



REPORTS

2000

-
1. **REPORT OF SINGLE FAMILY BOND SALE AND RELATED INTEREST RATE SWAPS (HMRB 2000 SERIES TUVW)..... 2002**
 2. **UPDATE ON VARIABLE RATE BONDS AND INTEREST RATE SWAPS.....2006**
 3. **ANNUAL INVESTMENT REPORT: JUNE 30. 2000..... 2010**
 4. **SAN DIEGO ELECTRIC UTILITIES REPORT..... 2018**
 5. **UPDATE ON NEW STATE LEGISLATION..... [under separate cover]**

2001

**THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

MEMORANDUM

2002

To: Board of Directors

Date: September 28, 2000



Ken Carlson, Director of Financing

From: CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: REPORT OF BOND SALE AND RELATED INTEREST RATE SWAPS
HOME MORTGAGE REVENUE BONDS 2000 SERIES TUVW

On September 12* we priced \$44.1 million of fixed rate single family bonds and at the same time arranged fixed rates through the swap market for \$141.2 million of variable rate bonds. A total of \$185.3 million of single family bonds will be delivered on October 5th.

Funding New Loans

A \$170 million portion of the transaction (Series T, U, and V) is being issued to fund new loans, with interest rates ranging from 6.508 to 8%. This \$170 million includes \$28.8 million of fixed-rate bonds (most of which are capital appreciation bonds) and \$141.2 million of variable rate bonds swapped to fixed rates. The interest rate swaps for the variable rate series (U and V) are structured with declining notional amounts that match the expected amortization of the corresponding bonds.

By utilizing interest rate swaps, the Agency was able to achieve a 0.53% savings in our overall cost of funds for this \$170 million of bonds when compared to issuing all fixed-rate bonds. This reduced cost of funds allows us to continue to offer low rates for new mortgages to low-income first-time homebuyers in spite of the fact that 60% of the bonds issued to fund new loans are taxable. Only \$68 million (40%) of this \$170 million portion of the transaction is tax-exempt.

New Investor for Taxable Bonds

We have been courting the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco (FHLB) for several years and are very pleased to report that it has agreed to purchase all of our \$102 million of Series V taxable variable rate bonds. These variable rate bonds will reset only semiannually and are indexed to semiannual LIBOR (the London Inter-Bank Offered Rate). In turn, our swap counterparty will pay us a semiannual rate that is also similarly indexed. The bonds and corresponding swap both have a 7-year average life.

While other Federal Home Loan Banks have purchased taxable bonds from us in the past, this represents the first investment by the San Francisco FHLB. Recently their board approved an initial \$250 million investment in state agency housing bonds, and we hope that this is the start of an ongoing investment partnership.

2003

An ongoing investor relationship with the San Francisco **FHLB** will be a key factor in the continuance of our successful interest rate swap strategy, because the indexed floaters we **are** selling to the **FHLB** do not have a put feature that requires bank liquidity. Of the several varieties of variable rate bonds, variable rate demand obligations (VRDOs) always provide the lowest rates, primarily **because** VRDO investors have the right to put their bonds **back** to the issuer. In order for us to **be** able to cover these puts, we must manage for highly-rated **banks** to provide the standby liquidity. Unfortunately, **banks** will not provide us with unlimited amounts of such liquidity, and therefore we cannot hope to sell all our variable rate bonds in the form of VRDOs. Finding an investor with a large appetite for indexed taxable floaters **will** enable us to target the limited resource of bank liquidity to our tax-exempt variable rate bonds, where the employment of VRDOs gives us the biggest interest rate advantage over other forms of variable rate debt.

Please note the attached news release from the San Francisco **FHLB**.

Preserving Tax-Exempt Authority

A \$15.3 million portion, Series W, is a **3.90%** one-year callable note being issued to preserve tax-exempt authority for later use. We have used a similar technique many times in the past with much success.

Other Matters

| Series | Amounts | Interest Rates | Reset Frequency | Maturities | Tax Status |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|
| 2000 Series T | \$ 28,797,899.40 | 4.00 - 6.15% | -- | 8/1/02 - 2/1/32 | AMT |
| 2000 Series U | 39,200,000.00 | Variable 4.527%* | Weekly | 2/1/17 | AMT |
| 2000 Series V | 102,000,000.00 | Variable 7.096%* | Semi-Annually | 2/1/32 | Taxable |
| 2000 Series W | 15,275,000.00 | 3.90% | -- | 10/1/01 | AMT |
| Total | \$185,272,899.40 | | | | |



FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
of SAN FRANCISCO

2004

News Release

First-time Purchase of California Housing Finance Agency Bonds by Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco to Boost Homeownership in California

SAN FRANCISCO, Calif.— September 12,2000—The Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco has agreed to purchase \$102 million in California Housing Finance Agency mortgage revenue bonds backed by home loans to low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers in California. "This investment represents a perfect match between the respective housing missions of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco and the California Housing Finance Agency," said Dean Schultz, president and chief executive officer of the Bank.

The taxable, variable rate bonds will be used to support the California Housing Finance Agency's home purchase program. According to Theresa A. Parker, CHFA's Executive Director, "We are delighted to be doing our first transaction with the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco. The Bank's support will greatly assist our agency in meeting Governor Davis' challenge that we provide \$1 billion each year for home loans for low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers. Because of restrictions on the amount of tax-exempt bonds we are authorized to sell, we need to issue approximately 60 percent of our bonds in taxable form. This kind of transaction makes sense both for CHFA and for the Bank, given our similar missions."

"This investment will directly benefit low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers in our district, while providing us with a safe and attractive return," said Dean Schultz. "This transaction represents our first direct investment in a state housing finance agency's bonds, and highlights the effectiveness of public-private partnerships in promoting housing accessibility and affordability."

600 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
Post Office Box 7948 (94120)
Tel 415 616 1000

2005

The California Housing Finance Agency is a housing associate of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco. Under a recently approved regulation on core mission activities, the bonds being purchased today qualify **as** core mission **assets** for the Bank.

The California Housing Finance Agency **was** established under state law in **1975** to act **as** the state's housing bank. Its mission is to finance below-market-rate loans to create safe, decent, and affordable rental housing and to assist **first-time** homebuyers in achieving the dream of homeownership. Over its **25-year history**, CHFA has issued over **\$15** billion in revenue bonds, financing more than **25,000** units of affordable rental housing and providing over 100,000 home **loans** to first-time homebuyers. CHFA's operations are entirely self-supporting, and its debt obligations are separate from those of the State of California.

The Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco delivers **low-cost funding** and other services that help member financial institutions provide home mortgages to consumers of all income levels and make loans that build neighborhoods and communities. The Bank also funds community investment programs that help members create affordable housing and that foster partnerships among lenders, housing developers, community organizations, and government agencies. With over **\$129** billion in **assets**, the Bank is the largest of the **12** banks in the nation's Federal Home Loan Bank System. It **serves** and is owned by commercial banks, **savings** institutions, credit **unions**, and thrift **&** loan companies headquartered in Arizona, California, and Nevada. For more information about the Bank, visit www.fhlbsf.com.

###

CONTACTS: Amy Stewart, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, **415-616-2605**
Richard **A. LaVergne**, California Housing Finance Agency, **916-324-4640**

MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors

Date: September 28, 2000



Ken Carlson, Director of Financing

From: CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: Update on Variable ~~Rate~~ Bonds and Interest Rate SwapsCurrent Variable Rate Exposure

As of October 5 (the closing date for our latest single family bond issue), the total amount of CHFA variable rate debt outstanding will be \$1.61 billion. As shown in the table below, \$504 million continues to be the amount that should be considered as "net" variable rate exposure. The net amount of variable rate bonds is that amount that is not backed by complementary variable rate loans or not swapped to fixed rates. This net amount is now only 7.2% of our \$7.0 billion of indebtedness.

VARIABLE RATE DEBT
(\$ in millions)

| | <u>Tied Directly to Variable Rate Loans</u> | <u>Swapped to Fixed Rate</u> | <u>Not Swapped or Tied to Variable Rate Loans</u> | <u>Total Variable Rate Debt</u> |
|---------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Single Family | \$57 | \$935 | \$490 | \$1,482 |
| Multifamily | <u>17</u> | <u>100</u> | <u>14</u> | <u>131</u> |
| Total | \$74 | \$1,035 | \$504 | \$1,613 |

As discussed previously, our \$504 million of net exposure provides the Agency with a useful internal hedge against a low interest rate scenario such as an economic recession, where we would otherwise suffer financially from low short-term investment rates, fast loan prepayments, failing multifamily projects, and low demand for new loans. On the other hand, if interest rates rise, high short-term investment rates and slow prepayments will provide a hedge against our higher variable rate bond costs. As described at previous meetings, much of this balance should be steadily declining as old high-rate single family loans pay off.

The table below summarizes this current risk position.

| | NET VARIABLE RATE DEBT | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | <u>Tax-Exempt</u> | <u>Taxable</u> | <u>Totals</u> |
| Short average life | \$266 million | \$104 million | \$370 million |
| Long average life | <u>\$ 14 million</u> | <u>\$120 million</u> | <u>\$134 million</u> |
| TOTALS | \$280 million | \$224 million | \$504 million |

Interest Rate Swaps

Including the two swaps (totaling **\$141 million**) for the single family transaction that will close on October 5, we now have **18** such swaps with four different counterparties for a combined notional amount exceeding **\$1 billion**. These interest rate swaps generate significant debt service savings in comparison to our alternative of issuing fixed-rate bonds. **This** savings will help us continue to offer exceptionally low interest rates to homebuyers and multifamily sponsors. The overall rate savings for our single family transactions, with their blend of fixed and variable, tax-exempt and taxable bonds, has been in the range of 0.50% to 0.60%. The rate savings in multifamily is approximately twice as great, given that all the bonds will be tax-exempt and variable rate.

The table below provides a summary of our swap transactions.

| | INTEREST RATE SWAPS | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | <u>Tax-Exempt</u> | <i>Taxable</i> | <i>Totals</i> |
| Single family | \$283 million | \$652 million | \$935 million |
| Multifamily | <u>\$100 million</u> | <u>\$ 0</u> | <u>\$100 million</u> |
| TOTALS | \$383 million | \$652 million | \$1,035 million |

It should be noted that, for **\$350 million** of the \$383 million of tax-exempt bonds swapped to a fixed rate, **CHFA remains** exposed to **certain** tax-related risks. In return for significantly higher savings (approximately **0.75% per year**), **CHFA has** chosen through these interest rate swaps to retain exposure to the risk of changes in tax laws that would lessen the advantage of tax-exempt bonds in comparison to taxable securities. **This** is the Same risk that investors take every time they purchase our fixed-rate tax-exempt bonds.

2008Multifamily Plans

Early in November we expect to **issue** approximately \$83 million of tax-exempt variable rate multifamily **bonds**, all of which will be swapped to fixed rates. These bonds **are** planned to **be** issued to provide **financing** for 11 multifamily projects, including seven for which we recently received a total of \$63.3 million of private activity **bond** allocation **from** the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee. In addition, we plan to issue another **\$20** million of bonds for four projects with **501(c)(3)** borrowers.

Single Family Plans

In keeping with our bi-monthly single family financing plans, we expect to **be** issuing approximately \$190 million of single family **bonds** in **December** and anticipate **that** most of this financing will consist of variable rate **bonds** again swapped to fixed rates. The debt service savings resulting from accessing the swap market enables us to **continue to** offer low mortgage rates to new borrowers in spite of our aggressive use of taxable **bonds** to increase our lending resources.

This issue is expected to include approximately **\$20** million of tax-exempt variable rate refunding bonds. Our intention would be not to swap these **bonds** to a fixed rate, given the anticipated short life of the high-rate 10-year-old loan portfolio that would be transferred to the refunding series. **Use** of this technique for maximizing the economic benefit of refundings accounts for the largest portion of our current balance of **\$504** million of variable rate bonds not swapped to a **fixed** rate or tied to variable rate loans.

Board Workshop

As discussed at the previous meeting, we **are** planning a Board workshop for the meeting of December **7**. The purpose of **the** workshop would **be** to provide Board members with an opportunity to learn more about variable rate **bonds** and interest rate swaps and how we are managing the attendant financial **risks**. A draft agenda and list of proposed speakers is shown below.

DRAFT WORKSHOP AGENDA

| <u>Topic</u> | <u>Proposed Speaker</u> |
|---|---|
| Introductions and Overview | Ken Carlson, CHFA |
| Interest Rate Swaps | Peter Shapiro, Swaps Financial Group |
| Interest Rate Risks/Capital Adequacy Criteria | Peter Block, Standard & Poor's |
| Interest Rate Risk Analysis | Carlos Montoya/David Notkin, Memll Lynch |

2009

a

**THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**



MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors

Date: September 27, 2000



From: Ken Carlson, Director of Financing
CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: ANNUAL INVESTMENT REPORT

At the March 1995 meeting, the Board adopted an Investment Policy and asked me to return periodically with an investment report. Attached for your information is the June 30, 2000 investment report for the 1999-2000 fiscal year. This, the sixth such annual investment report, shows that CHFA moneys are invested conservatively and in accordance with the Board-approved Investment Policy.

2011

**THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

INVESTMENT REPORT

June 30, 2000

SUMMARY

As of June 30, 2000, CHFA (including CaHLIF) had \$7.9 billion of assets, of which more than \$1.8 billion (23%) consisted of investments (not mortgages). For the fiscal year, CHFA/CaHLIF total revenues were \$585 million, of which \$104 million (18%) was investment interest income.

The following table shows what types of investments we hold for different categories of funds. Note that (as for the previous fiscal years) investment agreements are our most prevalent type of investment and are used exclusively for our bond funds. As before, our next most prevalent investment is the State's investment pool.

\$ AMOUNT INVESTED (MILLIONS)

| <u>INVESTMENT TYPE</u> | <u>BOND MONEYS</u> | <u>NON-BOND MONEYS</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Investment agreements | \$1,302.1 | -0- | \$1,302.1 |
| State investment pool | 187.9 | 145.4 | 333.3 |
| Securities (fair market value) | 77.8 | 7.6 | 85.4 |
| Money market and Bank deposits | 108.7 | 0.9 | 109.6 |
| Totals | <u>\$1,676.5</u> | <u>\$153.9</u> | <u>\$1,830.4</u> |

INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS

As stated in the Investment Policy, we normally invest bond moneys in investment agreements. Such agreements give us a high level of security of principal, a fixed rate of return to match the fixed cost of our debt, and complete liquidity so that we can use them like interest-bearing checking accounts and make deposits and withdrawals on short notice.

The following table shows the **types** of **bond** moneys that are deposited into investment agreements.

INVESTMENT AGREEMENT BALANCES
(Millions of \$)

| | Bond proceeds (<u>For Loan Purchases</u>) | <u>Note Proceeds</u> | <u>Reserve Funds</u> | Debt Service Funds | <u>Totals</u> |
|---------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Single Family | \$417.6 | \$288.5 | \$146.2 | \$370.3 | \$1,222.6 |
| Multifamily | <u>27.7</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>15.5</u> | <u>36.3</u> | <u>79.5</u> |
| Totals | \$445.3 | \$288.5 | \$161.7 | \$406.6 | \$1,302.1 |

The first two attachments show information about our **\$1.3** billion of deposits with financial institutions providing us with investment agreements. Note the high credit ratings of the institutions. If these credit ratings were to fall below a threshold level, we have the right to request collateralization or return of principal.

STATE INVESTMENT POOL

As shown by the table on the previous page, we have **\$333.3** million invested with the State Treasurer in the State investment pool, which, over time, has given us security, a fair return (**6.181%** as of June 30), complete liquidity, and administrative simplicity.

As stated in the Investment Policy, we invest most non-bond moneys in the pool. The amount, however, fluctuates greatly each month, depending on what amount of loans was being warehoused. On June 30 loans totalling **\$102.2** million were being warehoused, and this amount was returned to the investment pool early in July as the accumulated loans were transferred to bond issues.

We also invest a significant amount of bond moneys in the pool, including Housing Assistance Payments moneys from HUD for the Section 8 projects, servicing impound account moneys and mortgage revenue for some of the older transactions.

SECURITIES

The third attachment displays information about the \$85.4 million (fair market value) of securities we hold. This category includes \$50.3 million of Fannie Mae and Ginnie Mae securities backed by loans originated for our single family and multifamily programs. Note that the market value of the securities is lower than the amortized value because the loans backing the Fannie Mae and Ginnie Mae securities have below-market interest rates.

The commercial paper was purchased by our outside trustee (U.S. Bank Trust, National Association) for investment of certain escrow and program account moneys.

MONEY MARKET AND BANK DEPOSITS

Our outside trustee sweeps overnight deposits into a treasury securities money market fund which was paying 5.72% as of June 30. The amount invested in the money market includes some bond program moneys which we expect to use to purchase loans or pay costs of issuance. In addition, this category includes loan servicing revenues held in bank deposit accounts.

Attachments

SA0N48W2.dlc

2015

**CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
FUNDS INVESTED IN INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS
TOTALS BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTION RATINGS**

| <u>Moody's Ratings</u> | <u>Amount Invested 6/30/00</u> | <u>Percentage of Total Invested</u> |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Aaa | \$660,187,336 | 50.70% |
| Aa1 | 470,183 | 0.04% |
| Aa2 | 10,420,071 | 0.80% |
| Aa3 | 631,033,289 | 48.46% |
| Total | <u>\$1,302,110,880</u> | <u>100.00%</u> |

| <u>S & P Ratings</u> | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| AAA | \$915,636,045 | 70.32% |
| AA+ | 221,388,825 | 17.00% |
| AA- | 152,717,575 | 11.73% |
| A+ | 2,130,494 | 0.16% |
| not rated | 10,237,941 | 0.79% |
| Total | <u>\$1,302,110,880</u> | <u>100.00%</u> |

SUMMARY OF CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY FUNDS DEPOSITED IN
INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS - JUNE 30, 2000

| INVESTMENT AGREEMENT PROVIDER | MOODY'S RATING | STANDARD & POOR'S RATING | AMOUNT INVESTED |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| AEGON INSTITUTIONAL MARKETS | Aa3 | AAA | \$255,448,709 |
| CDC FUNDING | Aaa | AAA | 240,469,095 |
| PACIFIC LIFE CO. | Aa3 | AA+ | 214,646,910 |
| AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP MATCHED FUNDING CORP. (AIGMFC) | Aaa | AAA | 212,409,861 |
| SOCIETE GENERAL | Aa3 | AA- | 136,686,122 |
| BAYERISCHE LANDESBANK | Aaa | AAA | 93,390,030 |
| FGIC CAP.MARKETS SERVICES | Aaa | AAA | 56,002,893 |
| MBIA INV.MANAGEMENT CORP. | Aaa | AAA | 31,730,204 |
| BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY | Aaa | AAA | 26,185,253 |
| TMG FINANCIAL PRODUCTS | Aa3 | Not Rated | 10,237,941 |
| CITIBANK | Aa2 | AA- | 8,289,578 |
| CANADIAN IMPERIAL BANK | Aa3 | AA- | 7,012,745 |
| MONUMENTAL LIFE CO. | Aa3 | AA+ | 6,376,922 |
| BANKAMERICA CORP | Aa2 | A+ | 2,130,494 |
| CITICORP | Aa3 | AA- | 623,941 |
| WESTDEUTSCHE LB | Aa1 | AA+ | 364,993 |
| BANK OF AMERICA | Aa1 | AA- | 105,191 |
| TOTAL FUNDS INVESTED IN INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS | | | <u>\$1,302,110,880</u> |

SUMMARY OF CHFA INVESTMENTS IN SECURITIES AS OF JUNE 30, 2000

| TYPE OF INVESTMENT | PAR VALUE | BOOK VALUE | MARKET VALUE | WEIGHTED AVERAGE COUPON | WEIGHTED AVERAGE REMAINING MATURITY |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--|
| J.S. TREASURY BONDS | \$11,903,000 | \$10,679,312 | \$13,560,835 | 9.21% | 11.70 Years |
| J.S. TREASURY BILLS | 2,936,000 | 2,896,604 | 2,849,613 | 5.89% | 0.23 Years |
| REFCORP BONDS | 3,114,000 | 3,419,593 | 3,902,606 | 8.78% | 20.25 Years |
| GNMA SECURITIES | 26,766,268 | 26,766,268 | 24,129,328 | 6.21% | 30.71 Years |
| FNMA SECURITIES | 35,802,972 | 36,281,365 | 30,523,412 | 6.46% | 26.56 Years |
| FHLMC SECURITIES | 2,115,000 | 2,084,403 | 2,327,161 | 8.25% | 15.92 Years |
| COMMERCIAL PAPER | 8,218,000 | 8,218,000 | 8,112,585 | 5.00% | 0.20 Years |
| TOTALS | \$90,855,239 | \$90,345,544 | \$85,405,540 | | |

M E M O R A N D U M

CHFA Board of Directors

Date: September 29, 2000

From: Linn G. Warren
CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: Electric Utility Rates in San Diego County

The CHFA Board of Directors at the August 10, 2000 meeting, requested a status report on utility rates in the San Diego area. The issues and complexity of the entire utility problem are beyond the scope of this report. However, CHFA staff has reviewed the current utility situation in this area as it impacts the origination and asset management of Agency portfolio loans. A broad analysis of the electric utility situation including numerous immediate and long term recommendations, is contained in "California's Electricity Options and Challenges. Report to Governor Gray Davis", published by the Public Utilities Commission. Staff can supply copies of this report to Board members if desired.

Current Situation

Subsequent to the significant electric rate spike this summer, Governor Davis took a number of actions to implement temporary rate payment relief for residents and businesses in the San Diego area. Most notable of these was a direct appeal to President Clinton on August 22 to release emergency funds to aid low-income residents. On August 23, President Clinton released \$2.6 million in funds from the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) to help low-income Southern Californians pay their electricity bills. Two community based service organizations, the Metro Area Advisory Committee (MAC) and Campesinos Unidos Inc. will administer the funds. In order to temporarily restrain utility costs, Governor Davis signed AB 265 (Chapter 328, Statutes 2000) which establishes a cap on the wholesale cost of electricity that can be passed on to consumers at six and five-tenth cents (\$.065) per kilowatt/hour for residential and small commercial customers. It is estimated that this legislation will result in an average electricity bill for residential consumers of \$68 per month. The cap is scheduled to continue through December 31, 2002 and is retroactive to June 1, 2000. There are numerous other provisions in the legislation that relate to rates for medium and large

commercial consumers and tracking and accounting mechanisms directed at San Diego Gas & Electric.

CHFA Program issues

Evaluation. When evaluating the utility costs for a prospective project, CHFA staff analyzes the following primary issues:

- Is the project individually or master metered?
- What has been the operating history of the existing and comparable projects?
- Are the tenants assisted by project based Section 8, vouchers or other subsidies?
- What is the utility metering conversion plan for the project.
- What types of appliances predominate in the project (electric heat, air conditioning, gas kitchens, common area requirements, etc).

Existing Projects. In order to examine the utility cost issue, it would be helpful to revisit the payment of utility costs for low-income tenants. Rents charged by sponsors to low-income tenants are derived from the "gross" affordable rent calculated by county income level, bedroom size and the allowed number of per bedroom residents. For example, a one bedroom affordable unit may rent on a gross basis for \$500. On an individually metered property the tenant would utilize the "Personal Expense Benefit" (PBE or the utility allowance). The project sponsor can only charge the tenant a rent "net" of this utility allowance, since the tenant must pay the unit's utility cost. In our example, if the PBE is \$50, the net rent charged to the tenant is **\$450**. For a master metered project, the gross rent charged is \$500 and the sponsor pays the utility costs.

Clearly the PBE is a critical number. CHFA **uses** the **PBE** published annually by the local Housing Authority and this value is updated according to changes in utility costs.

CHFA loan underwriting examines these PBE's on all proposed loans. In the case of the preservation loans in San Diego, the historical utility costs for the projects matched the County's PBE allowances.

Utility Spikes. The utility spikes of **this** summer can impact projects in a number of ways:

- These spikes generally occur without warning (a common observation in the PUC report), hence project **owners** and tenants **cannot** prepare financially as most people would for an anticipated expense.
- **An** individual or family may have a utility cost in excess of their allowance, hence they **are** obligated to pay the difference. In the event a tenant cannot pay this cost, the utility company could terminate service causing a project vacancy. Some project owners have considered paying this utility cost differential in order to retain tenants, however this approach obviously creates numerous unbudgeted cost and management problems.
- For projects that are master metered, the project sponsor cannot pass the cost on to the rent restricted tenant, therefore the owners must pay these costs themselves.

Section 8 Projects. The situation is further complicated by properties subject to Section 8 contracts. Projects that are master metered can rely to a limited degree on increases to the contract associated with budget increases. This would occur annually through the Operating Cost Adjustment Factor (**OCAF**) process as administered by HUD. However this procedure cannot be relied upon to fully mitigate significant increases. In this situation the project sponsor would be obligated to pay the excess utility costs.

Individually metered Section 8 projects present a unique problem. These tenants are generally not the typical **tax** credit tenant, in that their portion of paid rent is very low (\$100 or \$200) or in some cases non-existent. Tenants in these situations cannot pay the excess utility cost and risk eviction or must seek some form of assistance. Sponsors with tenants in this situation may elect to pay the differential, even though there is usually a waiting list of Section 8 tenants that could pay the higher utility costs.

Program Procedures

To address the potential of utility increases impairing the sponsor's ability to maintain debt service on our loans. Programs staff will emphasize the following existing procedures and supplement project reserve requirements as deemed necessary.

1. Continue to require the Program' standard Operating Expense Reserve (OER) for the minimum of two years until stabilized occupancy is obtained. In the event of a significant spike in utility costs. project sponsors would be required to maintain the OER until operating costs stabilize.
2. Completely examine the utility operating costs in the project's geographic area. assessing the local utility's history of costs and delivery of utility products and requiring sponsors to address and mitigate the problems.
3. Continue to request that projects be individually metered for those utilities with a history of price volatility. Sponsors will be required to submit utility conversion plans reflecting the required capital costs and an estimated return on the conversion investment.
4. Continue to monitor state and national initiatives designed to mitigate the utility problem.
5. Establish a portion of the transition operating fund to be set aside for unanticipated utility increases.

Programs staff will continue to monitor and evaluate the utility situation in all markets throughout the state. Staff will also consult with projects sponsors and management companies to follow **techniques** they may adopt in addressing this situation.

2021

**THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**