which include:

1. Strengthen community cohesion
2. Support economic and workforce development for low-income residents and businesses that serve the SOMA community

¹ The Rincon Hill Downtown Residential District is the area bounded by Folsom Street, The Embarcadero, Bryant Street, and Essex Street.

3. Increase access to perpetually affordable housing opportunities for existing SOMA residents
4. Improve the infrastructure and physical environment

RFP Process

In March 2019, MOHCD issued an RFP for community-based organizations seeking grant assistance from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund. The RFP allowed for project proposals in the following 11 service categories: (1) Access to Housing; (2) Event-Based Economic Development; (3) Community Action Grants Coordinator; (4) Eviction Defense and Housing Stabilization; (5) Neighborhood Business Coordination; (6) Small Business Acceleration; (7) College Preparatory Program; (8) Community Council; (9) Financial Literacy; (10) School Site Coordinator; and (11) Neighborhood Arts/Culture Project. MOHCD received 26 proposals² for the 11 service categories, and an evaluation panel reviewed the proposals and scored them, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: RFP Proposals and Scores

| Program Area | Agency Name | Project Name | Score | Awarded Grant? |
|--|--|--|-------|----------------|
| Access to Housing | San Francisco Study Center | Bill Sorro Housing Program (BiSHoP) | 80 | ✓ |
| Access to Housing | Homeownership San Francisco | Homeownership Orientations | 67 | |
| College Preparatory Program | West Bay Pilipino Multi Service Center | College Prep Program | 84 | ✓ |
| Community Action Grants Coordinator | San Francisco Study Center | Community Action Grants Coordinator | 75 | ✓ |
| Community Council | Filipino-American Development Foundation | SOMA Community Collaborative | 95 | ✓ |
| Community Council | Filipino Community Development Corporation, fiscal sponsor of SOMA Neighborhood Residents Council | SNRC Community Council | 64 | |
| Event-Based Economic Development | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of Kultivate Labs | UNDISCOVERED SF / UNDSCLRVD | 85 | ✓ |
| Event-Based Economic Development | Kearney Street Workshop | APAture 20 th Anniversary | 83 | ✓ |
| Event-Based Economic Development | South of Market Merchants' and Individuals' Lifestyle Events (dba Folsom Street Events) | Up Your Alley / Folsom Street Fair | 79 | ✓ |
| Event-Based Economic Development | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of Kultivate Labs | Stevenson Alley-ooP | 68 | |
| Event-Based Economic Development | The East Cut Community Benefit District | Retail in the Cut | 63 | |
| Eviction Defense and Housing Stabilization | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of South of Market Community Action Network | SOMCAN's Tenant Counseling Program | 87 | ✓ |
| Eviction Defense and Housing Stabilization | Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach | SOMA LEP Community Eviction Defense Project | 70 | ✓ |
| Financial Literacy | Mission Economic Development Agency | 2019 MEDA-BALANCE Partnership to Expand Financial Literacy in SOMA | 87 | ✓ |

² An additional proposal for the Community Action Grants Coordinator was submitted by the Filipino-American Development Foundation, but was withdrawn by the applicant.

| Program Area | Agency Name | Project Name | Score | Awarded Grant? |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|-------|----------------|
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | Kulintang Arts, Inc. | Pilipinx Here & Now | 88 | ✓ |
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | Bindlestiff Studio | Stories High 19 | 85 | ✓ |
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | Filipino Community Development Corporation | Art, Games and Stories from Barangay SoMa | 83 | ✓ |
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of SOMA Pilipinas | LIWANAG - Reissue + Relaunch | 83 | ✓ |
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | San Francisco Parks Alliance | Eagle Plaza - A Tribute to Leather & LGBTQ Heritage | 74 | ✓ |
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | The East Cut Community Benefit District | Working Title | 71 | |
| Neighborhood Arts/ Culture Project | Kearny Street Workshop | Means of Exchange (South of Market) | 70 | |
| Neighborhood Business Coordination | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of South of Market Community Action Network | Workers Program | 82 | ✓ |
| Neighborhood Business Coordination | Brothers for Change Inc. | Make Em Shine | 73 | |
| School Site Coordinator | United Playaz | SOMA Youth Collaborative - School Site Coordination | 96 | ✓ |
| Small Business Acceleration | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of Kultivate Labs | SEED Business Accelerator | 78 | ✓ |
| Small Business Acceleration | Kearny Street Workshop, fiscal sponsor of Anthem Salgado/Art of Hustle | ART OF HUSTLE SOMA Scholarship | 70 | |

A total of 18 grants were awarded in the 11 service categories.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would authorize MOHCD to expend \$919,954 from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund to address various impacts of destabilization on residents and businesses in SOMA from July 2019 through June 2020. The list of awarded grants is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: SOMA Community Stabilization Grants Awarded in FY 2019-20

| Program Area | Agency Name | Grant Amount |
|--|---|--------------|
| Access to Housing | San Francisco Study Center, fiscal sponsor of the Bill Sorro Housing Project | \$75,000 |
| College Preparatory Program | West Bay Pilipino Multi Service Center | 50,000 |
| Community Action Grants Coordinator | San Francisco Study Center | 100,000 |
| Community Council | Filipino American Development Foundation | 50,000 |
| Event-Based Economic Development | Kearny Street Workshop | 36,954 |
| Event-Based Economic Development | Filipino American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of Kultivate Labs | 75,000 |
| Event-Based Economic Development | South of Market Merchants' and Individuals' Lifestyle Events (dba Folsom Street Events) | 38,000 |
| Eviction Defense and Housing Stabilization | Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach | 75,000 |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Eviction Defense and Housing Stabilization | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of South of Market Community Action Network | 75,000 |
| Financial Literacy | Mission Economic Development Agency | 50,000 |
| Neighborhood Arts and Culture Project | San Francisco Parks Alliance | 20,000 |
| Neighborhood Arts and Culture Project | Kulintang Arts, Inc. | 20,000 |
| Neighborhood Arts and Culture Project | Filipino Community Development Corporation | 20,000 |
| Neighborhood Arts and Culture Project | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of SOMA Pilipinas | 20,000 |
| Neighborhood Arts and Culture Project | Bindlestiff Studio | 15,000 |
| Neighborhood Business Coordination | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of South of Market Community Action Network | 75,000 |
| School Site Coordinator | United Playaz | 50,000 |
| Small Business Acceleration | Filipino-American Development Foundation, fiscal sponsor of Kultivate Labs | 75,000 |
| Total | | \$919,954 |

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed resolution would authorize MOHCD to expend \$919,954 from the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund for 18 grants to non-profit organizations in FY 2019-20, as shown in Table 2 above.

According to Mr. Rally Catapang, MOHCD Finance Manager, the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund has not received any funds in FY 2018-19. After expending the FY 2019-20 grants, MOHCD projects a fund balance of \$729,452, as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Projected SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Balance

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Current Balance | \$11,667,289 |
| FY 2010-19 Unspent Encumbered Funds | (1,627,886) |
| Expenditures Approved by Board of Supervisors but Unencumbered | <u>(5,225,000)</u> |
| Subtotal, Previously Approved and Unspent Funds | (\$6,852,886) |
| Small Sites Pool | (364,997) |
| FY 2019-20 Grants | (919,954) |
| Capacity Building | (1,800,000) |
| Three-Year Administrative Costs | (1,000,000) |
| Remaining Balance | \$729,452 |

Previously allocated SOMA Community Stabilization funds of \$6,852,886 remain unspent, as shown in Table 3 above, some of which were encumbered nearly 10 years ago in FY 2009-10. According to Ms. Claudine del Rosario, SOMA Fund Director, funds in the amount \$1,627,886 that were encumbered but unspent between FY 2009-10 and FY 2018-19 were for capital and service projects that are still in progress. Ms. del Rosario anticipates that these funds will be spent. According to Ms. del Rosario, MOHCD will return the monies to the fund balance if they are not spent by the time grant terms end.

According to Ms. del Rosario, the \$5,225,000 in SOMA Community Stabilization funds previously approved by the Board of Supervisors but not spent were for Small Sites projects to

be identified. Several sites are in the process of being evaluated by MOHCD's housing staff, in partnership with nonprofit housing developers. If and when a site(s) is successfully identified as an appropriate fit for the Small Sites Program, these funds will be made available to acquire and/or perform tenant improvements to the site. The CAC will be updated as suitable sites are identified and approved for underwriting.

According to Ms. del Rosario, the \$1,800,000 allocated to capacity building will be made available through a Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide capacity building services to community-based organizations serving the SoMa Fund's priority populations. MOHCD will work collaboratively with the CAC to develop a capacity building institute in order to strengthen the organizational sustainability of organizations serving the SoMa neighborhood. Anticipated services will include strategic planning, strengthening administration and operations, real estate readiness, leadership development and board development. Ms. del Rosario projects that an RFP will be issued within the first half of FY 2019-2020.

POLICY CONSIDERATION

The prior SOMA Community Stabilization Fund grants were for two years, from FY 2017-18 through FY 2018-19. Of the 18 grants awarded to community based under the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund allocation in FY 2019-20, eight were to community based organizations that were awarded grants under the prior allocation from FY 2017-18 through FY 2018-19. All eight organizations are currently meeting or exceeding their agreed upon program goals.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed resolution.