Thursday, January 22, 2004

The Westin
San Francisco Airport
Millbrae, California
(650) 692-3500

9:30 a.m.

1. Roll Call.

2. Approval of the minutes of the September 18, 2003 Board of Directors meeting.

3. Chairman/Executive Director comments.

4. Discussion, recommendation and possible action relative to final loan commitment for the following project: (Linn Warren)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>LOCALITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-053-C/N</td>
<td>Murphy Ranch II</td>
<td>Morgan Hill/</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resolution 04-01</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-049-L/N</td>
<td>Pacific Grove Senior</td>
<td>Pacific Grove/</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resolution 04-02</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion, recommendation and possible action relative to the adoption of a resolution authorizing the Agency’s single family bond indentures, the issuance of single family bonds, short- and long-term credit facilities for homeownership purposes, and related financial agreements and contracts of services. (Ken Carlson)

**Resolution 04-03**

6. Discussion, recommendation and possible action relative to the adoption of a resolution authorizing the Agency’s multifamily bond indentures, the issuance of multifamily bonds, short- and long-term credit facilities for multifamily purposes, and related financial agreements and contracts of services. (Ken Carlson)

**Resolution 04-04**
7. Discussion, recommendation and possible action relative to the adoption of a resolution authorizing applications to the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee for private activity bond volume cap allocation for the Agency's homeownership and multifamily programs. (Ken Carlson)

**Resolution 04-05**


   a) Business Plan Update Presentation. (Ken Carlson; Jerry Smart/Ken Williams; Nancy Abreu; Linn Warren; Margaret Alvarez; Jackie Riley)

   b) Board Member Comments

9. Discussion, recommendation and possible action relative to the approval of a resolution authorizing certain contracting by the Agency. (Tom Hughes)

**Resolution 04-06**

10. Discussion of other Board matters/Reports.

11. Public testimony: Discussion only of other matters to be brought to the Board's attention.

**NOTES**

**HOTEL PARKING:** Parking is available as follows: 1) overnight self-parking for hotel guests is $14.00 per night; and 2) rates for guests not staying at the hotel is $1.00 per hour.

**FUTURE MEETING DATE:** Next CalHFA Board of Directors Meeting will be March 11, 2004, at the Hyatt Regency, Sacramento, California.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

--o0o--

ORIGINAL

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PUBLIC MEETING

--o0o--

Hilton Burbank Airport & Convention Center
2500 Hollywood Way
Burbank, California

Thursday, September 18, 2003
9:37 a.m. to 12:32 p.m.

--o0o--

Reported By: YVONNE K. FENNER, CSR License #10909, RPR

Minutes Approved by the Board of Directors at its meeting held:

______________________________

Attest: ________________________

VINE, McKINNON & HALL (916) 371-3376
APPEARANCES

Directors Present:

CLARK E. WALLACE, Chairperson

EDWARD W. BAYUK

CATHY SANDOVAL
for Maria Contreras-Sweet

EDWARD M. CZUKER

MATTHEW O. FRANKLIN

THERESA A. PARKER

KATRINA JOHANTGEN
for Phil Angelides

JACK SHINE

ESTEBAN ALMANZA
for Tal Finney

--o0o--

CalHFA Staff Present:

THOMAS C. HUGHES
General Counsel

JOJO OJIMA

--o0o--
APPEARANCES
continued

For the Staff of the Agency:

EDWIN GIPSON
TINA ILVONEN
ROGER KOLLIAS
JIM LISKA
DEBRA STARBUCK
LINN WARREN
LAURA WHITTALL-SCHERFEE

--o0o--

Additional Speakers:

J. TIMOTHY BAKER, Project Manager
BRIDGE Housing

BRAD WIBLIN, Director
BRIDGE Housing

--o0o--
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Roll Call</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of the minutes of July 10, 2003</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chairman/Executive Director Comments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discussion, recommendation and possible action relative to final loan commitments for the following projects:</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-047-S Northwood Family Apartments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine/Orange, Resolution 03-35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-038-LN Villa Amador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood/Contra Costa, Resolution 03-36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-025-L/S Villa Cesar Chavez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard/Ventura, Resolution 03-37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-045-L/S Villa Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard/Ventura, Resolution 03-38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-048-N Moulton Plaza Apartments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale/Santa Clara, Resolution 03-39</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-026-N Oak Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland/Alameda, Resolution 03-41</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-037-N Ocean View Garden Apartments</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley/Alameda, Resolution 03-42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-023-C/S Coyote Run Apartments</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs/Riverside, Resolution 03-43</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-036-C/N Bayport Apartments</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda/Alameda, Resolution 03-44</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-034-C/S Copper Creek Apartments</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos/San Diego, Resolution 03-45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-021-N/S Mission Creek</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco/San Francisco, Resolution 03-46</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion of the other Board matters and reports</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public testimony</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter's Certificate</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---00o---
BE IT REMEMBERED that on Thursday, the 18th day of September, 2003, commencing at the hour of 9:37 a.m., thereof, at the Hilton Burbank Airport & Convention Center, 2500 Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, before me, Yvonne K. Fenner, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in the State of California, the following proceedings were held:

--o00--

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. I would like to call the September 18th, 2003, Board of Directors of CalHFA meeting to order.

Item 1: Roll Call

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And having done that, let's go to Item 1 and have the Secretary call the roll, please.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Johantgen for Mr. Angelides.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Present.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Here.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval for Ms. Contreras-Sweet.

MS. SANDOVAL: Here.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Here.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Here.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Hawkins.

(No audible response was heard.)

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Here.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Here.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Almanza for Mr. Finney.

MR. ALMANZA: Here.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Peace.

(No audible response was heard.)

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Parker.

MS. PARKER: Here.

MS. OJIMA: We have a quorum.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Good. We have a quorum.

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes of the July 10, 2003 Board of Directors Meeting

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Let's move on to Item 2, approval of the minutes of the July 10th, 2003 Board meeting. Are there any -- you've been submitted these in advance. Are there any corrections, additions, deletions?

MS. PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I have two corrections that I'd make. Very thorough Board minutes.
but I think there's just two typos, at least that I found. On page 15 in the Board book, line 16, the line, I believe that instead of capital E-I-R, I think it's "our," "that we had a discussion at our last board meeting." So o-u-r instead of E-I-R.

And then again on page 48, line 19, I think Mr. Franklin -- that should be HCD, not HCDR loan.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: What line?

MS. PARKER: 19 on page 48.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: HCD instead of HCDR.

Do you buy that, Matt?

MR. FRANKLIN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: You would never make a statement like that.

MR. FRANKLIN: That's right. HCD is firmly embedded in my brain.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: It's nothing like HCDR.

MR. FRANKLIN: Nothing like HCDR.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any other corrections?

Yes, Jack.

MR. SHINE: On page 39, line 18. I don't think --

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Hold on. Line 18; right?

MR. SHINE: Right. I don't think it's an insubordinate loan.
(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: 39.

MS. PARKER: 39 at the top, Jack, or --

MR. FRANKLIN: That's what Linn calls the MHP loans.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHINE: On page 39, line No. 18, six words in.

MR. HUGHES: 41 on ours.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Oh, 39 in the right hand, not the upper hand.

MR. SHINE: I'm sorry. Page 41 in the upper.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. And it's line 18 with an insubordinate loan. That means no subordination, doesn't it?

MS. PARKER: That is a really good catch.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: We've got some insubordination, but not attached to a loan.

Anything else?

Can I have a motion for approval as amended?

MR. SHINE: Moved.


Is there a second?

MR. FRANKLIN: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Matt.
We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion to approve the minutes as amended?

Hearing and seeing none, Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: The minutes have been approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: The minutes have been approved as amended.

Item 3: Chairman/Executive Director Comments

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Item 3, Chairman and Executive Director comments.
My main comment is welcome back, Terri. She went through, as most of you know, a lot of trauma in the waning days of her term expiration. And a lot of us rallied and beseeched the Governor and the Appointments Office at a very difficult time and time running out. August 12th, she was either reappointed or gone. And an awful lot of you and others came to Terri's, but let's say the Agency's rescue, and Terri was reappointed at the eleventh hour and is approaching things, I can already tell you, with new vigor.

And we're just thrilled to have you back.

MS. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Governor reappointed me and the Senate also confirmed me, so my term is now in place for the next five years. My colleague, Mr. Franklin, was also confirmed by the Senate, so we are joining our other colleagues at a state level to continue a really great housing team.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And there's a couple more of us, myself included, who is -- and Carrie Hawkins, who isn't with us today, chairman and vice chairman, whose directorships are upcoming and we'll apparently -- according to the latest legal opinion, speaking to Tom, we're going to be facing the same do or die fairly soon. So you may have some new faces around here soon and you
may not, but all that's plainly in the context of when
is this election going to be held. October 7th or in
March? Anybody want to offer -- no, let's not go there.
In any case, Terri, you had a couple -- that's
all I have. You have a couple other items?

MS. PARKER: I do, Mr. Chairman, just very
quickly.

Since we discussed this at our last couple of
Board meetings, we had an administrative dispute with
HUD. I'd just like to report we're in the final stages.
We believe we have an anticipated settlement agreement
with them, roughly in the area of about $330,000. So
we've essentially come to an agreement with HUD, and
we're putting this issue behind us. And unless there is
any further problem with it, I do not intend to report
further again on it.

The other thing I wanted to also mention and do
a brief introduction, we have one of our partners at the
local level we refer to as SCHFA.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Is it really CHFA, not
S-CalHFA?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Welcome back, Terri.

MS. PARKER: They are a JPA that is both the
counties of Orange and Los Angeles. They do also run a
mortgage first-home buyer loan program, and they're
going to be joining with CalHFA to use some of their
resources for us to partner, about a hundred million
dollars, and make a joint loan program for the City and
County of L.A. and Orange County where we're going to
use preferential rates and our down payment systems and
their first mortgage loans to be able to offer enhanced
programs to the citizens in their particular community.

So we're very excited about it. The Board has
yet to approve it, but we just wanted to let you know
that we are working on that and again to recognize
Mr. Kawczynski and his work and our partnership.

I also just wanted to just briefly bring to your
attention the legislative report. We had a very
successful year with legislative actions for the Agency.
Two pieces of important legislation were passed. One of
them is AB 304, and this piece of legislation had a
number of changes to allow the Agency's administration
of our portion of the $2.1 billion housing funds to
essentially work better in the market today.

But most importantly, I want to point out that
it's given us some authority in our mortgage insurance
program for us to work with GSEs so that our income
levels can match what theirs are. And that will allow
us to go forward and work and create partnerships with
GSEs for mortgage insurance products, particularly in the emerging market area.

The other piece of legislation is SB 353, which is something that the Agency sponsored. It's been a bone of contention for us to be able to work out loans with localities where we have a subordinate relationship. And we've been able to be successful and pass that legislation. And I think that will again add to our ability to work through financing options with localities producing more affordable rental housing.

So it was a very successful legislative session, an outstanding job as usual, and we're looking forward again to Fall with staff going in continuing to work on our business plan and implementing legislation and working on the administration of the housing law.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: I neglected to introduce the members that are sitting in, namely Esteban Almanza.

MR. ALMANZA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Did I get that right?

MR. ALMANZA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: OPR. Welcome. We're happy to have you.

MR. ALMANZA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And we hope you can make a
contribution, even though this is your first time.

And Katrina Johantgen. Did I get it pretty close?

MS. JOHANTGEN: Very close.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Representing the Treasurer's Office. We're happy to have you here.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: You've already commuted -- while you were commuting here, the traffic was so slow you were able to read the minutes. Anything else? Okay.

Format. We have, what, Linn, ten projects, eleven?

MR. WARREN: Eleven, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Eleven projects. And that's basically what's on our agenda. I'd be optimistic if I would say perhaps we're shooting for 12:00 or 12:30ish, and so hopefully we're going to be able to limit the debate on them. Staff, I know, is prepared to have a slightly briefer summary of the projects, and I hope we can focus as a Board on posing questions and get on with it. The target is about 12 to 15 minutes per project.

MR. WARREN: I think we can do that,

Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: We can get out of here at a reasonable hour. And if we don't, then I'm leaving anyway and you won't have a quorum, because I've got a plane to catch. Is that fair? You're used to that.

MR. SHINE: It's clear.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Well, for L.A., that's a good thing, isn't it?

MR. SHINE: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay, Jack.

Item 4: Discussion, Recommendation and Possible Action Relative to Final Loan Commitments for the Following Projects

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Let's then -- I'm going to pull one out of order because it turns out that BRIDGE Housing has two projects, one at the beginning of the agenda and one at the end. And it's kind of foolish to have them wait around forever, so I'm going to take the one that is designated as Copper Creek, 03-034, which is a BRIDGE project in San Marcos, and move it up first. And then the first one on the agenda, which will be second, Northwood, is also a BRIDGE, so I think it's reasonable, bear with me, to let them get on and get out, rather than sitting around for two and a half hours with it split.
So in that order, Linn, why don't you give us Copper Creek.

Resolution 03-45 (Copper Creek Apartments)

MR. WARREN: That would be fine, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

MR. CZUKER: Excuse me, what page?

MR. WARREN: The Copper Creek materials are on page 271 of your materials.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Sorry, Ed. 271.

MR. WARREN: Okay. The first project for the Board's consideration this morning is the Copper Creek Apartments. This is a 156-unit family project, inclusionary zoning in matched development in San Marcos in San Diego.

The loan requests are for a first construction loan in the amount of $19,210,000. This would be a variable-rate loan for 24 months and would be blending the sources of funds. Approximately $14 million would be tax exempt, and approximately $5 million would be taxable. This is a strategy we're using for most of our construction lending now to blend in taxable funds that are part of the activity bond.

The permanent loan would be in the amount of $4,410,000 at 5.5-percent interest rate for the year, fully amortized. And the bridge loan in the amount of
$6,955,000 for three years at 4 percent.

Rates have gone up somewhat. Our primary
30-year rate is now 5.5. The rates, I'm sure most of
you know, moved up the last couple of months and so we
had to take ours up 25 basis points.

The second mortgage, the bridge loan, is out
there for the purposes of leveraging debt to increase it
to 4-percent credit.

So with that, I'll ask Laura to go through some
of the project slides for Copper Creek.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: This first slide shows
the entire development of San Elijo Hills Master
Community. It's a 1920-acre master community with ten
residential subdivisions. Five of those subdivisions
have already been sold out.

To the west of the picture, kind of off the
screen a little bit, is Carlsbad. To the northwest is
the City of Vista.

This is a close-up shot of San Elijo Hills
Master Community. The project is outlined in white.
Across the street is one of the sold-out residential
communities. Adjacent to the residential community is
the site for a brand-new elementary school and middle
school.

Directly adjacent to our project is a green
belt, and right next to that is where the resident --
I'm sorry, where the retail is going to go in,
approximately 40,000 square feet of retail space. That
will include a grocery store, pharmacy, small retail
shops, and restaurants.

The whole concept behind this community is to
have a town center and a town feel. And that is what
this little square area is. There are a bunch of
walking paths, and it's a central area where Elfin and
San Elijo Road meet. To the north will be a visitor's
center with a library, post office, and a visitor
information center that will provide information on all
of the various subdivisions within the community.

And then directly to the south of that is the
19-acre park with the baseball diamond, which you can
see clearly right here. It's already been constructed.

This is a front elevation of the community
building. This is a two-phase project. We are
financing or we are asking for approval to finance the
first phase. The second phase is going to be a
9-percent tax credit deal, 48 units, and they are
asking -- they are coming to us for the financing of
that as well. The loan request is under 4 million, so
that would be a request we could consider internally.

However, the community building will be part of
Phase II, and it will include two offices, a learning center, kitchen, two bathrooms, a maintenance room, and a large rec room.

These are the front elevations for what the rest of the project will look like. It will consist of 11 residential buildings with stucco siding and tile roofs.

This is your rent chart. The market and affordable apartment vacancy level in the San Diego County area is very, very small. Generally, vacancy rates are at 2 percent, and it's really just the time it takes to turn over the unit.

There are seven projects within this area -- this area being Vista, Carlsbad, and San Marcos -- that are under construction with a total of 758 units. Both the market study and the appraiser are very comfortable that even if all those units came on the market today, they would be fully occupied within 30 days. There is huge demand in the San Diego area for affordable housing. This project is expected to lease up within 30 days of completion.

The rents are as follows: On the -- there are 32 one-bedroom units, and the rents are between 30 and 63 percent of market. There are 62 two-bedroom units with rents of 25 to 58 percent of market. And there are
62 three-bedroom units with rents of between 26 percent and 61 percent of market.

The agency would be restricting 20 percent of the units to 50 percent or less of market. The other junior lienholders would be restricting 100 percent of the units. The City of San Marcos is restricting units at a variety of levels, but nothing above 55 percent. MHP and TCAC would be restricting 100 percent of the units at levels not to exceed 60 percent.

And there are no adverse environmental conditions that have been found on this site.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Laura.

The City of San Marcos Redevelopment Agency is making a sizable contribution in approximately $3.5 million and a tax credit equity of $11.8 million, as well as the master development land, that land contribution of $5.6 million.

The developer is BRIDGE Housing. They will also manage the property upon completion.

With that, we'd like to recommend approval.

We'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any questions? Really, the affordability for that many units is attractive.

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: I think this is a very attractive
project and very attractive use of CalHFA resources, both on the construction loan side and the permanent loan side, especially securing the pay down of the construction loan with the tax credits.

My question relates to -- and specifically all the public support from other agencies.

My question relates specifically to the land contribution. Was that done as a donation to the partnership and is the landowner, therefore, taking a tax deduction for that, or is it somehow his capital account is given partnership? A contribution can be dealt with many different ways.

MR. WARREN: I do not believe he is part of the partnership. His acquisition cost of the land was approximately $2.6 million. The $8-million figure that you see under "Uses" is the valuation of the land today, so the net contribution is the $5.8 number. As far as his tax ramifications, I don't know, but he is not part of the partnership.

MR. CZUKER: He will not be part of the partnership going forward?

MR. WARREN: That's my understanding.

MR. CZUKER: We're talking about the $5.6-million land contribution under "Sources." if you look at page 280.
MR. SHINE: Oh, I see how that ties. Okay.

MR. CZUKER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any further questions?

Developer or --

MR. CZUKER: I had one other question. Have they identified the tax credit investor at this point?

MR. WARREN: I don't believe so.

MR. BAKER: Union Bank is the --

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Let me ask you to identify yourself, then if you could help us with the tax question.

/ / /

MR. BAKER: My name Tim Baker. I'm project manager with BRIDGE Housing on this project. We signed an LOI with Union Bank in view of the tax credits.

MR. CZUKER: To buy the tax credits?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

MR. CZUKER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Anything else? Anyone from the audience? The Board?

Hearing, seeing none, the Chair will entertain a motion.

MR. CZUKER: I'll move approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Czuker moves.

MR. FRANKLIN: I'll second.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Franklin seconds.

On the motion, any discussion?

Hearing, seeing none, the Secretary will please call the roll.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: With my usual admonition that I have been a long-time member of the BRIDGE board, but legal counsel, since I have no direct benefit, financial or otherwise, has advised that it's probably best to disclose that I have been a member, but I am able to vote. And I vote aye.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Resolution 03-45 has been approved.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-45 is hereby approved.

Let's go on to the back. Give me a page number if you can, somebody.

MR. WARREN: Page No. 93 in the book.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: 93 for the -- let's finish BRIDGE with Northwood Apartments.

Resolution 03-35 (Northwood Apartments)

MR. WARREN: Northwood Apartments is a 96-unit family project in Irvine. The request today is for a permanent loan only in the amount of $7 million, 5.5-percent interest rate, 35-year term, fully amortized, and a second bridge loan in the amount of $1 million for one year at 4 percent.

There is a fair amount of locality subordinate financing as well. We have Orange County providing a residual receipts loan in the amount of $1.9 million at 5.5 years, 3 percent. And the City of Irvine will also contribute $600,000 in HOME funds for 55 years.

This is a ground lease property of -- the Agency's mortgage will be the leasehold mortgage. The lessor is The Irvine Company. There will be a hard lease payment of $10,000 per year with a set escalator of 2 percent. At the end of the 55-year term or at the end of the lease term, which is 58 years, the project
will revert back to the lessor.

So with that, I'll ask Ed Gipson to run through

the project.

MR. GIPSON: This is Northwood Apartments in the

City of Irvine, Orange County. Running this way is

Trabuco Road where the property will have access. This

is Jeffery Boulevard.

A closer shot of the property. Adjacent to the

property is a church. And the surrounding uses are

condominiums, apartments. Across the street are

existing single-family residences. And this site here

on the far right bottom corner is a new single-family

development that's under construction.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And those are all

market-rate units you just referred to?

MR. GIPSON: All of them. All of them.

The project site is 4.54 acres. There will be

18 one-bedrooms, 49 two-bedrooms, and 29 three-bedroom

units.

This is a shot of the elevations. There will be

six three-story buildings, 201 parking spaces, two

laundry rooms, a pool. They will be individually

metered. There will be a central boiler for each

building.

Here's the site plan with the adjacent land
uses. You can see this large sign here. It says, "Project Site." That's future residential that's under construction now, the existing project. Office retail below here. This spot right here is a proposed cultural center that will be going in. They're actually moving dirt now and actually surveying for that to go in.

The PMA, the primary market area, is the city of Irvine in Orange County, which is only second in size to L.A. County in population. The existing rents off the rent chart show the rents substantially below market. The one-bedrooms are between 31 percent to 63 percent below market. The two-bedrooms are from 32 percent to 63 percent of market. And the three-bedrooms are 27 to 52 percent of market.

The housing in Irvine, Orange County, is averaging about $388,000. For the county it's $335,000. That housing does include condominiums. This is a very high-cost area.

The project also has applied for state tax credits. If it receives those tax credits, the rents will actually be improved. They'll increase the number of affordability in each of those units, and our first loan will go down by at least $350,000 per house and more, in accordance with that. And Orange County is the one asking the project to apply for state credits. In
addition, their loan will go down some percentage as
well.

The property has come back with its Phase I, and
there are no environmental concerns that warrant further
action.

MR. WARREN: As with the last project, BRIDGE of
Southern California will be the developer and will also
property manage.

So with that, we'd be happy to recommend approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Questions?

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Again, it's nice to see all the
local participation so that CalHFA's loan is under
50 percent of cost.

I'm just curious, when you review the uses of
funds, do you check, for example, some of the ancillary
fees of engineering and architecture? For example,
architecture, $500,000 for a 96-unit project is a little
bit high, $5,200 a unit. So I'm just raising that as
something that staff should look at by way of consultant
fees, if they seem to be excessive, to please review
that.

But in general, I support the project and thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: What's the answer to that.
Linn? Do you look down to the subcontractors?

MR. WARREN: If we are doing the construction loan, we do cost estimations, takeoffs, because we are concerned about that because our risk is in the construction period. We don't look at it as much as the permanent lender, but clearly if there's a situation where a construction budget is forcing us to lend more than we probably think we should, then we ask them to go back to it and we look at that. But we do spend more of our time looking at those costs when we are on a construction loan.


MR. SHINE: No. 1, could you tell me how many square feet we're building in that project? The land size is -- it's a typo. The land size and the building size are exactly the same -- unless that's just the way it is and it's a coincidence.

MR. GIPSON: No, it's a typo. You're right.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: That's not what the site plan showed.

MR. GIPSON: Yeah. It's about -- I think if you look at it, it's hard to know which one is which. I believe it's the $197,000 is --

MR. SHINE: If you have 96 units and they're a thousand feet apiece, the most it would be would be
1 100,000 feet or something.
2 MR. GIPSON: Yeah. It's got to be the land
3 size. It's a tight project. It's based --
4 MR. SHINE: No big deal. It's just that when I
5 tried to do my math, I had a tough time. It looked very
6 cheap.
7 One other question. One other comment. I would
8 like to tag on to that discussion of the architect. I'd
9 like to know the role of the architect that generates
10 the fees that runs through all these projects. Because
11 for an architect alone, I want to be the architect.
12 MR. WARREN: Well, I think as the Board has
13 requested us in the past and we can certainly bring that
14 back to the Board, what you're seeing here is a roll-up
15 of a lot of categories. It may not just generally be
16 architect. It could be engineering. I think that rolls
17 up in that area as well. But let us come back to the
18 next Board. We'll give you a breakout of what's in
19 that. My suspicion, without having it readily in front
20 of me, it's more than just the architectural costs.
21 MR. GIPSON: There are some engineering costs in
22 that line item. Absolutely.
23 CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Yeah, because you're
24 showing engineering as zero.
25 MR. GIPSON: Yeah. They rolled them up. They
grouped them together. I don't have the exact --

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: We've run into this before
and actually expanded our uses list, as I recall, a
couple of years ago, so, yeah, we might take a fresh
look at that.

MR. WARREN: That would be fine.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: BRIDGE gang, it's in line?

MR. WIBLIN: Hi, I'm Brad Wiblin, BRIDGE
Housing. Just briefly, the $500,000 does include
architecture, engineering, civil, landscape, acoustic,
both design construction period administration and
inspections. So that is a roll-up of all of our costs.
If memory serves, the architecture-only component is
about $235,000, and that does include sort of CHFA --
I'm sorry, CalHFA--required bimonthly inspections during
construction.

So these costs tend to be -- to answer your
question. Chairman Wallace -- pretty much in line with
our costs. And we do negotiate less fees on smaller
projects like this one.

MR. SHINE: The architects alone is a little
over $200,000 a year; is that what you're saying?

MR. WIBLIN: Yeah. Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Yes.

MS. JOHANTGEN: You stated that these risk
assumptions did not include tax credit; however, the
uses, there's a line with tax credits. Is that assuming
4 percent rather than 9?

MR. GIPSON: They include the 4-percent tax
credit, but not the -- the going acquisition state tax
credits in addition to the 4-percent allocation.

MR. WARREN: I think this underwriting does not
reflect what could be lower rents if the state tax
credits are obtained. If they do, then we'd have to
resize the loan downward, so I think these represent the
higher rents with the absent state tax credits.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. Any further
questions of the Board or from the audience?

Hearing, seeing none --

MR. CZUKER: Move approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Czuker moves. And Cathy
seconds.

MS. SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any questions on the
motion? Discussion on the motion?

Hearing, seeing none, Secretary, would you
please call the roll.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.
MR. BAYUK: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.
MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.
MR. CZUKER: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.
MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.
MR. SHINE: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: With my usual caveat in view of the fact it's a BRIDGE project, aye.
MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Resolution 03-35 has been approved.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-35 is hereby approved.
Okay. Moving on in good pace, Villa Amador.
Resolution 03-36 (Villa Amador)
MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Chair. Laura will have the next few projects, so take it away.
MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: One of the things you might have noticed when you were reading the Board package for Villa Amador is that you were missing page 2, and that was distributed this morning to you.
It's -- there are two page 2s that weren't included.
The one that will be for Villa Amador begins with "Other Financing" and has a bottom date of August 25th.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Hang on just a second.

It's page --

MR. SHINE: There's two pages 2s?

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: You have two page 2s because page 2 was missed on two projects. The one you're looking for has a bottom date of August 25th and starts with "Other Financing," and that's for Villa Amador.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: So you're actually -- in our books it's going to be --

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The first page.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: -- You're going to have page 1, and on the back of it is page 3.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And we need to insert page 2.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: So you might have thought there was no locality financing or other financing, but there is.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. Please go ahead.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: Villa Amador is a 96-unit new construction project for families located in
Brentwood, which is in Contra Costa County, California. The borrower is requesting a loan-to-lender loan through B of A in the amount of $13 million at 3 percent for two years. It's a tax-exempt loan-to-lender loan. CalHFA would then do the permanent lending first mortgage in the amount of $5,280,000.

Contra Costa County will provide the project with a $1 million residual receipt loan for 40 years at 3 percent. They will also have a Housing and Community Development loan in the amount of $5,509,905 MHP for 55 years at 3 percent, and a Joe Serna Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant in the amount of $2 million for 40 years at 3 percent.

The project has also received an AHP grant via B of A for $507,000 -- $507,600 for 30 years at 0 percent.

Ed, why don't you go ahead.

MR. GIPSON: Villa Amador in the City of Brentwood is located along Sand Creek Road and Highland Way. This is Sand Creek Road right here. In the background is the State Highway 4 bypass.

The property's surrounding land uses include agricultural here to the west. There's a new single-family residential, low income rents, going in here under development. This will be the site of a
future park for this site for which there will be a
gated access from the property. The property will be
fully gated.

It is an eight-acre parcel. Across the street
is existing single-family homes. There is a -- this is
a vacant lot here. There is a park and a school back
here in this green belt area by the park. And at the
corner here is a shopping center which includes a
Raley's and many other stores, Starbucks, also
surrounding the area.

This shot of the property shows existing land
uses. You can see the park area will be the site here
and the new subdivision going in.

This is a rendering of what the future project
will look like. It will consist of 14 two-story
buildings with 205 parking spaces. It will be fully
gated. There will be an over 3,000-square-foot
community center. Inside that community center will be
a day care center, which will be open to the residents
of the project, as well as the nearby local area
residents. It will most likely be operated by Head
Start or a similar program like that. They're very
excited to get that in the neighborhood.

Here's a site plan of the project, a little
difficult to read, but each project will be -- each unit
will have central heat and air conditioning. There will be laundry rooms in the three- and four-bedrooms units. There's one-, two-, three-, and four-bedroom units. The three- and four-bedroom units will have washer and dryer hookups. There will also be multiple laundry rooms located throughout the project as well.

The market rents are substantially below market. The one-bedrooms are between 37 percent below market or of market. The one-bedrooms are 75. The two-bedrooms are as low as 39 percent of the market to 78. The three-bedrooms, 39 percent of the market and 79 percent of market, respectively. And the four-bedrooms are 32 percent and 65 percent of market.

As of February 2003, there exists with the Contra Costa Housing Authority a large Section 8 waiting list, and a waiting list for public housing also exists in the area. The Section 8 list now has 3,577 households on its waiting list, and the public housing has over 2,000 people waiting for one-bedrooms, 2,000 households, excuse me, waiting for two-bedrooms -- 1,400 waiting for two-bedrooms, 561 waiting for three-bedrooms, and at least almost a hundred waiting for four-bedroom units in the area.

The Phase I has come back with no further environmental conditions that warrant further
MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The sponsor for this project is Mercy Housing. Mercy has developed and rehabilitated over 77 projects in California with over 4,000 units during the past 34 years. They're well known to the Agency. We currently have financed five projects with a total of 364 units.

With that, I'll be glad to answer any questions you have.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Questions?

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Again, I'm very supportive of the project, especially with all of the third-party subsidies that support the project and the CalHFA first mortgage of that permanent loan funding at 22, 23 percent.

I do have a couple of questions that relate to the format. The package itself would be more interesting if we could have sources and uses during construction as part of the package when providing the Loan to Lender. Our $13-million Loan to Lender for construction period is what percentage of the total budget and what other subsidiaries are going to be available during the construction period, since some of those proceeds are going to be needed to pay down the
Loan to Lender from $13 million to our permanent loan of $5.2 million. So it would be helpful to have that spreadsheet or some information on that.

And one additional comment which relates to the high-cost areas, you have a very high impact fee here at 14 percent or $3.3 million on a $23 million budget. That's a very high impact fee allocation that obviously the project is being forced to absorb for affordable housing. Sometimes for affordable housing you can get some of those impact fees waived. I don't know if any attempt has been made to -- either by the sponsor or the Agency to try to get concessions from impact fees to lower the burden on the project.

MR. GIPSON: Yes, there has been. You're right, those impact fees are very, very high. And we have the estimate from the City, which runs numerous pages, on how they assess those fees. But the answer to your question is, yes, they're high and, yes, there were attempts to lower them.

MR. WARREN: Just as a -- by way of background, we do visit these fees, and occasionally the Board will ask for details to give more roll-up or more detail for this. As a general rule, we don't lobby when we have the sponsors, but we do ask them to give us a breakdown justifying the costs. But all sponsors do try to deal
with that.

MR. CZUKER: And are the construction sources available?

MR. WARREN: Not for this presentation, but we can bring that in future loan-to-lender presentations, look at it and have that in the package.

MR. CZUKER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Thanks, Ed.

Any other comments from the Board? Questions from the audience?

Hearing, seeing none, the Chair will entertain a motion for its approval.

MR. CZUKER: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Czuker.

And a second?

MR. SHINE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Shine. Thank you.

Any questions, discussion on the motion? Hearing, seeing none. Secretary, please call roll.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you.

Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-36 has been approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-36 is hereby approved.

Okay. Then let's move on to Villa Cesar Chavez in Oxnard. Linn.

Resolution 03-37 (Villa Cesar Chavez)

MS. WHITALL-SCHERFEE: I've asked Debra Starbuck to do most of the slides for the next two projects, which are Villa Cesar Chavez and Villa Victoria. Both -- yes, we have three Villas. Lots of Villas today.

Villa Cesar Chavez and Villa Victoria are both 514 projects. This a new project type for us. What it is is it's a program through the USDA Department of Rural Development. It provides subsidy -- subsidized
financing for the development of farmworker housing and it's for new construction of farmworker housing. Villa Cesar Chavez is a 52-unit townhome development that's going to be developed in the City of Oxnard. They are requesting Loan to Lender financing through Wells Fargo. The loan amount will be $6,980,000 at 3 percent for two years, and that is tax exempt. Then they are requesting permanent financing in the amount of $2,540,000 at 5-and-a-half-percent interest for 30 years, also tax exempt. They are requesting a second mortgage in the amount of $645,000 at 5 and a half percent for ten years, and this is based on a subsidy that would be provided by RD, the USDA Department of Rural Development. They are providing a rental subsidy with Section 521 rental assistance for 39 units for five years with five-year renewals, and they are subsidizing up to 60 percent of median income. Locality financing includes the City of Oxnard, who is providing a 33-year $860,000 residual receipt loan. They are also going to obtain -- or they have obtained financing from the Department of Housing and Community Development, a $2,736,128 loan under the Joe Serna Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant and Loan Program for 40 years at 3-percent interest. They have a USDA RD
$1,100,000 Section 514 Farm Labor Housing loan at 1 percent for 33 years, and a Rural Community Assistance Corporation loan in the amount of $750,000 at 1 percent for 33 years.

Now we'll go to the slides.

MS. STARBUCK: Good morning. The aerial photo you see here represents the view of the Villa Cesar Chavez site in south Oxnard. You're looking in the westerly direction here. To the left you see Port Hueneme, and Oxnard is to the right or north of the site.

The close-up of the site is the view looking in an east direction. You can see the 3.6-acre site. Along the north, the north border, you see single-family homes and a mobile home park. To the west of the site you can see new homes that are starting in the $400,000 price range, where you'll also see an access to the site when it's completed.

Along the eastern edge of the site running the length here is a railroad track that is used approximately twice a day, and a flood channel runs alongside that. Commercial development is further east and southeast and south of the project. The site is actually about a mile inland from the ocean.

Here's an illustration, artist's rendering of...
townhome units. There will be about 49 -- or there will
be 49 townhome units, and the remainder will be
single-story, one- and two-bedroom units. Actually, I'm
sorry, there are no one-bedrooms. They are two-bedroom
units. They will all have attached garage units with
washers and dryers and individual hot water heaters and
water meters.

Here's the site plan. The main access to the
site will be off of Hueneme Road. There will also be
six single-family homes developed separately from this
multifamily project that will be paid for with separate
sources of funds later down the road. The site will
access again from the single-family development as an
alternate route.

There will be a community center near the access
with a kitchen and bathrooms and a community room. Next
to that will be a tot lot. And the remainder of the
units are accessible past the single-family units, which
will sign a joint use and access easement and pay for
maintenance fees of the area.

Hueneme Road, which is the main access, is being
widened as part of the planned development. The project
had to bear the costs for the engineering of this
road-widening project; however, the actual costs for the
road will be borne by the City of Oxnard.
The project has been designed for farmworker families, larger families. And the three- and four-bedroom units have rents of 40 and 50 percent of area median income with rents being approximately 50 to 64 percent of the market. There are three two-bedroom units that are slightly smaller than market, with rents at 40 and 50 percent of AMI with rent levels at 55 to 70 percent of the market rate in Oxnard. Rental assistance will be made available to the 39 farmworker households that are currently scheduled with rents at the higher levels of 60 percent.

The environmental assessment found no adverse site conditions other than noise concerns from the railroad, and the noise assessment suggested a sound wall with sound-rated construction in the walls and windows to help mitigate the noise concerns.

There are five existing buildings on the site that will be demolished. An asbestos study will identify any concerns that need to be addressed during demolition. The geotech report suggested removal of the top layer of soil, replaced with three to four feet of compacted fill to raise the slab foundations above the hundred-year flood plain.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The borrower is Cabrillo Economic Development Corp. They have come to CalHFA
before, and the Agency has approved for financing Plaza Del Sol, a 70-unit project in Simi Valley. CEDC has been in existence for 22 years, and they have developed 16 projects with approximately 823 units. They will be the developer, the general partner, and the contractor on Villa Madera (sic).

I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Questions?

We'll give you first chance, Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Okay. Thank you.

With CalHFA's loans in the 20 to 25 percent range, obviously with all the subsidiaries that are there from other sources, I'm very supportive of the project.

I have a comment though that the total costs per unit is on the high side of what seems to be reasonable for affordable housing, $250,000 per unit in costs in a relatively non high-up cost area. So for a non high-cost area to be at $250,000 a unit seems high, especially when it has nothing to do with land or acquisition costs, which are reasonable at $13,000 a unit at 6 percent.

But with all the subsidies and the maximum exposure on a loan-to-value basis being 35 percent instead of 25 percent, I am very supportive of the project based on all the third-party subsidiaries.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Is there a reason why? It seems kind of incongruous.

MR. WARREN: Go ahead.

MS. STARBUCK: The foundation engineering and also widening Hueneme Road, the main access to the site, and the railroad tracks have to be modified, so the engineering costs basically for that are actually showing up in the architectural fees and also should have been showing engineering and acoustical analysis and the design of the units to mitigate the noise concerns from the railroad tracks.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Are you saying that we've rolled up things in that category again?

MS. STARBUCK: Right.

MR. WARREN: And generally, Mr. Chairman, large family units tend to cost more. We have some four-bedroom units. But costs are going up, and this is an issue with all the projects we've seen today.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Why do large family units cost more? You've got more square footage.

MR. WARREN: More square footage.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: You've got one or two bathrooms and one kitchen.

MR. WARREN: It seems to be the trend. They seem to trend higher.
MS. STARBUCK: These three- and four-bedrooms actually have two and a half baths as well. And there was a larger -- liability insurance has gone up during construction, so those costs are rolled up in this line item that you see here.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Yes.

MR. FRANKLIN: Just a couple comments. As the holder of the subordinate debt on this, I would add to the Board's concerns on costs, but more to the point, I'd really like to commend you guys for getting into this, as you mentioned at the beginning, somewhat of a new direction. Traditionally, many of these deals are farmworker programs through HCD and RD alone, and that's often because they're in markets where there's no one to carry soft debt.

But where it does permit and where you can do some of this fully amortizing debt, then I, you know, really encourage you to keep looking for these opportunities, because I think it's a good thing.

One change we're making that, you know -- on this cost issue, maybe it's something that we could coordinate somehow because, as you know, as a member of our loan and grant committee, we're concerned with costs, regularly looking at total development costs, trying to think about how to get a handle on some
standards and benchmarks.

One other change I'd just note with the
farmworker, with the increased funding that we have in
that program we're seeing many, many more multifamily
rental deals than we did in the past. Historically it
was much more a single-family program. And we found a
little bit of a skill set mismatch in that area, so
we're taking the tax credit piece as a first move, but
then ultimately all of the rental deals will be
underwritten by our MHP team. So we're really looking
to consolidate there, which is, of course, the team that
the CalHFA underwriters are working with on a regular
basis. You see MHP on a lot of these deals. So
hopefully one of the benefits of that is it will
facilitate the coordination with you-all in this issue
of development costs.

But really I'm pleased to see you're getting
into this area. I think it's a good area to push.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Jack.

MR. SHINE: On another note, with a railroad
going down the side of the property, did you look at the
plans in terms of foundation stability? Are they
doing --

MS. STARBUCK: They did the acoustical analysis.

The acoustical analysis recommended different windows
and sound mitigation and design of the townhome units.
The wall would be high enough to mitigate the additional
noise. The soil has to be -- they’re going to bring in
90-percent compacted fill, three or four feet of it, to
address --

MR. SHINE: The foundation engineer developed
that?

MS. STARBUCK: Yes. And that’s why some of the
engineering costs are actually on this. They’re added
in with the architectural fees that you see there.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any further questions?

Yes, Cathy.

MS. SANDOVAL: Port Hueneme Road, is that also
the main access to Port Hueneme?

MS. STARBUCK: Actually, it’s Hueneme Road, and
it actually is north of Port Hueneme. It runs
west-east, and Port Hueneme is actually south of that.

But it is very close to the area.

MS. SANDOVAL: But we don’t expect any negative
impacts from the port or its operation?

MS. STARBUCK: No. It’s about a mile and a half
to the west of the site.

MS. SANDOVAL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Esteban.

MR. ALMANZA: I also wanted to echo Director
Franklin's comments and congratulate the staff for venturing into this type of much needed housing. With the additional leverage, it does stretch the available farmworker housing dollars that are out there.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Thank you.

Any further questions?

MS. JOHANTGEN: I just had a quick question. Do these cost analyses include the construction of the noise abatements?

MS. STARBUCK: Yes, they do. The costs are incorporated.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Anyone else?

The Chair will entertain a motion.

MR. SHINE: Motion.

MR. CZUKER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Shine and Czuker -- and Shine again for the third.

Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing, seeing none, would the Secretary please call the roll.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.
MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-37 has been approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-37 is hereby approved.

Let's move on to Villa Victoria.

Resolution 30-38 (Villa Victoria)

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The next project is very similar to what you just heard with Villa Cesar Chavez. The project name is Villa Victoria. It's a 54-unit townhouse project also located in Oxnard. These projects are approximately seven and a half miles apart from each other.

They are also requesting a Loan to Lender with Wells Fargo or through Wells Fargo. The loan amount will be $7,100,000 at 3 percent for two years, and it's tax exempt. Then they are requesting permanent financing from the Agency. The first mortgage would be
$3,525,000 at 5 and a half percent for 30 years and a second mortgage in the amount of $400,000 at 5 and a half percent for ten years.

This second mortgage is taking advantage of the subsidy that RD is providing for on this project, it's 27 units where they subsidize up to 50 percent of median. We're treating it very similarly of how we treat our HUD Section 8 project-based locality units where we take that surplus money and we fund a loan for ten years.

And it's a fully amortized loan that is due and payable at the end of ten years.

Locality involvement includes the City of Oxnard with a 33-year loan of $865,150. And then we also get to Housing and Community Development, who has committed, again with Joe Serna Jr. Farmworker Grant and Loan Program, a $2,977,367 four-year loan at 3-percent interest. There's also USDA Department of Rural Development providing a $1.1 million Section 514 Farm Labor Housing loan at 1 percent for 33 years. 27 of the units must be rented to low income farm worker families.

MS. STARBUCK: Here's the aerial view of the site looking in a southerly direction. In the far distance you see Port Hueneme. And this project is actually part of a 320-acre community known as Victoria Estates, which is being developed around the northwest
part of Oxnard. You'll see that it was primarily
agricultural land previously, and what you see here is
an expansion of the River Ridge Golf Course that's being
handled -- it's actually halfway completed. And
approximately 551 new single-family homes are to the
east of the site.

The main road you see here is Victoria Avenue
that runs from the Ventura 101 Freeway to just west of
Port Hueneme. The other lateral -- the cross road here
is Gonzales Road. A new high school, and there will be a
new elementary school and church as part of the
single-family home development.

There will be new fairway that runs along the
east side of the site. To the north of the site is a
previous convent that is now a women's shelter that will
share access to the property. There will be a shared
driveway. Here's a close-up. Here's the access off of
Victoria Avenue, the women's shelter, and the site.
This will be a fairway. The project will be boarded
with high walls on the south and east of the project for
golf ball mitigation. And --

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: What was that?
MS. STARBUCK: For golf ball mitigation.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Are you talking about a
fence or a wall?
MS. STARBUCK: A large wall, a very high wall.

In addition, there will be a lot of lush landscaping around the perimeter.

You'll see hundred-year-old eucalyptus trees lining Victoria Avenue here, which has some sound considerations. There is also going to be an acoustical study done to see if a wall is needed along the tree line of Victoria Avenue.

Here's the artist's rendering of the townhome style units. The units circle an open area where the tot lot is located. And a community room is also near the entrance to the site. Here's the access off of Victoria Avenue.

Each of the units has a two-car garage, and there are 20 additional open parking spaces. Each unit will also have a washer and dryer. Predominantly, these are three- and four-bedroom units. You have 33 three-bedroom and 18 four-bedroom units.

These units are in the newer, more expensive part of Oxnard, and the rents on the one- and two-bedroom units will be at 40 percent, and they're averaging 52 percent of market. The rents on the three- and four-bedroom units will range between 40 and 60 percent of area median, and the rents run between 48 to 76 percent of market.
Only 27 of the units are specifically targeted
to farmworker households. The remaining units will be
housed with people that the Housing Authority hopes to
put Section 8 tenants into.

The environmental assessment found no adverse
site conditions, other than that geotech did recommend
removal of the top layer of soil and replaced by again
three to four feet of compacted fill to raise the
foundations above the hundred-year flood plain. A noise
study has been ordered for the noise along Victoria
Avenue.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: This project is also
going to be developed by Cabrillo Economic Development
Corp., the same -- the same sponsor that we have for
Villa Cesar Chavez and the same sponsor that's on Plaza
Del Sol, the previously approved project in Simi Valley.

And with that, we'd like to take any questions
you might have.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Is this the first
affordable housing project being built on a golf course?
I don't remember.

MS. STARBUCK: Actually, the Wild Horse project
in Davis is on a golf course.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: I almost bought that
property.
MR. WARREN: It is a new program, Mr. Chairman, we're rolling out. I feel obligated to take the lead in this, so you'll see more.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Is this called a Project 18 or something?

MR. WARREN: We'll think of some appropriate acronym.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: How high is the wall?

MS. STARBUCK: They're evaluating that right now. The planning department there is anticipating at least eight feet.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: I built a golf course one time, and it gets really exciting at those early homeowners meetings when your trees aren't up and stuff like that. I had a navy captain come in one time with a big brown paper bag and a bucket. And he said, "The last --" and he spilled out all these golf balls at homeowners association meeting and he said, "Everything's been fine, and we love it here. It's wonderful. We live on the fairway right in the slice zone." He says, "But the last -- this last ball that came in went through our bathroom window. My wife was in there taking a shower, and that ball ricocheted all over the shower room, so that's why I'm here tonight."

His wife didn't say a word. It gets exciting.
Questions from the Board now that I've editorialized on affordable golf courses?

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Again, I'm very supportive of the project because of all the third-party subsidies that are involved and the low exposure for CalHFA in participating with creating this affordable housing.

My concern is still similar to the prior project with the same sponsor in that we have a very high cost per unit in delivering this project, especially when you factor in zero land costs and especially when you factor in the relatively high architectural fees. If you look back to just the construction costs alone, if you add in the contingencies, they're around $135 a foot, $140 a foot. For this style of construction, that's very high. We should be able to bring the housing in for substantially below that hard cost number, and it's something that perhaps staff can take a look at.

MR. WARREN: Okay.

MR. CZUKER: But with that, I'm supportive of the project, other than the costs are on the high side.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay.

Jack.

MR. SHINE: I think it gets back to what we talked about last time, about understanding what it is
that makes up the particular cost. No two builders do
it the same way and never have and probably never will,
but if construction includes every bit of on-site
development costs, off-site developments costs,
landscaping, common area amenities and so on, then it
should say so, because if we build a product, we know
what it costs. And it just looks funny, you know. I'm
not saying it's right or wrong. I can't judge that.
But one line for every -- one line fits all is tough,
for me anyway.

MR. WARREN: I understand, Mr. Shine, and
historically, you know, prior to me being involved in
construction lending over the last several years, we've
not done that in keeping the presentations short, but as
we said before, we would be happy to start including
more detail so the Board can see where these costs are.
And that's a separate issue from the actual amount of
the costs, whether it's reasonable or not.

MR. SHINE: With a little explanation that goes
along with that, just an exhibit maybe or something
showing those breakdowns would keep us quiet.

MR. WARREN: There is a detailed analysis that
we have that's within our cash flow models which we've
not shared with you, and we can. So we do have a
separate analysis which we can go through.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: On the other hand, I know Linn has told me recently that he's looking at scoping down the volume of these, some of these presentations, both timewise and paperwise. But I understand and I'm sure you do in this context at least for a while, these do look like pretty heavy numbers to me. We understand that sometimes in suburban type where you get neighborhood opposition, that drives a lot of mitigation and it drives a lot of costs up and stuff. This doesn't -- this looks like a piece of cake politically.

MR. WARREN: The -- I'm glad, Mr. Chairman, you brought up the size of the package. We are going to look at perhaps reducing the size of the narrative portion of the package. We'll probably leave the financial analysis pretty much the way it is, with the exception of what Mr. Shine and Mr. Czuker have asked for, with some more detail on the construction side, which we have, like I said, within our models already. But the narrative does take some time to prepare, so we would like to reduce that somewhat.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And I, for one, have encouraged him to do so. A lot of this gets -- is maybe of questionable necessity and so let's see how it works out. I understand on your specific issues.

MR. SHINE: Yeah. And while I agree that
shorter is better than longer, sufficient is also better
than both, neither -- to either side, you know.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Sure.

MR. SHINE: If we have it in our books, at least
we have an overview of what we're going to be talking
about and don't come in to totally or somewhat less than,
you know, informed on a broad basis.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Let's free him up, Jack,
to do a new format that's maybe shortened and we can
critique that, just as we are on this issue.

MR. SHINE: That's a great idea.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: Just for some
edification, one of the big issues for both Villa Cesar
Chavez and Villa Victoria is the increased cost that
they're seeing just for insurance during the
construction process. They're being charged or having
to come up with almost $400,000 for each one of these
projects.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Let's not go there, but
you're absolutely right.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: It's huge.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: The whole industry is
suffering badly, and it's not lending itself either in
Congress or in California to a ready solution. It isn't
going to happen soon.
With that, it's still a good project.

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Move approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Motion by Ed.

MR. SHINE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Second by Jack for approval.

Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing, seeing none, Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-38 has been approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-38 is hereby approved. Let's talk about Moulton Plaza.

Resolution 03-39 (Moulton Plaza Apartments)

MR. WARREN: The next project before the Board's consideration is Moulton Plaza. I've asked Jim Liska to join us. Jim has worked on this one.

The request for Moulton is a first mortgage in the amount of -- it's a 66-unit, I'm sorry, family apartment complex that is located within the footprint of Homestead Apartments, which the Agency approved and financed several years ago.

The first mortgage request is for a first mortgage in the amount of $5,810,000, a 5.5-percent interest rate area for 30 years, and a bridge loan in the amount of approximately $3 million, 4 percent, for one year, interest only.

There is a -- by way of a little bit of background, Jim will show you some slides. When we financed the Homestead Project several years ago, there was a parcel within the project that was designed to be set aside for brand-new housing, which Jim will show, and that's what we're doing today is really financing the second phase of that.

There is a large amount of locality lending.
The City of Sunnyvale is contributing HOME funds in the amount of $800,000 and Housing Mitigation funds in the amount of $992,000. What's important about the subordinate financing for this project is that the City of Sunnyvale had asked in their original request in Year 11 that their loan essentially begin to amortize, after the halfway period had passed.

The modeling reflected that would not work and would stress the property far too much. So we asked the City of Sunnyvale to redo their loan agreement in which in Year 11 there could be an acceleration payment, but only to the extent that a 1.08 debt coverage ratio could remain, so cash flows reflect that. And if there are any problems with the property, the City of Sunnyvale has indicated that they would accept less debt payment under their subordinate financing.

So with that, Jim, show us the slides.

MR. Liska: This is the overview of the Moulton Plaza site. You can see, as Linn indicated earlier, this is part -- Phase II of Homestead Plaza. Homestead Plaza was taken to the CalHFA Board July 24th, 2000, and this was an acquisition and refinance of Homestead Park.

At that time it comprised 222 units of which were excluded in this portion here, you'll maybe get a better shot, which is two two-story buildings containing
11 units. Those level units are vacant, so no
relocation is required. There is a — also a
community — one-story community room, office space, and
there was a child care center.

Approximately two years ago, the provider for the
child care center discontinued the contract. And also
at that time there were no children from the project
itself that were attending the facility, so this is
basically, I think, a moot issue.

But if you can look — I don’t have it
completely outlined, but it’s 22 buildings in Homestead,
and it basically goes around this area here.
Surrounding the neighborhood, the facility, it’s a
built-up area comprised of multifamily apartments as
well as condominiums and single family.

The main access back here is Saratoga Sunnyvale
Road, which has commercial, retail. Off the screen here
is Homestead Road, which is another major arterial
street for commercial, retail, shopping, what have you.
Straight down Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road is Interstate 280,
which is access to employment centers, the downtown, San
Jose, as well as access to the Silicon Valley, what have
you.

As far as what’s going to be built on the site,
let me give you one more interior. Renovation has been
taking place on Homestead Park, and it's almost complete. We're doing some reroofing now, and we should be finishing up here now shortly within the next two to three months. But the project has come -- developed very nicely. The rehab has been very well. The tenancy has been very supportive of what has been done in the process.

Here's a rendition of Phase II Moulton Plaza. It's two- and three-story, four buildings. The three-story will have an elevator, and the two-stories are three-bedroom townhouses. The project will be built over a subterranean parking lot, parking garage, which will accommodate 118 parking spots. This structure has been pretty much mandated by the City, which we originally questioned the cost of the project, what have you, but this is something that the City wants to see, and the sponsor/developer Mid-Pen is accommodating that and developing it.

As far as rents, what have you, we have pretty low rents, 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. We're able to reach these and achieve these levels because of the array of subordinate financing being provided by the City, HOME, Housing Trust, what have you.

Yes, we're still in Silicon Valley. The market is pretty much, I think, bottoming out now. Rents,
you'll probably be seeing a -- you know, another slight
decrease this year, but I think you're starting to see
some steadiness. Rent concessions are starting to fade
a little bit. Overall in that area, vacancy is
approximately 7 percent, and again rents are sort of
flat. The economy hopefully will be rebounding a little
bit.

But just looking at these rents here, I was
doing a comparison of where we were in market rents back
in 2000. 1998, 2000 seem to be the high watermark as
far as rents, but when we did Homestead back in 2000, we
were looking at a one-bedroom market rate unsubsidized
of $1,512 versus $1,300 today. A two-bedroom rent was
$1,742 versus $1,600. And a three-bedroom was $2,299
versus $2,000. So I believe we are in tune with where the
rents are as to what we calibrated for market. And
again, our subsidized rents are substantially below
that.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Jim.

The sponsor is Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition,
an organization that we have done a number of projects
with over the last 20 years, and they will also manage
the project as they are now with the Homestead Park
project.

With that, we'd like to recommend approval and
be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Questions? Board?

This is straightforward. No questions?

The Chair will entertain a motion.

MS. JOHANTGEN: I'll move staff's

recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Staff's recommendation is

for approval. And will you so move?

MS. JOHANTGEN: Yeah. I move staff's

recommendation for approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Thanks. Ms. Johantgen --

MS. Sandoval: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: -- First and Cathy second.

Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing, seeing none, would the Secretary please

call roll.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-39 has been approved.

MR. WARREN: The next project for the Board's consideration is --

MR. CZUKER: Excuse me.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Hang on.

Ed?

MR. CZUKER: I have a conflict on the next project, so I'd like to publicly disclose that I have done joint ventures with Las Palmas Foundation. I have no economic interest in this project, but the fact that I have projects together with the sponsoring nonprofit, I'd like to make that public. And to the extent that you have a quorum without my vote, then I'd prefer not to vote. If you need my vote for a quorum, then I will just sit quietly and leave it to legal opinion.

Mr. Hughes, maybe you can add.

MR. HUGHES: The CalHFA statutes obviously prohibit directors from voting or participating in any
decision in which they have a financial interest. That
also includes holding any paid position in a housing
sponsor or employed by a housing sponsor. If there's
not a financial interest, because those are defined in
ethics laws if it's not an actual conflict, it does have
to be disclosed. If there is a conflict, the director
can't participate in the discussions or vote on the
project.

MR. SHINE: Mr. Chairman, isn't there a quorum
without him?

MR. HUGHES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: I think so. Let me do
this: How are you doing? I'm about ready to call a
five-minute break.

THE REPORTER: That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: That's No. 1. Stand by
just a second.

No. 2, it's a good time, Ed, we appreciate it. I
think we do have a quorum without you, so to the degree
that we continue -- nobody is leaving? None of my
voting members? So I think that probably in the essence
of total -- if you prefer it, and I understand, we won't
make you vote.

No. 3, that's a good reminder that I picked up
some stuff in the C file, one of which was our ethics
training. And I'd just ask that -- the request when it went out a few months ago was that we would get it back by September 1st. And JoJo has just told me though we have till the end of the year before it has to be official, I'd suggest -- and JoJo tells me there are only two of us that are in so far, so let me give you a reminder and/or if you've lost it and you have a D file which has been carted out with waste management, then we ought to let JoJo know right away, because that is a mandated requirement.

MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, I would just add that I would encourage any Board member when you look through the package if there might be a question raised as to where there is a conflict issue, if you can catch that soon enough to contact my office, because many times resolution of a conflict or ethical issue can be detailed oriented. It's a lot more precise. We will certainly give you an opinion then prior to the Board meeting, if that is feasible.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Well, Ed had mentioned it here this morning.

So I appreciate what you're doing, Ed. We recuse you from discussion or vote because we do have a quorum.

And let's take a five-minute break. No longer.
(Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. We are on the second page of our agenda with Oak Village; is that right?

MR. WARREN: We are, Mr. Chairman.

Resolution 03-41 (Oak Village)

MR. WARREN: The next loan for your consideration is the Oak Village Project. This is an existing 117-unit apartment complex in Oakland. This is originally a HUD 236 project that was built in 1973. And the lending request today is for a first mortgage in the amount of $6,840,000, a 5-and-a-half-percent interest rate for 32 years, two years of which will be variable-rate debt, and then after the rehabilitation period will roll into a 30-year fully amortized loan. And with other projects today, it is one that is split between tax-exempt and taxable.

Because this is a 236 loan, there is the dedicated interest deduction payment stream from HUD in the original 236 program, which we will capitalize at 5 and a half percent yielding an IRP mortgage for eight years, which is the remaining term of the IRP agreement, $487,000.

So with that, Jim, show us the project.

MR. LISKA: Here's the aerial outlining the
subject, which is located on a city block, for lack of a
better term.

Here's a better close-up.

MR. SHINE: Sorry, could you go back one,
please. It zipped by me.

MR. LISKY: Again, this is our project. It's
located on a city block. It fronts on 13th Street and
14th Street. This is Market Street here, and this is
Brush Street. Right over here is the freeway, 980.
This is designated, this neighborhood, as the West End
Addition in the Oakland area. There's some small
shopping located just off the fringe here. And also off
the fringe is the BART station, so it has ready access
to downtown Oakland, as well as to other employment
centers in the Bay Area.

There's been a lot of rejuvenation taking place
in much of Oakland over the years, and it's amazing some
of the changes that -- from when this project first
developed in 1973. Originally this area was part of a
redevelopment area, and it's pretty much built out now.
Right across the street here is Lowell Middle
School. And this other area two blocks up is a park.
Again, this is closer up of the site. There's
basically two three-story elevator-type buildings.
Again, built in '73, it's showing its age. Our sponsor/
developer, Related, is coming in to look at this. And they're going to be expending a lot of money on rehabilitation. The rehabilitation outlined here is we're looking at approximately $36,000 a unit. It's going to encompass new roofs, siding, some elevation detail, landscaping, some fencing, security key card access for vehicles and pedestrians. We're going to be doing the interiors as far as kitchen cabinetry, appliances, kitchen countertops, new bathroom fixtures, some bathroom surrounds, et cetera.

They're also contemplating -- this is the existing laundry room right now, and this in the middle is the common room. There are plans to basically put in a new community building here, with an office leasing space, a recreation center, possibly maybe a computer learning center that could be provided, as well as a new laundry area.

As far as rents, this project is at 100 percent, 50 percent. You'll notice that we're doing 50-percent CalHFA on studios and the two-bedrooms. I have not included CalHFA in the one-bedrooms because in this instance, 50-percent TCAC is slightly lower than CalHFA's 50 percent. I don't know if that's just an anomaly or what.

And these rents also reflect that the developer
will be converting -- the project has master gas and
mass electricity, and we are converting to individual
electricity for this project.

Overall with this market, this market also has
suffered some of the residual effects of the Silicon
Valley and the State of California’s economy in general.
Average rent for Oakland is something like $1,351. Even
given our spreads here on market rents with studios,
one-bedrooms, two-bedrooms, we go anywhere from a low of
$800 for a studio up to $1,100 for a two-bedroom.

Vacancy levels in this area across the board are
approximately 6 percent. Again, this market is pretty
good, and our 50-percent rents are pretty well below
what we perceive to be as market.

As far -- I will leave the environmental to
Linn.

MR. WARREN: I thought you were done.

MR. LISKA: I am.

MR. WARREN: Okay. As your materials will
indicate, there is -- in the course of due diligence,
there is mold in the project. And what the Related
Companies are doing in conjunction with the John Stewart
Company, which is the seller, is they’ve engaged a
number of experts in the area of mold remediation,
health and safety hygienists and such, to determine the
extent of the mold and the type of the mold.

Preliminary indications today indicate the mold is not
toxic, but because of everyone's concern about mold,
this will have a very extensive analysis.

What the buyers are saying and representing to
us, and if we concur, is that prior to the acquisition
by the partnership, the mold will be remediated. And
there will be an indemnity agreement agreed upon by the
buyers and sellers obviously for our review and approval
as well. The mold reports will be reviewed by our own
experts to make sure that they do cover all the issues.

And with the sizable amount of rehabilitation,
as Jim indicated, in excess of $30,000 a unit, we
certainly take it that any potential future mold issues
will be dealt with. We are in agreement, I think, with
the buyers on this. This is obviously a serious issue
for us, as for any purchaser, and we'll be very diligent
and not extend any Agency funds prior to our being
satisfied on this issue.

Jim indicated that the Related Companies are
acquiring the property. This is the advancing and
rehabilitation model we have used successfully on a
number of other projects, and quite frankly, we're really
pleased that they are the ones that are addressing this
issue with respect to the mold problems.
So with that, I would be happy to recommend approval and answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Questions?

We'll give Ed first opportunity for once. I'm sorry to interrupt your meal.

Any questions from the Board or the audience?

Hearing, seeing none, the chair will entertain a motion.

MR. FRANKLIN: Move to approve.

MR. SHINE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: First motion by Mr. Franklin. Second by Mr. Shine. I saw Shine leaning. Is that good for a second?

MR. SHINE: Yes.

MS. JOHANTGEN: I'd just ask maybe for us to amend the approval that a full and complete remediation of the mold be contingent for part of the loan closing.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: No problem. I know that's inherent in what he's saying, but there's -- that's a valid amendment. Will the maker and seconder accept that amendment?

MR. FRANKLIN: Yes.

MR. SHINE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: That's right. It's his. So, JoJo, do you need that repeated -- or, no,
you've got it. Do you need that repeated, because I
sure do.

THE REPORTER: Do you want me to read it back?
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: No. I'm sure you've got
it.

Any questions on the motion as amended? Board?

Audience?

Hearing, seeing none, Secretary, please call the
roll.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Abstain.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you.

Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-41, as amended, has been
approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-41 is hereby
approved.

Okay, Linn. Ocean View Garden Apartments.

Resolution 03-42 (Ocean View Garden Apartments)

MR. WARREN: The next project for the Board's
consideration is Ocean View Garden Apartments. I've
asked Roger Kollius to join us on this particular
project.

This is an Agency Section 8 loan that has been
in our portfolio for approximately 20 years, but what's
being proposed is the sale to a new limited liability
corporation. The financing request is for a first
mortgage in the amount of $3,160,000 at a 5.75-percent
interest rate, tax exempt, and the second loan, a
taxable loan for ten years at 1,195,000 at 6.5-percent
interest rate. The rates are a little bit different,
and I will explain how we arrived at these rates.

Under the Section 8 refinancing policy with the
Agency, we endeavor to get the maximum amount of loan
spread or income we can do for the refinancing, since
these projects do supply income to the Agency for other
programs. So in this particular case, the interest rate
is an increment higher than the other rates at 5.75 to
maximize that spread to the Agency, and the 6.5-percent
rate is the rate we arrived at for taxable debt over a
ten-year period.

The second loan is a Section 8 increment loan,
which we've done in a number of refinancings. It's the
difference between the existing tax credit rents and the
Section 8 contract rents. We capitalize that stream and
lend against that for a ten-year period. The ten-year
period expires in 2013, which is the same time that the
existing contract will also terminate.

By way of information, the purchasers are the
partnership composed of the Evans Company and
Mr. Hyseth. They're also -- Hyson, I'm sorry.
Mr. Evans and Mr. Hyson are also the sellers, among
others, in this partnership. There are several other
people, so they are taking sale proceeds from the
distribution; however, they -- on a go-forward basis,
there is no developer fee going to either one of these
partners. And on a go-forward basis, there is no
distribution being given to the limited liability
corporation, since all excess proceeds go to the benefit
of the City of Berkeley, so I do want to say that.

We know the Evans Company very well. Obviously
for a sale situation, we want to make sure that there's
no undue enrichment, and we don't think there is in this
case. They were very straightforward about that.
There is a ground lease on the property. It's a redevelopment area for the City of Berkeley. The ground lease could be renegotiated and extended well past our loan term, and our regulatory agreement would be placed against the fee of the property.

So with that, I'll let Roger take a walk through the property.

MR. KOLLIAS: Ocean View Gardens Apartments is an existing 52-unit family community in the west Berkeley area of Berkeley. The site we are looking at is to the east. The neighborhood falls within a 30-year redevelopment area, which is intended to maintain a harmonious balance between industrial, residential, and commercial retail uses.

In the property, we have two sites of the property, here and over in this area. Along this area right here is called Fourth Street, and Fourth Street is continuing up into this area. It's permeating into other streets as well. This was -- this is an expanding upscale open-mall shopping district which was historically one of those industrial marine buildings supply-type areas. During the early 70s a, lot of the artists and artisans were moving into the area because of the low rents. And in the late 70s and 80s, several destination restaurants moved into the area, at which
time this area has expanded into an upscale restaurant, boutique, commercial-type area.

This is a view of the sites. To the north -- they are two noncontiguous sites. The larger one at the top of the page has access on both Fifth Street and Six Street. On lower part is Delaware Street, which has been vacated and is currently being used for residential parking. The second site is in the southeast corner of First Avenue and Sixth Street. The two sites contain a total area of about 2.7 acres.

The improvements consist of 13 two-story wood-frame buildings containing the 62 residential units and a ground floor 833-square-foot retail store which is along Delaware Street. The project amenities include a management office, two laundry rooms, a picnic area, community room, and off-street parking for 62 vehicles. The landscaping is mature and well maintained, and the surrounding streets and sidewalks are in good condition.

Again, the project contains 62 units consisting of 18 one-bedroom, 32 two-bedroom, and 12 three-bedroom units.

This is a view of the ground floor retail space along Delaware Avenue. If you notice the Victorian type edifice of the property, this is in keeping with the historical ambiance of Delaware Street.
There are no outstanding -- there are no
outstanding environmental or seismic issues. The
improvements are considered to be in good condition.
Renovations and repairs to the property will consist of
repairs to the parking area, asphalts, and upgrades to
landscaping and on-site lighting. The community room
will also be renovated.

The individual living units will -- they'll be
upgraded and maintained pursuant to an established scope
of work, which will include such items as new carpeting,
painting, floor coverings, kitchen/bathroom cabinets,
countertops, fixtures, as well as other items of
deferred maintenance.

At the present time, the expected cost of the
project renovation is about $16,500 per unit, and an
expanded scope of work will be implemented, should funds
from the earned surplus residual receipts account for
this project become available for project renovation.

This final slide shows the Fourth Street
shopping area with the various restaurants and boutique
stores.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: How close is that, Roger?
Because Fourth Street has really turned into some nice
things, as you can see there. How close is that?

MR. KOLLIAS: The property -- if we can back up.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: It's a couple a blocks, I guess.

MR. KOLLIAS: Yeah. Well, actually, the -- the -- Fourth Street is one block to the west. The property is -- yeah. We're -- here's Fifth Street. Here's Fourth Street. And what's happening is this area here is more or less a continuation of the Fourth Street parking area. And again, Fourth Street is combining into other areas. And as time goes on, a lot of the industrial properties are being converted to commercial boutique-type uses.

MR. WARREN: As Roger said, the area has changed dramatically.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Fourth Street has some nice restaurants. In the last probably 15 to 20 years, it's been totally rehabbed. Some of the restaurants have been kind of rough, and I guess this is kind of part of the comeback.

MR. WARREN: It has changed dramatically to when Spanger's was the only place to go to.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: There's more than that now. Are you through, Roger?

MR. KOLLIAS: I was just going to give you the rents.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay.
MR. KOLLIAS: The project -- the first mortgage loan is underwritten at a 50- and 60-percent loan level. The second loan is being written at the difference between the HAP contract rents, which is -- I can't tell that color, but it's next to the red and rents at the 50- and 60-percent level over the remaining term of the HAP contract. And you'll note here that the market rate rents for the area are in excess of the HAP contract rents.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Thank you.

MR. WARREN: As Roger indicated, one important piece of this is that we are holding a fair amount of surplus, which is used as a post-80 HUD project, and what that means is that the way the regulation passes, the earned surplus or extra proceeds are held in trust for the benefit of HUD. Theoretically in the end of the loan term, the money has to be returned to HUD unless we elected to spend it for renovation of affordable housing. Our powers or our ability is really broad to do that, so this is the first project that I'm aware of in portfolio refinancing in which we're using this earned surplus directly for the benefit of the property. We have to go to HUD and make sure they're okay with it, but it would enhance the rehabilitation money by approximately $450,000. So it's better that we spend it
on our projects than have it revert back to HUD and be
spent on somebody else's project, so we'll see more of
these as we go forward.

So with that, I'd be happy to recommend approval
and answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: We have been through this
drill before, but tell me again why with a $9-million
appraisal, and I think we have a $3.1-million first and a
$1.2-million second, why don't you just do a -- we've
been through this before, but why don't we just do a
first loan?

MR. WARREN: In this particular case with the
ten years that's remaining for the Section 8 contract,
we did a BP that's lending solely against the Section 8.
And we have the tax credits grants and then we have the
Section 8 grants, and the difference is that ten-year
loan. So if we make it all one loan, it gets a little
messy from an amortization standpoint, but what it does
is we can size that secondary piece very easily and tie
it to a specific event such as the termination of the
original contract. It's just -- it seems -- we've tried
it both ways. It's a cleaner way to do the second loan.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Thank you. I'll ask again
in about a year and a half.

MR. WARREN: That would be fine.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any questions from the Board?
It's Berkeley. We need a project in Berkeley.
Do I hear a motion?

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Move approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Second?

MS. SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Cathy? Was it Cathy?

MS. SANDOVAL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Thank you.

Any discussion on the motion?

If not, then the Secretary please call roll.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.
MR. SHINE: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-42 has been approved.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-42 is hereby approved.
Moving on to Coyote Run Apartments in Palm Springs.
Resolution 03-43 (Coyote Run Apartments, Phase II)
MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The next project is Coyote Run Apartments, Phase II. This is going to be the follow-up to Phase I, which is 140 units in Palm Springs. Phase II is a 66-unit new construction family apartment project.
They are asking for construction financing from the Agency. And the construction loan is in the amount of $6,450,000 at 3-percent interest for 18 months. Then it would roll into a permanent loan in the amount of a million, six dollars at 5 and a half percent for 30 years.
The locality involvement includes the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Palm Springs, the land donation to the partnership, which is valued at $700,000. They're also making a permanent loan to the project in the amount of a million dollars for 55 years at 3 percent.
The sponsors also received financing from Housing and Community Development from the MHP program in the amount of $2,428,834 for 55 years at 3 percent interest and from the HOME program in the amount of $2,155,601 also for 55 years at 3 percent. They're applying for an AHP loan which is expected to be awarded in November in the amount of $350,000 for 32 years.

Tina Ilvonen will now present the slides.

**MS. ILVONEN:** The first slide is looking to the east. This is -- this is -- the project site is northwest of downtown, northwest of the airport. It is off of Interstate 10 in Indian Hills, north of Highway 111 and the mountains and two miles northwest of the Palm Springs airport.

The uses surrounding the site are mainly Phase I, which is right here. And this will be a public park that will be constructed concurrently with the construction of the project. There's vacant land across the street, single-family homes adjoining a mobile home park, and other vacant land also. There are shopping areas, medical clinics, restaurants within a mile of the property.

And the next slide, I'm going to talk about the environmental, which there's not much. There was a
Phase I report completed, and they said there's no
further investigation necessary. They did find some
undocumented fill on the site, which they recommended
removing during the rough grading operations.

The next slide shows some of the elevations of
the project. The project is being designed by
Interactive Design Company, and the construction company
is William C. Buster, Incorporated.

The next slide shows a site plan. And this will
be connected to Coyote Run Phase I here and here. And
the total site is 6.78 acres. The development contains
17 residential buildings and one community building.
The community building is right here. And here's the
swimming pool next to it. There's also a children's
play area, 75 carports, and 68 open spaces on-site. The
2,300-square-foot community building will house the
management office, laundry room, and public rest rooms,
kitchen and meeting room for community events.

The next slide shows the rents. The rents are
at 30-percent SMI, 50-percent AMI, and 60-percent AMI.
And the rents run from 31 percent to 67 percent of the
market rate rents for the area.

And I will stop my presentation there.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The borrower -- I'm
sorry, the sponsor of this project is Coachella Valley
Housing Coalition. They are also the developer of Phase I. They have developed nearly 2,300 units in Riverside County. And of that, approximately 1,400 are apartment units. We are familiar with them. In 1993 we financed Las Casas Phase III, which is 78 units in Coachella.

And with that, we'd happy to entertain any questions and request approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Questions?

Ed.

MR. CZUKER: I'm very supportive of the project. I want to just say that the construction costs at $107,000 a unit are more in line with some of the -- what we hope to see. If you back out the land costs per unit, the total project cost of 180 less the land, there seems to be very high impact fees here. And even with the high impact fees and high reserves, obviously reserves help protect CalHFA. I think this is a project, obviously, that is well conceived and certainly well subsidized and worthy of our support.

I believe there is a typo on page 235. I don't understand how under the appraisal category you can have a final value of $4,675,000.

MS. ILVONEN: That is the value, the market value of the project. The construction value is a very different value, which takes into consideration the
1 restricted amounts plus the investment plus the
2 beneficial financing.
3
4 MR. CZUKER: So are you saying --
5
6 MS. ILVONEN: So there's two very different
7 values that we're looking at.
8
9 MR. CZUKER: So you're showing a final value
10 which you tie into a permanent loan.
11
12 MS. ILVONEN: The final value that ties into the
13 permanent loan is $4.6 million. That's a 34-percent LTV
14 on the permanent. The construction value is
15 $10.4 million, which is a 62-percent LTV on the
16 construction loan.
17
18 MR. CZUKER: So while our loan-to-cost and loan-
19 to-value look low relative to that number, if you go on
20 cost approach, based on all the costs necessary,
21 obviously something looks a little off here in that we
22 have 11, 12 million dollars in total budget --
23
24 MS. ILVONEN: The cost approach is --
25
27
28 MS. ILVONEN: The cost approach has a very
29 low -- they rely on cost approach very little when
30 coming up to market value, which is this final value of
31 $4.6 million.
32
33 MR. CZUKER: Even that is 34 percent.
34
35 MS. ILVONEN: Uh-hmm.
MR. CZUKER: That's the construction. That's why it's confusing.

MR. FRANKLIN: That's the --

MR. CZUKER: Does the construction loan have more than the value?

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: In evaluating the tax credits.

MR. FRANKLIN: But then you see that and the reason is all these different layers of the permanent financing have restrictions on it.

MR. WARREN: Yeah, it's --

MR. FRANKLIN: It's important you do an income basis to value the property, where it comes in, whereas in the construction phase theoretically those numbers haven't come in yet.

MR. CZUKER: Right. The construction loan is obviously higher than the final value.

MR. WARREN: When we take the value --

MR. FRANKLIN: With restricted rents, which I think we also --

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Hang on, guys. The stenographer is going nuts and so some of these well-chosen remarks are not going to be recorded.

MR. WARREN: You will occasionally see here in the Agency the construction period valuation includes
tax credits, which is if we had to foreclose, for
example, during the construction period we would -- the
assets would be retained we would require, because we
have a valuation of the tax credits, which in this case
is about $3 million.

When we do our permanent valuation, we do not
include tax credits. We look at it from a straight
market rate. This is a market rate comparison, so
occasionally you get this anomaly. Well, the anomaly
happens a lot with the construction period value pumped
up with the tax credits and the permanent period can be
less because restrictions. It's just kind of an
indemnity issue.

But the test is are we covered from an LTV
standpoint if we ever had to take back the property,
hence the higher valuation for the construction period?

MR. SHINE: If we do, are we still restricted?

MR. WARREN: I'm sorry?

MR. SHINE: If we take it back, are you still
restricted or are you contemplating that we --

MR. WARREN: Well, that's -- technically, no,
we're not, but it would be very problematic for the
Agency to take the property, say, after the permanent or
whatever and eliminate the restrictions. I think we
just probably would not do that.
When we underwrite a property where the primary
debt is based upon restricted rents, we compete against
the smaller one. But as a matter of policy for the
Agency, even if we did foreclose, we’re not going to
terminate the locality restrictions. We just would not
do that.

MR. SHINE: But at that point we have a smaller
loan. We’d have been paid off on the proceeds down to
one-six.

MR. WARREN: We could have been, yes. That’s
right.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any further questions?

MR. CZUKER: How would the new construction loan
programs be received as well as administered by the
Agency as well as the public?

MR. WARREN: We have approximately six projects
for construction loans in the pipeline today, plus
whatever was in the package today, so it’s been very
well received. They are primarily linked with MHP
programs, Mr. Czuker, and we think it will grow well.

But as you can also see in the package today,
there are a number of them where we still want to use
loan-to-lender because of the existing relationships we
have with the other lenders.

As far as administration, our first draw, I
think, is in a couple weeks, and I think there's one or
two small pieces left. Essentially everything is in
place. We feel very confident about it.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: We're actually getting
ready to close the first construction loan next week,
and then there will be another closing of our second
coloration loan at the end of this month, the
beginning of October.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Well, this agenda is
replete with loan-to-lender and construction loans like
we're not used to, so we're kind of -- we're kind of
looking at it a little tighter and we need that
hand-holding, Linn. I think we're on the right track,
but there's an awful lot of these that -- the loan-to-
lender we're kind of used to now, the construction loan
program. We're doing okay.

MR. WARREN: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And there's quite a bit of
this, looking in the pipeline?

MR. WARREN: There is. And really the driving
force, quite frankly, behind it is the level of MHP.
And I think, as Mr. Franklin has attested, I think his
folks estimated, you know, five to six years with an MHP
outflow, and we're leaning to that. And I think our
goal is now to expand the marketing for the construction
loans to those localities that are primary funders that
are not using MHP like some of the other projects we've
seen, which are also prevailing wage jobs. And we'll
see how accepted they are.

But what is beneficial in all this is the MHP
program has given us a good opportunity to establish the
program with good borrowers and we'll use that to
demonstrate for further business.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: We're comforted we're in
good shape.

On that high note, Ed.

MR. CZUKER: I move approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Motion by Czuker and a
second?

MR. SHINE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: By Shine. Thank you,
gentlemen.

And any discussion on the motion?

Hearing, seeing none from Board or audience,
Secretary, please call roll.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

MR. BAYUK: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.
MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-43 has been approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-43 is hereby approved.

On to Bayport Apartments in Alameda.

Resolution 03-44 (Bayport Apartments)

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: Bayport Apartments is located in Alameda on the former Alameda Naval Air Station Base. They are requesting construction and permanent financing from the Agency. Their construction loan request is for $9,335,000 at 3-percent variable interest for 18 months.

That first mortgage will be broken into a taxable piece and a tax-exempt piece. The tax-exempt piece is expected to be $6,700,000, and the taxable piece is $2,635,000. When the loan rolls into permanent, the first mortgage will be for a million-five at 5 and a
half percent for 30 years, and there will be a second mortgage at $1,450,000 at 5 and a half percent for ten years. The second mortgage piece is very similar to the structures you've seen elsewhere. It's based on the HUD Section 8 that has been requested on this property, and it's based on that income stream, and it's fully amortized over a ten-year period.

There's going to be a ground lease on this project, and the reason for it is that in 1972, the City of Alameda passed Measure A, and that restricted residential development to no more than two units per structure. The Alameda Housing Authority is exempt from this restriction, and so in order for the Bayport Apartments project to benefit from the exemption, the Alameda Housing Authority is maintaining a fee interest in the project. The sponsors entered into a ground lease for 75 years at a dollar per year, and the ground lease will transfer. It would be assumed by the limited partnership when that entity is formed.

Other financing on this project includes Housing and Community Development MHP money in the amount of $3,930,103 for 55 years at 3 percent. And also HOME money from Alameda County in the amount of $385,792 for 55 years at 3 percent. They're also applying for an MHP -- I'm sorry, for an AHP loan that is expected to be
awarded in November of 2003 in the amount of $306,000.

And with that, Tina will talk about the slides.

MS. ILVONEN: Okay. This first slide is looking
to the north. This is Jack London Square across the
channel, and this is Alameda. This is the redevelopment
area. This will be the new housing. The City of
Alameda is also developing a new business park and a
12-acre waterfront park.

While I have this slide up, I'm going to talk
about the environmental. This site is being developed
in connection with the redevelopment of the Alameda
Naval Air Station and the Fleet Industrial Supply
Center. I'm talking about the whole 215 acres right
now.

Over the course of several years, the
environmental mitigation has taken place. There were
asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint,
thermostats, florescent lamps identified in the
residential structures. In addition, organochlorine
pesticides used to prevent termite intrusion had
accumulated beneath the soil.

Demolition and OCP removal activities have been
performed. All asbestos and lead have been taken
off-site and disposed of properly. In addition,
29,000 tons of impacted soil have been removed from the
site and multiple rounds of excavation were performed until post-extraction sampling indicated that all pesticides have been removed to below the residential risk-based screening levels as established by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

We will be requesting an updated Phase I and review of the environmental reports by URS, our environmental consultant. If there’s any additional testing or remediation that needs to be completed, our consultant will let us know that. Also, if anything does need to be done, the Alameda Housing Authority is responsible for that pursuant to the ground lease.

Okay, this next slide is looking to the southwest. And this redevelopment area is 74 acres. This is the 74 acres that’s being redeveloped by Catellus. This is Atlantic Avenue, which is an existing street. Fifth Street, which is going to be a main -- a new main street to the new business park will be developed right here, right along the site and along the College of Alameda, which is adjacent to the site.

These will be single-family homes. This will be another main street developed called Main Street, and this will be Tinker Avenue along here. And this is where houses will be demolished also.

Oh, there’s also coast guard housing that’s
existing right here to the north of the site. And this
is the site plan for the new 72-acre site. There will
be a four-acre park with a school. This is the
multifamily housing site. It's three acres, a portion
of which is for ten townhomes which are also being
developed by RCD. That's not part of what we're
financing. We're financing the 2.5-acre site for
multifamily housing.

And Bayport Apartments consists of
34 two-bedroom flats and 18 three-bedroom townhomes.
It's designed with 11 separate two-story residential
buildings, each comprised of between two and eight
units. It's one of the reasons why the construction
costs are so high, because it's designed to fit into the
neighborhood, the new redeveloped single-family home
neighborhood.

Each building has outdoor space for each unit.
The buildings are wood frame, stucco siding. Roofs will
be pitched and composition shingles. The units will
have central gas heat, washer and dryer hookups.
There are 67 parking spaces on-site with additional
parking spaces on the surrounding streets. The project
will also have a laundry room and community room with a
community center. There will also be a basketball court
and a tot lot.
The next slide shows the rents. And the rents range from 30 percent to 81 percent of the market rates in the area. The rents are set at 35 percent SMI, 50 percent and 60 percent AMI.

Also, one other thing, the Section 8 rents are showing as higher than the market rate rents. There will be a Section 8 market study completed before construction starts. And the market study will determine what the final Section 8 rents are. We do have a Section 8 loan that’s ten years and that’s based -- it’s ten years because the Section 8 contract is ten years. And it’s based on the Section 8 rents during underwriting. If those change, the Section 8 loan will need to be reduced if they go down.

And I'll stop there.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: The sponsor on this project is Resources for Community Development. They have developed 900 affordable housing units and emergency shelter beds in 30 projects in the East Bay. We're very familiar with RCD. We have approved financing on five of their projects, four of them have been completed, and one of them, Laurel Apartments in Fairfield, has received a commitment but is not yet under construction.

And with that, we'd be happy to address any
questions, and we request approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Ed.

MR. CZUKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, can you explain why the construction loan needed to be split into both a taxable and tax exempt as opposed to just doing it in one way or the other? And then second, it looks like the architectural fees here are exceptionally high at over $12,000 a unit. And this gets back to an earlier comment, which is, you know, we look at the scope of all of the service contracts and subcontractors where there may be some excessive fees or is something else pushing it to that number? Maybe you can address that.

MS. ILVONEN: Okay. On the construction loan being split into a tax-exempt and taxable portion, that has to do the 50-percent test. 50 percent of the project's total development costs needs to be financed with tax-exempt financing. And we don't want to take more tax-exempt financing than the project needs, so we split the construction into a tax-exempt and taxable portion.

And on the architectural fees, they are high and I did ask about that. And it's because Catellus is building a 435-single-family home development in the neighborhood, and there was a lot of opposition to
building affordable housing. This is actually the result of a lawsuit that this affordable housing is being required to be built. And it -- it's required to fit into the character of the neighborhood, so there's a lot -- there's many small buildings with a lot of architectural features, and that's why the architectural fees and construction costs are very high on this project.

MR. CZUKER: So the construction costs are really not that high when you factor in the three-bedrooms and the larger units. The architectural fees, do they include perhaps some zoning or planning entitlement work?

MS. ILVONEN: I am not sure of that.

MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: What we see with a lot of these projects where there's been a lot of neighborhood opposition, things get drawn and redrawn and redesigned, and that really can make our architectural fees a lot more expensive than you would otherwise expect.

MS. PARKER: I think we had that issue at our last meeting on a project that was in Berkeley that we had tremendous neighborhood opposition, and the redrawing of it continued to escalate the costs.

MR. CZUKER: That makes sense.
MR. SHINE: In theory that sounds right. In Berkeley they were forced to change that which they'd built, so it was a much different thing. They put in some facade goodies on the building so it fits into the neighborhood.

And it gets back to the comment earlier that when you do address the construction line item, the more particulars of what you add up to get to construction, probably a good idea would be, as another note, to do the same thing in the architecture. Because unless there's a lot of money spent on zoning and expediters and political and neighborhood outreach and so on, I'm sure this is a direct ultimately, but it looks funny to those of us who have been building for a long time and aren't accustomed to those kinds of things.

MR. WARREN: I think it's important to note that on these types of projects, particularly in urban areas like Berkeley and Alameda, that those have development periods of four and five and six years, which is not uncommon. The project that Terri mentioned had a development period of almost three years. Each time there is a change, the architect has to do something. So what we often see is that the fees are high.

But it often represents a four- and five-year process in which the architect gets it every single
time. I've seen that happen time and time again,
particularly in these neighborhood opposition groups, it
just takes a lot to keep architects on task.
MR. SHINE: We're not saying it doesn't happen.
I have had my own projects. It's just -- we'll look
forward to your exhibit.
MR. WARREN: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: I had one eight and a half
years, 74 hearings, before I broke ground.
MR. SHINE: You win.
MR. FRANKLIN: I think that --
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: I got it approved, but
then they sued and incorporated. I got approved by the
county board of supervisors. My architects and legal
fees were out of sight. In fact, I flew down this
morning with my lawyer who defended me. So it drove the
costs up. Eight and a half years and your pro forma
doesn't look too good.
MR. FRANKLIN: Again, the discussion when you're
talking construction, constructive attention on costs is
very healthy. I think it's a good thing to keep
watching.

Just a parenthetical comment, our unit that
reviews housing elements for all jurisdictions in the
state has spent much of the summer with this City, which
does, as the write-up mentioned, have a measure in place that effectively prohibits multifamily development, which is why they're doing the ground lease from the housing authority. But it's an extremely difficult environment to develop in right now. They're about to get another military lease, I believe, in addition to this one, so there are big plans to do more, but it will be interesting to see if they can get it done. But it is, I think, one of the toughest development environments.

In that light, it's disappointing to see $15,000 a unit on impact fees, because they hit them coming and going, but.

MS. ILVONEN: Mr. Czuker, I was just told that these architectural costs also include site work, joint trench, and high civil engineering costs.

MR. CZUKER: I'm sorry, I could barely hear you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Say it again, Tina.

MS. ILVONEN: The architectural fees also include site work, joint trench, and high civil engineering costs.

MR. CZUKER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Makes more sense.

In any case, the project pencils out and you recommend we approve it then.
MS. WHITTALL-SCHERFEE: Yes. Yes, we do.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: How about that, you guys?

Cathy.

MS. SANDOVAL: I noticed that there's significant environmental mitigation that has gone on, and I'm glad to see that you're going to be continuing to review it. Are we comfortable with how the environmental mitigation was been conducted, and how it's affected the cost of the project?

MS. ILVONEN: Well, we haven't had it reviewed by our environmental consultant yet. But the reports that I have reviewed said that it has met the risk-based screening tests of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and that no further environmental investigation is necessary, that they removed the asbestos and the leads and disposed of it off-site and removed the pesticide-containing soil and disposed of it off-site.

In addition, the Housing Authority of the City of Alameda is responsible for any environmental work that is found to be necessary, if any.

MR. HUGHES: I can add from personal experience in my private practice, I represented the original party who was entitled to the site with the base closing, and the entire base has been studied extremely stringently. And my client was also satisfied with the remediation at
this particular site. As it turned out, someone else
 came in and got it, but the EOD has some residual for
 liability.

 CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Yes, Jack.

 MR. SHINE: Just one question. Tell me about
 the insurance.

 CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Jack, hold that just a
 little bit closer.

 MR. SHINE: I noticed they had asked for an
 exemption in having to have any earthquake insurance.
 Is that -- I imagine that's been a source of a great
 deal of discussion. I haven't heard any mention about
 it. Are we -- is this recommendation one that includes
 granting the exemption for them to have earthquake
 insurance?

 MR. WARREN: That's right. Most of these -- all
 of these construction projects today have requested the
 waiver. And how we are approaching that from a
 procedural standpoint is we are delivering architectural
 packages that were designed by URS, our earthquake
 engineer, to the architect and the construction engineer
 telling them what the requirements are to meet our level
 for the waiver of the earthquake insurance. They
 basically fill that out, respond back with preliminary
 plans, and based upon the representations, then we
proceed assuming the waiver would be granted.

MR. SHINE: You're talking about additional requirements with regard to structural?

MR. WARREN: That's correct, yeah, to meet UBC97 or greater.

To date, every one we've gotten back -- we've gotten back two or three, I think, so far. And they have all met the standards with a minimum of the increased structural. The next project is a little different. I'll tell you about that in just a minute.

So with the design that's being followed, then when we get the final set of plans, then we get the final waiver. And if someone should fail to do so, then the insurance may be required. But in almost -- in all cases to date, the engineers have indicated they have complied with our requirements.

MR. SHINE: The necessary structural engineering?

MR. WARREN: Exactly. And then during the construction period, our engineer goes back out to the site, inspects it, and the final plan is signed off. So it's a complete project, and this process costs the sponsors an additional $10,000 in fees, which we then use to pay our structural engineers to do the analysis.

MS. ILVONEN: In this project, the earthquake
insurance is included. The earthquake insurance is
included in the operational budget on this, because at
the time of the underwriting, I wasn't certain they
would be receiving the earthquake waiver. So if they do
going to go down as far as their cash flow, and their
cash flow will look better.

MR. SHINE: They will receive more cash.

MS. ILVONEN: Right. Right.

MR. SHINE: Does this have any --

MS. ILVONEN: They won't be spending the cash
they had in the budget for earthquake insurance, anyway.

MR. SHINE: Does that have any impact on our
loan or on the reserve or anything? If we issue the
waiver, is additional cash -- what happens to it?

MR. WARREN: The reason we did the project in
the first place was to reduce the amount of locality
financing, but -- not having all the numbers in front of
me, but in the general sense of our loan can go out and
it can be supported, which it should be because of
reduced operating expenses, then locality financing
would probably need to go down. It would go down.

MR. SHINE: Then what goes down?

MR. WARREN: The locality contribution would be
less because our loan would be larger.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Makes sense. But we're right on the threshold. We haven't had -- we had the presentation by URS two meetings ago or whenever?
MS. PARKER: Last meeting.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: At the last meeting?
MS. PARKER: The last meeting.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And set up these guidelines. And everybody -- what's happened is that everybody is trying to meet the guidelines.
MR. WARREN: Yes, they are.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And school is still out whether they do and the impacts related thereto.
MR. SHINE: I'm sure glad there's 25-percent LTD.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. Any further questions?
If not, the Chair will entertain a motion.
No motion; these guys lose.
MS. SANDOVAL: Move to approve.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Cathy.
MR. FRANKLIN: I second.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Matt.
There's a motion duly secondly before us. Any discussion on the motion?
Seeing, hearing none, Secretary, please call the
1 roll.

2 MS. OJIMA: Thank you.
3 Ms. Johantgen.
4 MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.
5 MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.
6 MR. BAYUK: Aye.
7 MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.
8 MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.
9 MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.
10 MR. CZUKER: Aye.
11 MS. OJIMA: Mr. Franklin.
12 MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.
13 MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.
14 MR. SHINE: Aye.
15 MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.
16 CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.
17 MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-44 has been approved.
18 CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-44 is hereby approved. We have done Copper Creek at the front end, and so we're now on our last project, Mission Creek in San Francisco.
19 (Mr. Bayuk leaves.)
20 Resolution 03-46 (Mission Creek)
21 MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, the request for Mission Creek is for the initial commitment. Let me
explain why we are doing it this way.

A few weeks ago, we got a request from the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and Mercy Housing to put forth a financing proposal for the Mission Creek Senior Project which is being developed down in the Mission Creek redevelopment area in the city. The reason we were asked is with the upward movement of long-term rates, both the RDA and Mercy felt that it would be appropriate and helpful to the project if we would put together a financing package to help with the long-term financing.

We know this project. Tina and I looked at it basically about a year ago. But because of earthquake insurance issues, interestingly enough, we didn't proceed. So the request is really twofold. The first is that in order to include this in the upcoming third-round bond issue -- by the way, the RDA has put the request for bond allocation in the third round with CDLAC, and it's under consideration now. If the RDA decides that our financing is beneficial, then they may transfer the allocation to the Agency for inclusion in the third-round approval bond issue.

In order to do that, we need to have some action by the Board that our finance folks can show to the bond underwriters saying that the Board has generally
approved this. Then what would happen in November, we
would come back for a final commitment. And then the
timing of the final commitment in November would be at
or about the time that the full bond issue for the
program is being priced, so it would fit into it fairly
well, but it needs to be included early on for the
planning purposes and pricing purposes.

If the RDA decides not to pull the allocation
and have us do the transaction, then we would go for a
bond re-funding, which would mean three years after the
project is completed we would then re-fund out based on
the life of the main loan, which is approximately
$10 million.

So the financial request in front of the Board
today is for an initial commitment, and you would see
the final in November, that if the CDLAC allocation is
pulled and given to us, we would do a primary loan for
$10,400,000 and a bridge loan for $11,555,000. If it's a
re-funding, then we would only do the $10,400,000 of the
transaction.

I'll stop there and let Tina show you a couple
quick slides.

MS. ILVONEN: Okay. I just wanted to explain
one thing about it. The first loan is a 20-year fixed
fully amortized loan, and that loan is based on both the
tax credit rents and the Section 8 rents. There will be
a ten-year Section 8 contract, but the second ten years,
Years 11 through 20, would be guaranteed by the
redevelopment agency. That's why we're underwriting a
20-year Section 8 loan and combining it as really one
loan.

And other financing on the project is MHP funds
of $7 million, AHP funds of $625,000. The redevelopment
agency has several loans to the project; a $10.8 million
first mortgage -- or mortgage from redevelopment agency
funds; a million-dollar mortgage from HOPWA funds; a
third mortgage of $360,000 from CDBG funds, and that's
specifically for the adult day health center; and a
fourth mortgage is $431,000, and it's a hazardous
materials mitigation and demolition loan.

The project is in the Mission Bay area of San
Francisco, and it's in a developed neighborhood by the
new Giants ballpark. It's adjacent to the Mission Place
being developed by Catellus, which will include
595 rental units, 45,000 square feet of neighborhood
office space, 83,000 feet of retail space including a
Safeway, a Borders Books, and a Wells Fargo.

Towards the northeast is the South Beach area
with residences, restaurants, a marina, and the new
ballpark. There's also the Yerba Buena Center close by.
The site is one acre, and the project will consist of a seven-story L-shaped reinforced concrete frame. The structure includes approximately 174,000 square feet. Parking is provided in an on-grade garage with 34 spaces. The building will be serviced with two elevators. There will be a courtyard garden on the second-level podium deck. There's also rooftop terraces. The building also contains property management offices, maintenance spaces on the first floor, a multipurpose room, exercise rooms, computer room, and a community kitchen next to the resident dining room on the second floor, and laundry facilities on each floor.

In addition to the residential areas in the building, there's also a city library branch, a 4,000-square-foot retail commercial space, and a 6,000-square-foot adult day health center.

This project is for frail elderly, and the project will be fully accessible to accommodate their needs. There will also be a lot of services on-site in addition to the adult day health center, two full-time on-site community and resident initiative coordinators, and 24-hour security desk coverage.

The adult day health center will accept residents from the Mission Creek Center community as
well as other seniors in the area. It will be open
seven days a week and will serve a total of 100 -- 80 to
100 individuals per day. The services include skilled
nursing, occupational and physical therapy, and personal
care.

I also wanted to talk about the environmental on
this project. This is part of Mission Bay and it was --
it was filled in the late 1800s. The site is blanketed
by approximately 30 feet of fill. There has been a
geotechnical investigation on the site, and it is
recommended that the building be supported on a pile
foundation, with the piles reaching the bedrock in order
to gain support from the bedrock.

There was a Phase I done on the entire site
that's being developed, and Catellus is responsible for
cleaning the environmental problems on the site. Lead
has been found in the soil as well as other metals. The
soil that is being disturbed by the development, where
there's drilling for piles, that will be removed from
the site. And we will request a Phase I update and
review of the environmental reports by URS, if this loan
does end up coming to CalHFA.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Tina.

The earthquake insurance is important from the
standpoint that, as Tina indicated, the project is built
on piles. We've had a preliminary review by URS that
did come back very positive. We have some remaining
reviews to do, but because of the fill nature of this
part of the Bay Area, it should pass the earthquake
waiver, so we will think good thoughts.

So with that, we'd like to recommend approval,
with the understanding if we do proceed with the
project, the Board will see it in November.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. Let's let somebody
go before Ed here.

MR. FRANKLIN: I actually just have a question.
I'm interested in the RDA guaranteeing the second ten
years on the HAP contract. Have you seen that before,
do you expect them to do it in other circumstances, and
what do you think was sort of, you know, the calculus
for them in coming to that decision? Because I think if
we could get more RDAs in that kind of situation, it
would help us leverage these dollars quite a bit more.

MR. WARREN: It would really be nice. This is
an established program with the RDA. They have done
this on a number of projects with a number of loans. We
did the first one, as a matter of fact, with the RDA on
a project four years ago. And the reason we did this is
concerns from the redevelopment agency had been very
aggressive in reserving the Section 8 profits. They
really have written the book on this.
And the way they did it is through leasehold projects and to guarantee the Section 8 to encourage lenders like us and others like Citibank to lend against that Section 8 increment and then what they'd do is essentially guarantee us.

What lenders have done is gone back to the RDA and said show us how you reserved appropriately for this should bad things happen. And all of us have come away very satisfied that there are reserves that are set aside, there are liability dollars set aside by the RDA, and they, like us, are betting on the good nature of HUD to go forward with their funding and stuff like that, so we shall see.

But it's a very good project, a very good program by the RDA. And you're right, Mr. Franklin, we've actually encouraged other RDAs to do the same thing, and some are actually being more serious than others have, but with the guarantee from the RDA, we are comfortable.

MR. FRANKLIN: Are you -- can you tell me, are you seeing it in other areas and do you think that other large RDAs are in similar positions as far as their reserve requirements?

MR. WARREN: I think they are. Certainly in all
fairness, San Francisco RDA has a fair amount of assets.
Others don't. I've come across a couple towns in the
Valley actually that have guaranteed this. I'm not sure
where Los Angeles and San Diego are, although we have
had discussion with them. I think it's something that we
bring up on a regular basis and ask if they'll do it.

MR. FRANKLIN: I'd encourage that, exactly,
whenever you're working with the RDAs to basically ask
the question --

MR. WARREN: That's correct.

MR. FRANKLIN: -- As to whether they would. I
personally think it's a very good bet, and this is
exactly what we need as a first step forward to create
the comfort for lenders such as CalHFA.

MR. WARREN: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Jack.

MR. SHINE: We're building -- there's 80 units
at about 550 feet apiece in the project, which adds up
to about 75-, 80,000 feet a building. What is the other
hundred thousand feet for?

MR. WARREN: Well, there are 140 units in total in
the project.

MR. SHINE: Okay. Well, that doubles it.

MR. WARREN: That was an easy one, Mr. Shine.

Thank you for that softball.
CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: You want the record stricken?

MR. SHINE: 140 units, right, at 550 feet per unit? Right?

MR. WARREN: Right.

MR. SHINE: Is about 80,000 square feet; right?

MR. WARREN: And there are --

MR. SHINE: 170,000 feet in the project. I'm just curious what it's devoted to.

MR. WARREN: There's --

MS. ILVONEN: There's a library branch, there's the adult day health center, and there's 4,000 square feet of retail space in the project also.

MR. SHINE: That adds up to a hundred thousand feet or so.

MS. ILVONEN: Yes.

MR. SHINE: None of that is parking, is it?

MS. ILVONEN: And there is some parking.

There are only 34 parking spaces because this is a project for frail seniors.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. Jack, do you want to think about it while --

MS. PARKER: Mr. Shine, I would certainly --

MR. SHINE: I'm --

MS. PARKER: To the extent that we come back, I
know that this isn't an issue today, if there are
questions that the Board would certainly like for us to
focus on in our presentation next month when it comes
back, let us know what they are and we'll make sure it's
addressed.

MR. SHINE: I think it's a nice project. I'm
not familiar with this kind of project because I don't
develop that kind of development, so it's like speaking
a different language. But it seems to me if you're
building something with 70- to 80,000 feet of usable
space for the purpose which you're building, which is a
place for people to live, and you're constructing
175,000 feet to get there, then I don't know if it's
mandated or appropriate or what the reason is, but it
seems to me somebody is getting a hundred thousand feet
of something that is not devoted for places for people
to live. And I'm just curious what it is what we're
building. Are we trying to get them to the city?

MR. WARREN: That is what the RDA -- they are
redeveloping the entire Mission Bay area and this is one
of the --

MR. SHINE: Is that part of why they're giving
us $10 million?

MR. WARREN: And that's why they're giving us so
much money. That's exactly right.
MR. SHINE: If they're paying for it, I don't care, I'm just curious.

MR. FRANKLIN: That is part, as I think the presentation highlighted somewhat, but there's a very large redevelopment across basically from the ballpark heading west for, you know -- they went through the numbers, but it's a phenomenally large development, and they're building a lot of housing and intentionally, you know, mixed use. So that's why I think he said a pretty retail -- is it retail or office?

MS. ILVONEN: 4,000 square feet of retail.

MR. FRANKLIN: It was only 4,000.

MS. PARKER: Because there's the library.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Okay. Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: First, to shed some light on the question, the prior question, it is very common in senior citizen projects of this type to have tremendous amounts of recreational space that's devoted to the project, whether it be community rooms, whether it be libraries, whether it be even to put in, in some cases, dining facilities, activity rooms of all kinds, including sometimes being able to host doctors and so forth, and so they have a large percentage, maybe not a hundred thousand square feet, but to have a large amount of common area associated with the relatively small size
of senior units is actually a normal phenomenon for
senior projects of this type.

I think the cost per unit obviously is still an
issue. You're dealing with San Francisco being a
high-cost area, and the cost of this construction is
very expensive. That's something we've discussed
before. But to address your original concern, it is not
uncommon to have numerous common area facilities that
support and add services to the seniors who live in
these facilities.

Obviously, since this is a preliminary review,
the appraisals aren't done yet. We don't know how the
high cost is going to be handled, relative to loan-to-
value, loan to cost, which I'm sure we'll address later.

I just had a question which wasn't really
discussed in any great detail relative to the
possibility of a bridge loan and maybe you can take a
minute to explain when and -- when would a bridge loan
come into being? It's only for one year. You mentioned
that depending on the approvals of the City, it may or
may not be necessary, and I'm not quite sure how it ties
into --

MR. WARREN: That's --

MR. CZUKER: What's the source for repayment of
that bridge loan?
MR. WARREN: The source of the repayment if we did the bridge loan would be tax credit equity for the project. And the reason we would only do the bridge loan would be to -- of the tax-exempt financing would be to qualify for the 4-percent credits.

If the allocation stays with the RDA and those credits are financed by Citibank, for example, then the 4 percent/50-percent test is met through that particular construction loan, so it's not an issue. If the allocation came to us, since we're not the construction lender under either scenario in this project, the bridge loan would have to be put in in three years to qualify the project for the 4-percent credits.

MR. CZUKER: So if the -- if I understand you correctly, if Citibank or an outside source provides the construction financing, then CalHFA will not be requested to provide a bridge loan, and the only time that becomes necessary is if you're in effect bridging the construction period and using tax credit proceeds to retire another bridge loan.

MR. WARREN: Not really bridging the construction period, but placing additional tax-exempt debt on the property at a point in time when you qualify for the 4-percent credits.

MR. CZUKER: So it's the 50-percent rule?
MR. WARREN: That's correct. Yeah. And that would happen at the same time the permanent loan would go on, but it's only to facilitate the 4 percent and it's only the one-year bridge loan.
And bridge loan is probably a bad term. It's really just kind of a facilitating loan for a year to qualify.

MR. CZUKER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Any further questions?

So you're looking for an initial go-forward and sort out some of these issues and come back hopefully pretty soon?

MR. WARREN: Yeah.

MR. CZUKER: Move approval.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Approval by Mr. Czuker.

Or motion by Mr. Czuker.

MR. FRANKLIN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Mr. Franklin seconds.

Any discussion on the motion for initial approval? Board? Audience?
Hearing and seeing none, Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you.

Ms. Johantgen.

MS. JOHANTGEN: Aye.
MS. OJIMA: Mr. Bayuk.

(No audible response was heard.)

MS. OJIMA: Ms. Sandoval.

MS. SANDOVAL: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Czuker.

MR. CZUKER: Oh, is it me? Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Thank you Mr. Czuker.

Mr. Franklin.

MR. FRANKLIN: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Shine.

MR. SHINE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Aye.

MS. OJIMA: Resolution 03-46 has been approved.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Resolution 03-46 is hereby approved.

What else have you got, Linn?

MR. WARREN: We're done, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Let me then say, Item 5.

Item 5: Discussion of Other Board Matters/Reports

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Are there any other unagendized items from the Board that are pressing that we should put forth at this moment?

MR. SHINE: I think you should be complimented on shepherding us through all of these projects in time
for you to get out so we can also.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: The last train out of
town.

Actually, what I was going to say is we have all
done good. This went smoother, better. The
presentations were right on the money and short and
sweet, so well done to all of us. And the Board, I
think your questions were excellent today and shed some
light on the situation. They were really helpful. Good
for us.

So Item 5, nothing.

Item 6: Public Testimony

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: Anything from the members
of the public who might be here under Item 6 that you
would like to bring to our attention?

Hearing, seeing none, let me again thank you,
remind you that our parking discount tickets are up here
up front with JoJo.

We look forward to our next meeting on November
13th. I'm not sure I do. It's our 48th anniversary. I
may not make it. But my wife has long held that I'm
always at some kind of a meeting on our anniversary
anyway --

MS. PARKER: It's in the Bay Area, Mr. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: -- And that one of these
days I'll make it up to her.

MS. PARKER: It's in the Bay Area.

JoJo has sent out to you all to look at your calendars for next year the 2004 calendar. I would point out that we're going to try to invite Mr. Klein to come to accept a gift of appreciation, so I'm trying to work on that, so you may see your colleague at the next meeting. I encourage you all to attend.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: And he's right down the peninsula, so that's a great time to do that.

Did you have a question?

MS. JOHANTGEN: No.

CHAIRPERSON WALLACE: No? I thought I saw a hand waving over here, but I just failed an eye test, so I apologize. What's that big E over there? Okay.

Thanks again. You did great.

We are on our way.

(Whereupon the meeting concluded at 12:32 p.m.)
I hereby certify the foregoing meeting was held at the time and place therein named; that the proceedings were reported by me, a duly certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested person, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.
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CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
Final Commitment
Murphy Ranch II
Morgan Hill, Santa Clara County, CA
CalHFA # 03-053 C/N

SUMMARY

This is a final commitment request for construction financing in the amount of $7,235,000 and a permanent loan in the amount of $4,400,000. Murphy Ranch II is a 38-unit family apartment project in Morgan Hill. The property is owned by Murphy Ranch II LP, a Limited Partnership whose general partner is First Community Housing Corporation.

LOAN TERMS

Construction

First Mortgage: $7,235,000
Interest Rate: Variable
Term: 18 Months, interest only
Financing: Tax-exempt

CalHFA construction financing is subject to the assignment by the borrower of tax credit equity and all rights under non-CalHFA financing commitments.

Permanent

First Mortgage: $4,400,000
Interest Rate: 5.50%
Term: 30 year fixed, fully amortized
Financing: Tax-exempt

LOCALITY INVOLVEMENT

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Morgan Hill (RDA) has committed a loan in the principal amount of $3,400,000 for a term of 55 years, at 4% simple interest. The RDA loan will subordinate to a CalHFA first deed of trust and regulatory agreement.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

- The subject property is located in the City of Morgan Hill, in southern Santa Clara County. Morgan Hill is bordered by San Jose, San Martin and Gilroy, and is 20 miles south of downtown San Jose.

January 5, 2004
The site is located at 310 East Dunne Avenue at the intersection of Butterfield Road, in a Redevelopment district known as Ojo De Agua. The project is one-half mile from two grocery-anchored shopping centers, two miles from major retail shopping, within 0.7 to two miles from all levels of schools, two blocks from the CalTrain station, and a bus stop is located across the street. A new community and cultural center is .25 miles from the site, two public parks are within one-half mile of the site and Highway 101 is one-half mile away.

The property is an in-fill site and is Phase II of Murphy Ranch, an existing 62-unit family apartment project financed by CalHFA, completed in July and that achieved stabilized occupancy in September 30, 2003.

Land uses in the vicinity include a mix of single family homes, vacant land and commercial buildings.

**Site**

- The project consists of a 38-unit family apartment building on a 2.02 acre site.
- The property is zoned R-3/RPD, which allows for development as planned.

**Improvements**

Phase II consists of ten two-story residential buildings containing 38 townhouse-style units. Thirty-four units are townhouse-style ranging in size from two bedrooms, 1-3/4 baths to four bedrooms, two baths. Four of the three bedroom, two bath units are flats. The units will contain a dishwasher, refrigerator, a washer and dryer, a garbage disposal, gas range/oven, plastic laminate countertops and forced air heating and air conditioning. Hot water is provided by an individual heater. Each unit will have a large private patio and a walk-in closet. Each bedroom will be wired for phone and internet access. The buildings will be wood frame construction on reinforced concrete slab foundations, with composition shingle roofs, and Hardiplank exterior siding with wood trim. There will be 124 parking spaces; 104 spaces are uncovered, and 20 are covered.

The community building is 2,800 square feet and contains offices, a learning/computer center, full kitchen, a recreation/meeting room, two bathrooms and a maintenance room. A pool with a cabana is located next to the community building. The cabana contains two showers and a storage room. A large play area is located near the pool and a second tot lot is located near Phase II buildings.

The community building, two playgrounds, pool and cabana have been constructed and are located on the land within the first phase. The on-going maintenance costs will be shared on a pro-rata basis by the two phases. A recorded access agreement, an operating expense reimbursement agreement, a joint use agreement and cross easements are subject to review and approval by CalHFA prior to recordation of the permanent loan.

Murphy Ranch exceeds Title 24 energy standards by 25% by utilizing such methods as gas appliances, low flow water fixtures, hydronic heating and cooling, vinyl double-glazed windows, recycled carpet and interior trim, photovoltaic electricity generation for common area lighting and solar-heating for the pool.

Parking for the subject phase will total 124 spaces, 104 of which are covered. The parking ratio is 3.25 spaces per unit. In addition, the developer will offer all residents of Murphy Ranch free transit passes for CalTrain use.

January 5, 2004
Construction of Phase II is scheduled to begin in June 2004 and is expected to be completed by June 2005.

**Unit Mix:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>No. of Bedrooms</th>
<th>No. of Bathrooms</th>
<th>Unit Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 3/4</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,164-1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Off-site improvements**

All off-site improvements have been completed as part of Phase I.

**MARKET**

**Market Overview**

- The City of Morgan Hill is located near San Jose to the North and San Martin and Gilroy to the South. The market study defines the Primary Market Area (PMA) as Morgan Hill and the adjoining unincorporated community of San Martin. The PMA spans a radius of between six and 15 miles from the subject.
- The population in the PMA is 49,295 residents, and is expected to grow by 1.15% annually between 2003 to 2008, 37% higher than growth anticipated in Santa Clara County.
- There are 15,472 households in the PMA, with an average of 3.4 persons per household.
- The median household income in the PMA is $93,144, which is 11% higher than that of Santa Clara County. Nearly 53% of the households in the PMA earn less than the PMA’s median household income.
- Single family units comprise 80% of the housing units in the PMA, according to the 2000 census information.
- The median value of a single family home in the PMA in 2003 is estimated to be $632,501, which is 14% higher than that of the County.
- Renters account for 25% of all households in the PMA and 90% of these renter households occupy multifamily housing. Over 85% of the multifamily housing stock in the PMA was built prior to 1980.
- Within the PMA, 34% of all renter households pay over 40% of their income towards rent.
- Employment in Santa Clara County is broken down as follows: 38% in the services industry, followed by manufacturing (18%) and retail (12%). Within the PMA, employment by occupations closely follows that of the County.
- From 2000 to 2003, employment grew 2.1%. The unemployment rate in Morgan Hill was 6.6%, well below that of Santa Clara County, which is currently 8.4%.
Housing Demand and Supply

In the PMA, seven market-rate projects were surveyed, totaling 413 units. The market study focused on projects which were in close proximity to the subject, had a similar floor plan, and were newer, or recently remodeled. There were very few projects containing three bedroom units and none containing four bedroom units. Therefore, the market study surveyed single family homes to determine market rents for these floor plans.

Rents for the market rate projects surveyed range from $1,200 to $1,372 for a two-bedroom unit and $1,867 to $1,967 for three- and four-bedroom units. Common area amenities in the market rate projects were similar to the subject's, with covered parking, a pool and a community room. Unit amenities were similar to the subject's as well, with air conditioning, dishwashers, storage and patios. Occupancy levels averaged 95.8% for market rate projects in the PMA.

There are seven affordable rental properties totaling 438 units within the PMA. Of the affordable properties surveyed, 40% of the units are restricted to those earning 50% of median and 26% are restricted to those earning 60% of median. The majority of the affordable housing projects were built in the 1990's. The affordable properties leased up as rapidly as they were completed and most have extensive waiting lists. The vacancy rate is from 1% to 2% and vacancy is merely a factor of turnover. Occupancy levels averaged 98% for affordable projects in the PMA.

There is presently one affordable housing project in the planning stages which is a 72-unit, 9% tax credit project in Morgan Hill. Grading began in August and the project will be ready for occupancy in late 2004, prior to Phase II's entry to the market, scheduled for mid-2005.

PROJECT FEASIBILITY

Market rents are estimated to be $1,300 for two-bedroom units, $1,500 for three-bedroom units and $1,610 for four-bedroom units.

Rent Differentials (Market versus Restricted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Market Rate Average</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
<th>% Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$371</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$426</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,301</td>
<td></td>
<td>$199</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,610</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,449</td>
<td></td>
<td>$161</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated Lease-up Period

The project is expected to be leased up within 60 days of completion, which is an absorption rate of 18 units per month. This estimate is based on the achievement of Phase I, which was completed mid July and fully occupied by September 30, 2003 at rents identical to Phase II. During the marketing of Phase I, an interest list of over 1,000 was generated, resulting in a waiting list of 652 qualified applicants. This waiting list will also be utilized for Murphy Ranch II.

OCCUPANCY RESTRICTIONS

CalHFA 20% of the units (8) will be restricted to 50% or less of AMI

City of Morgan Hill 100% of the units (38) will be restricted to 60% or less of AMI

TCAC 100% of the units (38) are restricted to 60% or less of AMI

ENVIRONMENTAL

A Phase I Environmental Assessment report prepared by Confidential Compliance Consultants dated August 8, 1998 was completed for Phase I and II. No adverse conditions were noted. An updated Phase I report has been ordered and will be a condition of closing the construction loan.

ARTICLE XXXIV

A letter dated March 22, 2001 by the City of Morgan Hill Redevelopment Agency states that the Murphy Ranch project received approval under Article XXXIV through adoption by the voters of Gilroy and Santa Clara County of Measure A in November, 1988.

DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Borrower

Murphy Ranch II, LP

The project is to be owned by Murphy Ranch II, LP, a California limited partnership, with First Community Housing Corporation, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation ("FCH") as the general partner. FCH has been developing affordable housing in California for over 15 years and has completed seven projects containing 535 units. Currently three projects with 236 units are under construction. CalHFA financed a loan to lender loan for the construction of the first phase of Murphy Ranch and the permanent loan is scheduled to close this month, ahead of the original closing schedule.

January 5, 2004
The borrower has offered a Completion and Repayment guarantee during construction. The guarantee is subject to review and approval by staff of the financial information provided by the borrower and compliance with the Agency's underwriting standards.

Management Agent

The John Stewart Company

The John Stewart Company ("John Stewart") was founded in 1978 and is a full service housing management organization with employees throughout the state of California. John Stewart manages over 22,000 rental apartment units, 70 of which are tax credit projects totaling over 5,000 units. They are known to CalHFA and manage several projects in the CalHFA portfolio, and are the manager of Phase I.

Architect

Fisher-Friedman Associates

Fisher-Friedman Associates was founded in 1964 and specializes in residential design and planning. They have designed over 40 apartment projects in California totaling over 9,000 units. Fisher-Friedman is the architect for Phase I.

Contractor

L & D Construction Co., Inc.

L & D Construction Co., Inc. ("L & D") was incorporated in 1979 and their primary focus of on multifamily rental units. Their client list includes projects for ten non-profit developers. L & D has completed 10 affordable housing projects with over 1,163 units during the past twenty years and has over 452 units in three projects currently under construction.
Project Summary

Project Profile:

- Project: Murphy Ranch II
- Location: 310 East Dunne Avenue
- Cap Rate: 7.50%
- Market: $7,000,000
- County: Santa Clara
- Construction: $8,170,000
- Borrower: Murphy Ranch II, L.P.
- GP: First Community Housing Corp.
- As Restricted: $8,300,000
- LP: Apollo Capital LLC
- Program: Tax-Exempt
- CalHFA #: 03-063
- Loan/Cost: 60% 37%
- Loan/Value: 87% 53%

Project Description:

- Units: 36
- Handicap Units: 2
- Bridge Type: Flats, townhomes
- Buildings: 10
- Stories: 1
- Gross Sq Ft: 47,018
- Land Sq Ft: 67,899
- Units/Acre: 19
- Total Parking: 124
- Covered Parking: 20

Financing Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA First Mortgage</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$115,789</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$89,474</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>$93,063</td>
<td>$2,449</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>$4,121,546</td>
<td>$108,462</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Construction Loan-tax-exempt</td>
<td>$7,235,000</td>
<td>$190,395</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit Mix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Manager 25% AMI</th>
<th>40% AMI</th>
<th>50% AMI</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees, Escrows, and Reserves:

**PERMANENT LOAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Basis of Requirements</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Permanent Loan</td>
<td>0.50% Permanent Loan</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Bridge Loan</td>
<td>0.50% Bridge Loan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Escrows**

- Construction Defect: 2.50% of Hard Costs; $167,607; Letter of Credit

**Reserves**

- Operating Expense Reserve: 10.00% of Gross Income; $51,402; Cash
- Rent Up Reserve: 0; Cash
- Annual Replacement Reserve Deposit - New Co; $350 per unit; $13,300; Operations

**CONSTRUCTION LOAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Construction Loan</td>
<td>$72,350</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection fee</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guarantees**

- Bond Origination Guarantee: 1.00% of Total Loans; $72,350; letter of credit
- Completion Guarantee-Borrower: 10.00% of Construction Contract; $670,427; letter of credit
- Performance Bond-contractor: 100.00% of Total Hard Costs; 6,704,266; Bond
- Payment Bond-contractor: 100.00% of Total Hard Costs; 6,704,266; Bond
## Sources and Uses-Construction

### SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Lender / Source</th>
<th>Construction Amount</th>
<th>Loan per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Construction Loan</td>
<td>7,235,000</td>
<td>190,395</td>
<td>67.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>89,474</td>
<td>31.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutional Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,635,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>279,868</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.55%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity Financing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>86,040</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,040</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,106</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.45%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Loan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,791,040</td>
<td>283,975</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construction Amount</th>
<th>Loan per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>918,403</td>
<td>24,169</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>6,704,266</td>
<td>176,428</td>
<td>62.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>399,381</td>
<td>10,510</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey and Engineering</td>
<td>68,704</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Const. Loan Interest &amp; Fees</td>
<td>501,201</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Financing</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>9,026</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Costs</td>
<td>21,850</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>496,217</td>
<td>13,058</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fees</td>
<td>1,104,425</td>
<td>29,064</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAC</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>137,747</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,530,427</strong></td>
<td><strong>277,117</strong></td>
<td><strong>97.58%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer Overhead/Profit</td>
<td>225,613</td>
<td>5,937</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Processing Agent</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Loan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,791,040</td>
<td>283,975</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sources and Uses-Permanent
Murphy Ranch II

### SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Lender / Source</th>
<th>Perm Amount</th>
<th>Loan $ per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA First Mortgage</td>
<td>4,400,000</td>
<td>115,789</td>
<td>36.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>89,474</td>
<td>28.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Construction Loan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions From Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Contribution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutional Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>205,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.92%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity Financing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perm Amount</th>
<th>Loan $ per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credits</td>
<td>4,121,546</td>
<td>108,462</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Equity</td>
<td>93,063</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,214,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.08%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,014,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>316,174</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perm Amount</th>
<th>Loan $ per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>918,405</td>
<td>24,169</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>6,704,266</td>
<td>176,428</td>
<td>55.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>399,381</td>
<td>10,510</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey and Engineering</td>
<td>68,704</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Const. Loan Interest &amp; Fees</td>
<td>501,201</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Financing</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>60,428</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Costs</td>
<td>21,850</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>496,836</td>
<td>13,075</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fees</td>
<td>1,104,425</td>
<td>29,064</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAC</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>137,747</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,582,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>278,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.08%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perm Amount</th>
<th>Loan $ per unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer Overhead/Profit</td>
<td>1,397,159</td>
<td>36,767</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Processing Agent</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USES</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,014,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>316,174</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annual Operating Budget

### INCOME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Rental Income</td>
<td>514,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Potential Income (GPI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>514,020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13,527</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Less:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Loss</td>
<td>25,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>488,319</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12,851</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,851</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>53,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>39,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>15,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating and Maintenance</td>
<td>26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance and Business Taxes</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and Assessments</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Replacement Deposits</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,139</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,188</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Payments (1st loan)</td>
<td>299,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financial</strong></td>
<td><strong>299,793</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,889</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>458,932</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12,077</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,077</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent Dollars</th>
<th>Permanent Construction</th>
<th>Permanent Per Unit</th>
<th>% of Total Sources</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA First Mortgage</td>
<td>4,400,000</td>
<td>115,789</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>89,474</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Construction Loan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions From Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Contribution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>93,063</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>4,121,546</td>
<td>108,462</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,014,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,791,040</strong></td>
<td><strong>316,174</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gap)/Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES:

#### ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent Dollars</th>
<th>Permanent Construction</th>
<th>Permanent Loan Per Unit</th>
<th>% of perm. Loan Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Cost or Value</td>
<td>918,403</td>
<td>918,403</td>
<td>24,169</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Broker Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Improvements Value</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acquisition Cost</strong></td>
<td>918,403</td>
<td>918,403</td>
<td>24,169</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REHABILITATION

|                      |                  |                       |                       | 0.00%                 |
| Site Work            | -                 | -                      | -                       | 0.00%                 |
| Structures           | -                 | -                      | -                       | 0.00%                 |
| General Requirements | -                 | -                      | -                       | 0.00%                 |
| Contractor Overhead  | -                 | -                      | -                       | 0.00%                 |
| Contractor Profit    | -                 | -                      | -                       | 0.00%                 |
| **Total Rehab. Costs**| -                 | -                      | -                       | 0.00%                 |

#### NEW CONSTRUCTION

|                      |                  |                       |                       | 10.44%                |
| Site Work            | 1,253,982        | 1,253,982              | 33,000                 | 38.95%                |
| Structures           | 4,679,723        | 4,679,723              | 123,151                | 3.60%                 |
| General Requirements | 432,315          | 432,315                | 11,377                 | 2.82%                 |
| Contractor Overhead  | 338,246          | 338,246                | 8,901                  | 0.00%                 |
| Contractor Profit    | 0                 | 0                      | -                      | 0.00%                 |
| Furnishings          | 0                 | 0                      | -                      | 0.00%                 |
| **Total New Const. Costs**| 6,704,266       | 6,704,266              | 176,428                | 55.80%                |

#### ARCHITECTURAL FEES

|                      |                  |                       |                       | 2.78%                 |
| Design               | 334,381          | 334,381                | 8,800                  | 0.54%                 |
| Supervision          | 65,000           | 65,000                 | 1,711                  | 3.32%                 |
| **Total Architectural Costs**| 399,381        | 399,381                | 10,510                 | 0.57%                 |

#### SURVEY & ENGINEERING

|                      |                  |                       |                       | 0.57%                 |
| Design               | 68,704           | 68,704                 | 1,808                  |                       |

#### CONST. INTEREST & FEES

<p>|                      |                  |                       |                       | 1.61%                 |
| Const. Loan Interest | 193,482          | 193,482                | 5,092                  |                       |
| Construction Loan Fee| 72,350           | 72,350                 | 1,904                  | 0.60%                 |
| Application Fee      | 500               | 500                    | 13                     | 0.00%                 |
| Predevelopment Interest| -                | 0                      | -                      | 0.00%                 |
| Taxes                | 44,760            | 44,760                 | 1,178                  | 0.37%                 |
| Insurance            | 154,609           | 154,609                | 4,069                  | 1.29%                 |
| Title and Recording  | 15,000            | 15,000                 | 395                    | 0.12%                 |
| Contractor's insurance bond| -              | -                      | -                      | 0.00%                 |
| Title,escrow, misc. const.closing| 2,500           | 2,500                  | 66                     | 0.02%                 |
| CalHFA Construction Inspection Fee| 18,000         | 18,000                 | 474                    | 0.15%                 |
| <strong>Total</strong>            | <strong>501,201</strong>      | <strong>501,201</strong>            | <strong>12,716</strong>             | <strong>4.02%</strong>             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENT FINANCING</th>
<th>Permanent Dollars</th>
<th>Permanent Construction Dollars</th>
<th>Permanent Loan Per Unit</th>
<th>% of perm. Loan Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Fee-Permanent Loan</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and Recording</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Loan Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD Environ. Review</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-EQ Waiver Fee</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Perm. Financing Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.43%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL FEES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Legal Fee</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Legal</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-syndication/organization</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Attorney Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.79%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESERVES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense Reserve</td>
<td>51,402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Origination Guarantee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Credit Costs</td>
<td>9,026</td>
<td>9,026</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Up Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserve Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT COSTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Study</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>575</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.18%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINGENCY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Contingency</td>
<td>308,027</td>
<td>308,027</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On &amp; Off Site Contingency</td>
<td>77,007</td>
<td>77,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Cost Contingency</td>
<td>111,804</td>
<td>111,183</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contingency Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>496,838</strong></td>
<td><strong>496,217</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.14%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCAC App/Alloc/Monitor Fees</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Audit</td>
<td>15,347</td>
<td>15,347</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils, Survey, Testing</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Processing Fees</td>
<td>267,920</td>
<td>267,920</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fees</td>
<td>836,505</td>
<td>836,505</td>
<td>22,013</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Furnishings</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Audit</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Consultants</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,264,379</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,264,379</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,273</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.52%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COSTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer Overhead/Profit</td>
<td>1,397,159</td>
<td>225,613</td>
<td>36,767</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Processing Agent</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Processing Agent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Developer Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,432,159</strong></td>
<td><strong>260,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,688</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.92%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12,014,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,791,040</strong></td>
<td><strong>316,174</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Murphy Ranch II</th>
<th>CaHFA Development Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rent Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rents</td>
<td>514,020</td>
<td>526,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>514,020</td>
<td>526,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROSS INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>514,020</td>
<td>526,871</td>
<td>540,042</td>
<td>553,543</td>
<td>567,382</td>
<td>581,566</td>
<td>596,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Expense Increase</strong></td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>144,839</td>
<td>150,633</td>
<td>156,658</td>
<td>162,924</td>
<td>169,441</td>
<td>176,219</td>
<td>183,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,965</td>
<td>13,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Tax Increase</strong></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and Assessments</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>159,139</td>
<td>164,933</td>
<td>170,958</td>
<td>177,224</td>
<td>183,741</td>
<td>191,184</td>
<td>198,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET OPERATING INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>329,180</td>
<td>335,594</td>
<td>342,082</td>
<td>348,642</td>
<td>355,272</td>
<td>361,304</td>
<td>368,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEBT SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CaHFA - 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>29,387</td>
<td>35,802</td>
<td>42,290</td>
<td>48,849</td>
<td>55,479</td>
<td>61,512</td>
<td>68,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEBT COVERAGE RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEBT COVERAGE RATIO</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cash Flow

### RENTAL INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Rent Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rents</td>
<td>657,989</td>
<td>674,439</td>
<td>691,300</td>
<td>708,582</td>
<td>726,297</td>
<td>744,454</td>
<td>763,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RENTAL INCOME</td>
<td>657,989</td>
<td>674,439</td>
<td>691,300</td>
<td>708,582</td>
<td>726,297</td>
<td>744,454</td>
<td>763,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROSS INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>657,989</td>
<td>674,439</td>
<td>691,300</td>
<td>708,582</td>
<td>726,297</td>
<td>744,454</td>
<td>763,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expense Increase</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>214,397</td>
<td>222,973</td>
<td>231,892</td>
<td>241,168</td>
<td>250,814</td>
<td>260,847</td>
<td>271,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>14,663</td>
<td>14,663</td>
<td>14,663</td>
<td>14,663</td>
<td>15,396</td>
<td>15,396</td>
<td>15,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tax Increase</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and Assessments</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>230,060</td>
<td>238,836</td>
<td>247,555</td>
<td>256,831</td>
<td>267,211</td>
<td>277,243</td>
<td>287,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET OPERATING INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395,029</td>
<td>402,081</td>
<td>409,180</td>
<td>416,322</td>
<td>422,771</td>
<td>429,988</td>
<td>437,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEBT SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA - 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95,237</td>
<td>102,288</td>
<td>109,387</td>
<td>116,530</td>
<td>122,979</td>
<td>130,196</td>
<td>137,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEBT COVERAGE RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cash Flow

### RENTAL INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Rent Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rents</td>
<td>842,282</td>
<td>863,339</td>
<td>884,922</td>
<td>907,045</td>
<td>929,721</td>
<td>952,964</td>
<td>976,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>842,282</td>
<td>863,339</td>
<td>884,922</td>
<td>907,045</td>
<td>929,721</td>
<td>952,964</td>
<td>976,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROSS INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate: Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate: Affordable</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Vacancy Loss</td>
<td>42,114</td>
<td>43,167</td>
<td>44,246</td>
<td>45,352</td>
<td>46,486</td>
<td>47,648</td>
<td>48,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME</strong></td>
<td>800,168</td>
<td>820,172</td>
<td>840,676</td>
<td>861,693</td>
<td>883,235</td>
<td>905,316</td>
<td>927,949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expense Increase</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>317,360</td>
<td>330,054</td>
<td>343,257</td>
<td>356,987</td>
<td>371,266</td>
<td>386,117</td>
<td>401,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>16,166</td>
<td>16,166</td>
<td>16,166</td>
<td>16,166</td>
<td>16,975</td>
<td>16,975</td>
<td>16,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tax Increase</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and Assessments</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>334,526</td>
<td>347,221</td>
<td>360,423</td>
<td>374,153</td>
<td>389,241</td>
<td>404,092</td>
<td>419,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET OPERATING INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>465,641</td>
<td>472,951</td>
<td>480,253</td>
<td>487,540</td>
<td>493,994</td>
<td>501,225</td>
<td>508,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEBT SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA - 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>299,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>165,849</td>
<td>173,158</td>
<td>180,461</td>
<td>187,747</td>
<td>194,202</td>
<td>201,432</td>
<td>208,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEBT COVERAGE RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEBT COVERAGE RATIO</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESOLUTION 04-01

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A FINAL LOAN COMMITMENT

WHEREAS, the California Housing Finance Agency (the "Agency") has received a loan application on behalf of Murphy Ranch II, L.P., a California limited partnership (the "Borrower"), seeking a loan commitment under the Agency's Tax-Exempt Loan Program in the mortgage amounts described herein, the proceeds of which are to be used to provide construction and permanent mortgage loans on a 38-unit multifamily housing development located in the City of Morgan Hill to be known as Murphy Ranch II (the "Development"); and

WHEREAS, the loan application has been reviewed by Agency staff which has prepared its report dated January 5, 2004 (the "Staff Report") recommending Board approval subject to certain recommended terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, Section 1.150-2 of the Treasury Regulations requires the Agency, as the issuer of tax-exempt bonds, to declare its reasonable official intent to reimburse prior expenditures for the Development with proceeds of a subsequent borrowing; and

WHEREAS, on October 22, 2003, the Executive Director exercised the authority delegated to her under Resolution 94-10 to declare the official intent of the Agency to reimburse such prior expenditures for the Development; and

WHEREAS, based upon the recommendation of staff and due deliberation by the Board, the Board has determined that a final loan commitment be made for the Development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board:

1. The Executive Director, or in his/her absence, either the Chief Deputy Director or the Director of Multifamily Programs of the Agency is hereby authorized to execute and deliver a final commitment letter, subject to his/her recommended terms and conditions, including but not limited to those set forth in the CalHFA Staff Report, in relation to the Development described above and as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT NAME/ LOCALITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
<th>MORTGAGE AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 03-053-C/N     | Murphy Ranch II Morgan Hill/Santa Clara | 38              | Construction First Mortgage: $7,235,000
|                |                            |                 | Permanent First Mortgage: $4,400,000 |
2. The Executive Director, or in his/her absence, either the Chief Deputy Director or the Director of Multifamily Programs of the Agency is hereby authorized to increase the mortgage amount so stated in this resolution by an amount not to exceed seven percent (7%) without further Board approval.

3. All other material modifications to the final commitment, including increases in mortgage amount of more than seven percent (7%), must be submitted to this Board for approval. "Material modifications" as used herein means modifications which, when made in the discretion of the Executive Director, or in his/her absence, either the Chief Deputy Director or the Director of Multifamily Programs of the Agency, change the legal, financial or public purpose aspects of the final commitment in a substantial or material way.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of Resolution 04-01 adopted at a duly constituted meeting of the Board of the Agency held on January 22, 2004, at Millbrae, California.

ATTEST: 
 Secretary
CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
Final Commitment
Pacific Grove Senior Apartments
Pacific Grove, Monterey County, CA
CalHFA # 03-049 L/N

SUMMARY

This is a final commitment request for a loan to lender loan in the amount of $5,280,000 and a tax-exempt first mortgage in the amount of $1,360,000. Pacific Grove Senior Apartments is a 49-unit senior apartment project in Pacific Grove. The property is owned by the City of Pacific Grove and will be leased to Jewel Avenue Associates LP, a Limited Partnership whose general partner is South County Housing Corporation.

LOAN TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan to Lender</th>
<th>First Mortgage</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,280,000</td>
<td>3.00%, simple interest</td>
<td>24 Months, interest only</td>
<td>Tax-exempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>First Mortgage</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>30 year fixed, fully amortized</td>
<td>Tax-exempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCALITY INVOLVEMENT

The City of Pacific Grove has leased the property to Jewell Avenue Associates for a term of 80 years. Upon execution of the lease agreement, the borrower paid an up-front lease payment of $300,000. The City of Pacific Grove has funded a land loan of $300,000 to pay the up front lease payment. The loan is for a term of nine years at 3% simple interest. The loan will be paid off at permanent loan closing through permanent loan proceeds. Prior to permanent loan closing, a one-time rental payment of $375,000 plus 3% accrued interest from the date of the lease (November 20, 2002) until the rental payment is made will be due, an amount estimated to be $390,000. During the operating period, the lease payment is $1 per year.

The City has committed a loan in the amount of $110,000 for a term of 57 years, at 0% interest, with residual receipts repayment and has waived plan check and building permit fees in the amount of $99,240. The two City loans will subordinate to a CalHFA first deed of trust and regulatory agreement.
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Negotiations are underway with the City of Pacific Grove and the developer relative to security for CalHFA’s regulatory agreement and deed of trust.

The reserve replacement is set at $400 per unit in years 1 through 16. In years 17-30, the reserve replacement is $125 per unit. In years 17-30, the project is to maintain a minimum reserve replacement of $24,500.

OTHER FINANCING

- AHP has approved a loan of $300,000 at 0% interest for a term of 30 years. All loans will subordinate to the CalHFA Regulatory Agreement and Deeds of Trust.
- An application for HOME funds in the amount of $3,500,000 has been made. The proposed terms are 0% interest for a term of 55 years. Prior to closing the loan to lender loan, the borrower is to provide a commitment from HOME in the amount of $3,500,000.
- Prior to closing the loan to lender loan, the borrower is to provide an investor commitment letter evidencing the tax credit equity commitment amount.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

- The subject property is located in the City of Pacific Grove in Monterey County, adjacent to the cities of Monterey and Carmel.
- The site is located at 650 Jewell Avenue, 600 feet west of the Monterey Bay, along an area known as Lover’s Point.
- The site is located in a primarily residential community. To the south are residential uses consisting of well-maintained single-family homes. To the west is the Sally Griffin Senior Center, and across the street is the 18-hole public golf course. A mobile home park and Chase Park are to the North and East of the site.
- The location is very convenient to senior services and in close proximity to retail services. There is a grocery store and pharmacy .25 miles from the site, and the downtown area is .20 miles away. Downtown Pacific Grove offers a variety of shopping, restaurants, entertainment and a library. The property is across the street from the Sally Griffin Senior Center which provides a wide variety of services, such as Meals on Wheels, fitness, education, computer, and arts classes. The nearest hospital is located three miles from the site and a bus stop is located across the street in front of the senior center.

Site

- The site consists of two parcels totaling 1.63 acres. The parcel being developed as residential is 1.13 acres and the open, unimproved space, known as Chase Park, is one-half acre. Both parcels are zoned C-2, which is a commercial zoning that permits multi-family dwellings. With a density bonus under this zoning, 32 units are allowable per acre, allowing for the development of the 49 affordable senior units.
- During the operating period, there will be minimal operating cost and maintenance relative to maintenance for Chase Park, as the park is one-half acre, with no lighting or irrigation.
Improvements

The project will consist of a single three-story and four-story building over a subterranean garage. The building will include 48 rental units and one manager's unit, one laundry room and a community/recreation room with a small kitchen, computer area and library area. The building has one elevator located in the middle of the building, security entry at the parking level and security entry at the main entrance. The construction will be wood frame concrete slab foundation, cedar shake-style siding, composition shingle roof, and copper gutters and downspouts.

On-site parking will consist of 19 covered spaces in the garage, nine spaces at grade, and 30 spaces located on the park site adjacent to the senior building. As a condition of approval by the Coastal Commission, the 30 spaces are available for public parking for access to the nearby beach and are also available to residents of the subject property for visitor parking.

The units will have a refrigerator, a gas range/oven, disposal and full bath. Heating will be via a gas cadet wall heater in the living room, a baseboard electric heater in the bedroom and a heat lamp/light combo in the bath.

Unit Mix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>No. of Bedrooms</th>
<th>No. of Bathrooms</th>
<th>Unit Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Off-site improvements

Offsite improvements will consist only of installation of curbs, gutters and sidewalks.

MARKET

Market Overview

- The market study defines the Primary Market Area (PMA) as Pacific Grove, Monterey, Carmel, Seaside and Marina. The PMA includes a geographic radius extending eight miles from the subject site. However, the market study indicates that senior projects generally attract tenants from a wider geographical area. Due to the desirable location, the subject property will likely attract tenants from outside the PMA.
- The population in the PMA is 113,290 in 2003 and is expected to increase by only .22% by 2008, compared to an estimated growth rate in Monterey County of 1.25%. The slow growth rate in the PMA is due primarily to the lack of available land for development and
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the moderate economic growth experienced since the closure of the Fort Ord military base in 1994.

- There are 43,053 households in the PMA. Senior households in the PMA total 11,788.
- The average household size in the PMA is 2.41 persons.
- 55% of the housing units in the PMA are occupied by renters. Additionally, seniors represent 50% of all renter households.
- The median income in the PMA is $56,424, which is slightly higher than the county's median income of $54,236. The median income is expected to increase 13.5% between 2003 and 2008.
- The median age in the PMA is 38.3, compared to that of the County at 32.4. This is because of a higher concentration of seniors in the Pacific Grove area compared to the County.
- In Pacific Grove, the labor force totals 11,050 and the unemployment rate is 3.1%. The largest employers are the Defense Language Institute and Naval Postgraduate School (23%), the Community Hospital (16%), the Pebble Beach Company (15%), and California State University Monterey Bay (6%). Countywide, the employment sectors are as follows: professional services (53%), retail trade (21%), manufacturing (13%), public administration (6%), transportation and communication (5%), and Agriculture (2%).

**Housing Demand and Supply**

The subject is located in a highly-desirable and expensive real estate market with no new affordable or market rate developments currently planned.

There are no senior independent-living market rate apartments in Pacific Grove and Monterey, and only two affordable senior projects within the PMA, which were located five to 7.5 miles from the subject. Because there are no senior apartments in the area, general occupancy properties report an occupancy rate by seniors which ranges from 10% to 30%, which is substantially higher than is normally seen in typical market conditions.

Four market-rate general occupancy projects were surveyed in the market study, totaling 328 units. All of these properties were built in the 1960's to 1970's, and all but one was walk-up configuration, which is an inferior product for seniors. Of the general occupancy properties surveyed, 12% were studios 37% of the units were one bedroom, one bath, 30% were two bedroom, two baths, 21% were two bedroom, one bath. In comparison, 16% of the subject's units are studios, 67% of the units are one bedroom, one bath, and 16% are two bedroom, one bath units.

The subject property is superior to the projects surveyed, considering project's proximity to a senior center, downtown shopping and the coastline. In addition, the subject is new and offers elevator service.

The occupancy rate for the general occupancy market rate projects is 98.6%, translating to five vacant units out of 328 total units. The average annual turn-over rate for these projects is 26%.

There are five senior tax-credit financed projects located in Monterey County, however only two of these projects totaling 90 units are located within 7.5 miles of the subject. The rest are located in inland cities of King City, Salinas and Soledad and are not considered to be competitive. The rents for the two competitive affordable projects are primarily set at 60% of median, with some at 50%.
The occupancy rates for affordable projects within the County are 100%, with extensive waiting lists. The average turn-over rate for the affordable senior projects is 15%. The City of Pacific Grove has generated a list of 300 seniors interested in leasing the project, without any marketing efforts made.

The subject property offers similar, if not superior, amenities than those offered in both the market-rate and affordable properties listed above. Only one affordable senior project offers senior services and programs, and none of the market rate projects offer similar amenities.

The subject property does not offer dishwashers in the units, which is typical for the affordable senior projects. Although most of the projects that are market rate, general population units with one and two bedrooms have dishwashers, the market study did not find that a lack of dishwashers in the subject property will be a detriment due to the subject's overall superiority to all projects surveyed.

PROJECT FEASIBILITY

Market rents for a studio average $827. Market rents for a one bedroom unit average $1,098 and rents for a two bedroom, one bath unit average $1,339.

Rent Differentials (Market versus Restricted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Market Rate Average</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
<th>% Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>$393</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,098</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,098</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>$719</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Lease-up Period

Due to the high demand for affordable senior apartments and complete lack of such housing, the market study estimates that the project will be leased up within 1.8 months, the time required to process the leases and move tenants into the property.
OCCUPANCY RESTRICTIONS

CalHFA  
20% of the units (10) will be restricted to 50% or less of AMI  
The CalHFA Regulatory Agreement will be for a term of 30 years.

City of Pacific Grove  
100% of the units (48) will be restricted to 60% or less of AMI for 30 years from the date of the building permit.

AHP  
17% of the units (8) will be restricted to 45% or less of AMI.  
46% of the units (22) will be restricted to 50% or less of AMI.  
37% of the units (18) will be restricted to 60% or less of AMI.

HOME  
13% of the units (6) will be restricted to 50% or less of AMI.  
15% of the units (7) will be restricted to 60% or less of AMI.

TCAC  
100% of the units (48) are restricted to 60% or less of AMI

ENVIRONMENTAL

A Phase I Environmental Report dated June 2002 reports that the subject site operated as a lumber company from 1926 until 1956. From 1967 to the present, there have been no permanent structures on the property. There are no hazardous materials from previous operations, nor are there environmental impacts from nearby properties.

A geotechnical investigation dated September 20, 2001 revealed a low potential for liquefaction and differential settlement. There are no extraordinary design requirements relative to the soil conditions. An updated geotechnical investigation has been requested and will be obtained prior to close of the construction loan.

The borrower has requested an earthquake insurance waiver and a seismic evaluation is in process. If the earthquake waiver is denied, the permanent loan amount may decrease so that the earthquake insurance premium can be paid.

Prior to close of the loan to lender loan, an update to the Phase I is required.

ARTICLE XXXIV

A satisfactory opinion letter will be required prior to construction loan funding.
DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Borrower

Jewell Avenue Associates, L.P.

Jewell Avenue Associates, L.P. is a limited partnership formed for the development and ownership of the subject project. South County Housing Corporation Inc., a 501(c)3 corporation, is the general partner and was founded in 1979. Since then, South County has acquired, rehabilitated and built over 42 affordable housing projects with a total of 1,350 units in California, 679 of which are multifamily apartments, including the Monticelli project in Gilroy, initially financed as a loan to lender loan. The permanent loan on Monticelli closed in 2003. In addition, CalHFA has financed the Corralitos apartments in Freedom, which is another loan to lender project currently under construction.

Management Agent

South County Property Management

South County Property Management, is an affiliate 501(c)(4) corporation of South County Housing Corporation. South County Property Management was incorporated in 1995 and shares the same board of directors as South County Housing Corporation. South County Property Management manages all 42 of South County's projects as well as 14 other residential and 7 commercial properties for other owners.

Architect

Flesher Foster Architects and Herman and Coliver Architects

The project is being designed by Flesher Foster Architects and Herman and Coliver Architects. Flesher Foster Architects was formed in 1987 and is located in Pacific Grove. The firm has designed a wide variety of projects ranging from office buildings, libraries, recreational facilities and multifamily projects. The principals of Herman and Coliver Architects have been design professionals since 1968 and have focused primarily on multifamily affordable housing projects. The firm has extensive expertise in working with local nonprofit developers, neighborhood groups, municipalities and communities in order to assist in the acceptance of the affordable projects in which they are involved with.

Contractor

Segue Construction

Segue Construction, founded in 1992, focuses on the construction of affordable multifamily apartment dwellings for Bay Area non-profit housing developers. Segue's cofounders, Paul Broeker and Kirk Wallis have 26 and 27 years of experience, respectively, in the industry working as engineers, general contractors and developers. Segue has built projects for developers such as BRIDGE Housing, Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, and the Housing Authority of Santa Clara County. All three developers have had great experiences with Segue,
and stated that Segue completed their projects on time and within budget. Other CalHFA projects constructed by Segue include Oak Court Apartments in Palo Alto, which is currently under construction, Capital Avenue Apartments for JSM Enterprises, and Monte Vista Apartments and Grayson Creek Apartments for BRIDGE Housing.
## Project Summary

### Project Profile:

- **Project:** Pacific Grove Senior Apartments
- **Location:** 650 Jewell Avenue
- **County:** Monterey
- **Borrower:** Jewell Avenue Associates
- **Managing G.P:** South County Housing Corporation
- **Cap Rate:** 6.00%
- **Market:** $5,720,000
- **Income:** $4,600,000
- **Final Value:** $5,720,000
- **Program:** Tax-Exempt
- **LTD/CAT:** Construction: 59%, Permanent: 14%
- **Loan/Value:** 92%, 24%

### Project Description:

- **Units:** 49
- **Handicap Units:** 2
- **Bldg. Type:** Senior
- **Buildings:** 1
- **Stories:** 3
- **Gross Sq Ft:** 45,681
- **Land Sq Ft:** 71,003
- **Units/Acre:** 43
- **Total Parking:** 58
- **Covered Parking:** 19

### Financing Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA First Mortgage</td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
<td>$27,755</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>30 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Loan to Lender</td>
<td>$5,280,000</td>
<td>$107,755</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>24 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove fee waiver</td>
<td>$399,240</td>
<td>$2,025</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$2,245</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove-land loan</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$6,122</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$6,122</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Reinvestment</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$6,429</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$71,429</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Equity</td>
<td>$468,854</td>
<td>$9,568</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>$3,394,956</td>
<td>$69,285</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit Mix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>45% AMI</th>
<th>50% CHFA</th>
<th>60% AMI</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>$620</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$434</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$513</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$611</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fees, Escrows, and Reserves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee/Basis of Requirements</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Fee</td>
<td>$52,800</td>
<td>$52,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Fee</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Origination Guarantee</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection fee</td>
<td>$127,377</td>
<td>$127,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Defect</td>
<td>$33,215</td>
<td>$33,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense Reserve</td>
<td>$19,600</td>
<td>$19,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sources and Uses

### Pacific Grove Senior Apartments

#### SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Lender / Source</th>
<th>Permanent Amount</th>
<th>Construction Amount</th>
<th>Construction % of total</th>
<th>Permanent $ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA First Mortgage</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>27,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Loan to Lender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,280,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>2,594,737</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>71,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove fee waiver</td>
<td>99,240</td>
<td>99,240</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove-land loan</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Reinvestment</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutional Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,984,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,998,977</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Equity Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credits</td>
<td>3,394,956</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>69,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Equity</td>
<td>468,854</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,863,810</strong></td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td><strong>78,853</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SOURCES**  
9,848,050     8,998,977       100.0%       200,981

#### USES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Permanent Amount</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>835,759</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>5,948,653</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>121,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>419,725</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey and Engineering</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Const. Loan Interest &amp; Fees</td>
<td>641,830</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Financing</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>46,550</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Costs</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>310,683</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fees</td>
<td>99,240</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAC/Other Costs</td>
<td>185,337</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,674,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>177,032</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Developer Overhead/Profit          | 1,138,473        | 11.6%      | 23,234     |
| Consultant/Processing Agent        | 35,000           | 0.4%       | 714        |

**TOTAL USES**  
9,848,050     100.0%       200,981
## SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Permanent Dollars</th>
<th>Perm. Bridge</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sources</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA First Mortgage</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,594,737</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Loan to Lender</td>
<td>5,280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove fee waiver</td>
<td>99,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,240</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific Grove-land loan</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Reinvestment</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Equity</td>
<td>468,854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>3,394,956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,848,050</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8,998,977</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gap)/Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## USES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Permanent Period</th>
<th>Construction Period</th>
<th>Permanent per unit</th>
<th>Pct. of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACQUISITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Lease Payments</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>14,082</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Broker Fees</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improvements</td>
<td>137,259</td>
<td>137,259</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Improvements Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acquisition Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>835,759</strong></td>
<td><strong>835,759</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rehab. Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>509,751</td>
<td>509,751</td>
<td>10,403</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures &amp; landscaping</td>
<td>4,585,320</td>
<td>4,585,320</td>
<td>93,578</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements</td>
<td>470,060</td>
<td>470,060</td>
<td>9,593</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Overhead</td>
<td>174,261</td>
<td>174,261</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Profit</td>
<td>174,261</td>
<td>174,261</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - construction mgr.</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Const. Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,948,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,948,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,401</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>376,225</td>
<td>376,225</td>
<td>7,678</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Architectural Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>419,725</strong></td>
<td><strong>419,725</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,566</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST. INTEREST &amp; FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Const. Loan Interest</td>
<td>411,330</td>
<td>411,330</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Fee-CalHFA</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Fee</td>
<td>52,700</td>
<td>52,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Premium</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and Recording</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Costs</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Const. Interest &amp; Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>641,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>641,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT FINANCING</td>
<td>Permanent Period</td>
<td>Construction Period</td>
<td>Permanent per unit</td>
<td>Pct. of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Fee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Fee</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and Recording</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Loan Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT Bridge Loan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD Environ. Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Perm. Financing Costs</strong></td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL FEES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Legal</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Legal Fee</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-syndication legal</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Attorney Costs</strong></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESERVES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Origination Guarantee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Credit Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense Reserve</td>
<td>46,550</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserve Costs</strong></td>
<td>46,550</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT COSTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Costs</strong></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINGENCY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Contingency</td>
<td>295,683</td>
<td>6,034</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Cost Contingency</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contingency Costs</strong></td>
<td>310,683</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCAC App/Alloc/Monitor Fees</td>
<td>31,948</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Audit</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils Report Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos/Lead-based Paint Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Study Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Processing Fees</td>
<td>99,240</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>63,889</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Budget</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA Construction Inspection Fee</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-EQ Waiver</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Costs</strong></td>
<td>284,577</td>
<td>5,808</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COSTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,674,577</td>
<td>177,032</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPER COSTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer Overhead/Profit</td>
<td>1,138,473</td>
<td>23,234</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Processing Agent</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Processing Agent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Developer Costs</strong></td>
<td>1,173,473</td>
<td>23,948</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,848,050</td>
<td>200,981</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Operating Budget  Pacific Grove Senior Apartments

#### INCOME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Rental Income</td>
<td>327,444</td>
<td>6,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Potential Income (GPI)</strong></td>
<td>332,148</td>
<td>6,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Less:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Loss</td>
<td>16,607</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315,541</td>
<td>6,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>64,364</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>36,294</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>40,975</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating and Maintenance</td>
<td>34,649</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance and Business Taxes</td>
<td>8,058</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and Assessments</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Replacement Deposits</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>205,800</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Payments (1st loan)</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financial</strong></td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>$ per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298,463</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Grove Senior Apartments</td>
<td>CalHFA Development Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent Increase</td>
<td>2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rents</td>
<td>327,444 335,630 344,021 352,621 361,437 370,473 379,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>327,444 335,630 344,021 352,621 361,437 370,473 379,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Increase</td>
<td>2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50% 2.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>4,704 4,822 4,942 5,066 5,192 5,322 5,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td>4,704 4,822 4,942 5,066 5,192 5,322 5,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS INCOME</strong></td>
<td>332,148 340,452 348,963 357,687 366,629 375,795 385,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate : Affordable</td>
<td>5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Vacancy Loss</td>
<td>16,607 17,023 17,448 17,884 18,331 18,790 19,259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME</strong></td>
<td>315,541 323,429 331,515 339,803 348,298 357,005 365,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expense Increase</td>
<td>4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 4.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>186,200 193,648 201,394 209,450 217,628 225,541 235,602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>19,600 19,600 19,600 19,600 19,600 19,600 19,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Lease Payment Increase</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Lease Payment</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>205,801 213,249 220,995 229,051 237,429 247,122 256,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET OPERATING INCOME</strong></td>
<td>109,740 110,180 110,520 110,752 110,869 109,883 109,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBT SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalHFA - 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage</strong></td>
<td>17,076 17,517 17,857 18,089 18,206 17,220 17,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBT COVERAGE RATIO</strong></td>
<td>1.18 1.19 1.19 1.20 1.20 1.19 1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENTAL INCOME</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Year 15</th>
<th>Year 16</th>
<th>Year 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rents</td>
<td>419,156</td>
<td>429,635</td>
<td>440,376</td>
<td>451,385</td>
<td>462,670</td>
<td>474,237</td>
<td>486,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RENTAL INCOME</td>
<td>419,156</td>
<td>429,635</td>
<td>440,376</td>
<td>451,385</td>
<td>462,670</td>
<td>474,237</td>
<td>486,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER INCOME</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>6,022</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>6,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>6,022</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>6,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GROSS INCOME           | 425,178 | 435,807 | 446,702 | 457,870 | 469,316 | 481,049 | 493,076 |

Vacancy Rate: Affordable
- Less: Vacancy Loss
  - 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00% 5.00%
  - 21,259 21,790 22,335 22,893 23,466 24,052 24,654

| EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME | 403,919 | 414,017 | 424,367 | 434,976 | 445,851 | 456,997 | 468,422 |

### OPERATING EXPENSES

| Expenses Increase | 4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 4.00% 3.75% 3.75% |
|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Replacement Reserve | 21,609 21,609 21,609 21,609 21,609 6,125 6,125 |
| Ground Lease Payment Increase | 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% |
| Ground Lease Payment | 1   1   1   1   1   1   1 |

| TOTAL EXPENSES | 297,231 308,256 319,722 331,647 344,048 341,462 354,037 |

### NET OPERATING INCOME

| 106,687 105,760 104,645 103,330 101,802 115,535 114,385 |

### DEBT SERVICE

| CalHFA - 1st Mortgage | 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 92,663 |

| CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage | 14,024 13,097 11,982 10,666 9,139 22,872 21,722 |
| DEBT COVERAGE RATIO | 1.15 1.14 1.13 1.12 1.10 1.25 1.23 |
# Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 21</th>
<th>Year 22</th>
<th>Year 23</th>
<th>Year 24</th>
<th>Year 25</th>
<th>Year 26</th>
<th>Year 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rents</td>
<td>536,555</td>
<td>549,969</td>
<td>563,718</td>
<td>577,811</td>
<td>592,256</td>
<td>607,063</td>
<td>622,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>536,555</td>
<td>549,969</td>
<td>563,718</td>
<td>577,811</td>
<td>592,256</td>
<td>607,063</td>
<td>622,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Increase</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>7,901</td>
<td>8,098</td>
<td>8,301</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>8,721</td>
<td>8,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>7,901</td>
<td>8,098</td>
<td>8,301</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>8,721</td>
<td>8,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS INCOME</strong></td>
<td>544,263</td>
<td>557,870</td>
<td>571,816</td>
<td>586,112</td>
<td>600,765</td>
<td>615,784</td>
<td>631,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate : Affordable</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Vacancy Loss</td>
<td>27,213</td>
<td>27,893</td>
<td>28,591</td>
<td>29,306</td>
<td>30,038</td>
<td>30,789</td>
<td>31,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME</strong></td>
<td>517,050</td>
<td>529,976</td>
<td>543,226</td>
<td>556,806</td>
<td>570,726</td>
<td>584,995</td>
<td>599,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Expense Increase</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>403,107</td>
<td>418,223</td>
<td>433,907</td>
<td>450,178</td>
<td>467,060</td>
<td>484,575</td>
<td>502,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Lease Payment Increase</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Lease Payment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>409,233</td>
<td>424,349</td>
<td>440,033</td>
<td>456,304</td>
<td>473,186</td>
<td>490,701</td>
<td>508,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET OPERATING INCOME</strong></td>
<td>107,817</td>
<td>105,627</td>
<td>103,193</td>
<td>100,502</td>
<td>97,540</td>
<td>94,294</td>
<td>90,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBT SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalIFFA - 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>92,663</td>
<td>92,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH FLOW after 1st Mortgage</td>
<td>15,154</td>
<td>12,964</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td>7,839</td>
<td>4,877</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>(1,916)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT COVERAGE RATIO</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESOLUTION 04-02

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A FINAL LOAN COMMITMENT

WHEREAS, the California Housing Finance Agency (the "Agency") has received a loan application on behalf of Jewell Avenue Associates, L.P., a limited partnership (the "Borrower"), seeking a loan commitment under the Agency’s Loan-to-Lender and Tax-Exempt Loan Programs in the mortgage amounts described herein, the proceeds of which are to be used to provide financing for a 49-unit multifamily housing development located in the City of Pacific Grove to be known as Pacific Grove Senior Apartments (the "Development"); and

WHEREAS, the loan application has been reviewed by Agency staff which has prepared its report dated January 5, 2004 (the "Staff Report") recommending Board approval subject to certain recommended terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, Section 1.150-2 of the Treasury Regulations requires the Agency, as the issuer of tax-exempt bonds, to declare its reasonable official intent to reimburse prior expenditures for the Development with proceeds of a subsequent borrowing; and

WHEREAS, on November 12, 2003, the Executive Director exercised the authority delegated to her under Resolution 94-10 to declare the official intent of the Agency to reimburse such prior expenditures for the Development; and

WHEREAS, based upon the recommendation of staff and due deliberation by the Board, the Board has determined that a final loan commitment be made for the Development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board:

1. The Executive Director, or in his/her absence, either the Chief Deputy Director or the Director of Multifamily Programs of the Agency is hereby authorized to execute and deliver a final commitment letter, subject to his/her recommended terms and conditions set forth in the CalHFA Staff Report, in relation to the Development described above and as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT NAME/LOCALITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
<th>MORTGAGE AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-049-L/N</td>
<td>Pacific Grove Senior Apartments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$5,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Grove/Monterey</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 04-02

2. The Executive Director, or in his/her absence, either the Chief Deputy Director or the Director of Multifamily Programs of the Agency is hereby authorized to increase the mortgage amount so stated in this resolution by an amount not to exceed seven percent (7%) and modify the interest rate charged on the Loan-to-Lender loan based upon the then cost of funds without further Board approval.

3. All other material modifications to the final commitment, including increases in mortgage amount of more than seven percent (7%), must be submitted to this Board for approval. "Material modifications" as used herein means modifications which, when made in the discretion of the Executive Director, or in his/her absence, either the Chief Deputy Director or the Director of Multifamily Programs of the Agency, change the legal, financial or public purpose aspects of the final commitment in a substantial or material way.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of Resolution 04-02 adopted at a duly constituted meeting of the Board of the Agency held on January 22, 2004, at Millbrae, California.

ATTEST:_____________________
Secretary
MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors

From: CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: ANNUAL SINGLE FAMILY BOND REAUTHORIZATION
RESOLUTION 04-03

Date: January 7, 2004

Ken Carlson, Director of Financing

Resolution 04-03 would authorize the sale and issuance of CalHFA single family bonds (with related interest rate swaps and other financial agreements) for another year. In addition, the resolution would authorize the Agency to borrow for homeownership purposes using both short-term and long-term credit facilities.

Annual reauthorization, a practice approved by the Board every year since 1987, enables the staff to schedule and size our bond transactions to meet demand for loan funds throughout the year without regard to the timing of individual Board meetings.

Resolution 04-03 would authorize single family bonds to be issued in various amounts by category, as follows:

1. equal to the amount of prior single family bonds being retired, including eligible bonds of other issuers;
2. equal to the amount of private activity bond volume cap made available for our single family program by the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee;
3. up to $900 million of federally-taxable single family bonds (in addition to any taxable bonds issued under the first category).

Bonds would be authorized to be issued under any of the previously-approved forms of indenture as listed in the resolution. We again anticipate continuing to use the Home Mortgage Revenue Bond indenture, with its Aa2/AA- ratings, for our single family bond issuances in 2004. Bonds issued under this 20-year-old financing program now comprise approximately 75% of our $7.84 billion of outstanding bonds.
The resolution would also authorize the full range of related financial agreements, including contracts for investment of bond proceeds, for warehousing of mortgages pending the availability of bond proceeds, for interest rate hedging (including the continued use of interest rate swaps), Board of Directors and for forward delivery of bonds through August 1, 2006. The resolution would also authorize contracts for consulting services or information services related to the financial management of the Agency, including advisors or consultants on interest rate swaps, cash flow management, and similar matters, and contracts for financial printing and similar services.

The resolution would also reauthorize short-term credit facilities in an aggregate amount not to exceed $400 million (for both the Homeownership and Multifamily Programs). This authorization would allow us to continue to utilize our $300 million warehouse line from the State's Pooled Money Investment Board and our $100 million line of credit from the Bank of America.

A new section of the resolution would authorize long-term credit facilities in an aggregate amount not to exceed $300 million (for both the Homeownership and Multifamily Programs). A long-term credit facility has been offered by Fannie Mae, and we believe that it will be a useful borrowing tool for carrying loans made for downpayment assistance or made to local agencies under the HELP program or the new Locality Initiatives program. The downpayment assistance loans (primarily for the Agency-funded CHAP program) and the HELP loans are currently carried directly by the Agency's Housing Assistance Trust; the Locality Initiatives program is being developed by our Multifamily Programs staff.

In addition, the resolution would reauthorize cooperation with local agencies such as the Southern California Home Financing Authority, with whom we are currently working. We expect our initial issuance of $100 million of SCHFA bonds early in 2004 to be followed by a number of subsequent issues. In addition, we have begun discussions with the City of Los Angeles Department of Housing and hope to assist them as well.

In order to allow for necessary overlap of authority for bond issues scheduled during the time that reauthorization is being considered, Resolution 04-03 would not expire until 30 days after the first Board meeting in the year 2005 at which there is a quorum. Likewise, last year's single family resolution (03-05) will not expire until 30 days after this meeting.

In past years we have strived to lock in our cost of funds approximately every 60 days, whether by means of pricing fixed-rate bonds or, in recent years, via the interest rate swap market. In 2004, we will continue to do our best to periodically match our cost of funds to our lending rates, but this effort will be affected by the complexities of our cooperative programs with SCHFA and the City of Los Angeles and our plans to fund a portion of our new loans with moneys received from "excess" prepayments of loans made in recent years.

Attachment
RESOLUTION OF THE CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
AUTHORIZING THE AGENCY'S SINGLE FAMILY BOND INDENTURES, THE
ISSUANCE OF SINGLE FAMILY BONDS, SHORT- AND LONG-TERM CREDIT
FACILITIES FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP PURPOSES, AND RELATED FINANCIAL
AGreements AND CONTRACTS OF SERVICES

WHEREAS, the California Housing Finance Agency (the "Agency") has
determined that there exists a need in California for providing financial assistance, directly or
indirectly, to persons and families of low or moderate income to enable them to purchase
moderately priced single family residences ("Residences");

WHEREAS, the Agency has determined that it is in the public interest for the
Agency to provide such financial assistance by means of ongoing programs (collectively, the
"Program") to make loans for the permanent financing of Residences (the "Loans");

WHEREAS, pursuant to Parts 1 through 4 of Division 31 of the Health and Safety
Code of the State of California (the "Act"), the Agency has the authority to issue bonds to
provide sufficient funds to finance the Program, including the purchase of Loans, the payment of
capitalized interest on the bonds, the establishment of reserves to secure the bonds, and the
payment of other costs of the Agency incident to, and necessary or convenient to, the issuance of
the bonds;

WHEREAS, the Agency, pursuant to the Act, has from time to time issued
various series of its Single Family Mortgage Purchase Bonds (the "SFMP Bonds"), its Home
Ownership and Home Improvement Revenue Bonds (the "HOHI Bonds"), its Home Mortgage
Revenue Bonds (the "HMP Bonds"), its Home Ownership Mortgage Bonds (the "HOM Bonds")
and its Single Family Mortgage Bonds (the "SFMor Bonds"), and is authorized pursuant to the
Act to issue additional SFMP Bonds, HOHI Bonds, HMP Bonds, HOM Bonds and SFMor
Bonds (collectively with bonds authorized under this resolution to be issued under new
indentures, the "Bonds") to provide funds to finance the Program;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Act, the Agency has the authority to enter into short-
term and long-term credit facilities for the same purposes for which the Agency may issue
bonds;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 6 of Part 5 of Division 31 (Sections 52060 et
seq.) of the Health and Safety Code of the State of California (the "Local Agency Assistance
Act"), the Agency also has the authority to enter into agreements with cities, counties and joint
powers authorities created by cities and counties (collectively, "Local Agencies"), which provide
that the Agency shall sell bonds on behalf of such Local Agencies for the purpose of providing
funds for home mortgages financing residences within the respective jurisdictions of such Local
Agencies; and
WHEREAS, the Local Agency Assistance Act provides that although such bonds are to be bonds of the Local Agency ("Local Agency Bonds"), the proceeds of such Local Agency Bonds may be utilized in the Agency’s Program, including borrowing such proceeds through the issuance of Bonds to the Local Agency;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors (the "Board") of the California Housing Finance Agency as follows:

Section 1. Determination of Need and Amount. The Agency is of the opinion and hereby determines that the issuance of one or more series of Bonds, in an aggregate amount not to exceed the sum of the following amounts, is necessary to provide sufficient funds for the Program:

(a) the aggregate amount of Bonds and/or other qualified mortgage bonds (including bonds of issuers other than the Agency) to be redeemed or maturing in connection with such issuance,

(b) the aggregate amount of private activity bond allocations under federal tax law heretofore or hereafter made available to the Agency (including any such allocations made available to a Local Agency in connection with the issuance of Local Agency Bonds) for such purpose, and

(c) if and to the extent interest on one or more of such series of Bonds is determined by the Executive Director to be intended not to be excludable from gross income for federal income tax purposes, $900,000,000.

Section 2. Authorization and Timing. The Bonds are hereby authorized to be issued in such aggregate amount at such time or times on or before the day 30 days after the date on which is held the first meeting of the Board in the year 2005 at which a quorum is present, as the Executive Director of the Agency (the "Executive Director") deems appropriate, upon consultation with the Treasurer of the State of California (the "Treasurer") as to the timing of each such issuance; provided, however, that if the bonds are sold at a time on or before the day 30 days after the date on which is held such meeting, pursuant to a forward purchase or drawdown agreement providing for the issuance of such Bonds on or before August 1, 2006 upon specified terms and conditions, such Bonds may be issued on such later date.

Section 3. Approval of Forms of Indentures. The Executive Director and the Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Agency (the "Secretary") are hereby authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency in connection with the issuance of Bonds, to execute and acknowledge and to deliver to the Treasurer as trustee and/or, if appropriate, to a duly qualified bank or trust company selected by the Executive Director to act as trustee or co-trustee with the approval of the Treasurer (collectively, the "Trustees"), one or more new indentures (the "New Indentures"), in one or more forms similar to one or more of the following:

(a) that certain indenture pertaining to the SFMP Bonds (the "SFMP Indenture"),
(b) that certain indenture pertaining to the HOHI Bonds (the “HOHI Indenture”),

(c) that certain indenture pertaining to the HOM Bonds (the “HOM Indenture”),

(d) those certain indentures pertaining to the HMP Bonds (the “HMP Indentures”),

(e) that form of general indenture approved by Resolution No. 92-41, adopted November 12, 1992 (the “SHOP Indenture”),

(f) that form of master trust indenture proposed by Fannie Mae (“Fannie Mae”) in connection with their “MRB Express” program and approved by Resolution No. 93-30, adopted September 7, 1993 (the “Fannie Mae MRB Express Program Indenture”),

(g) that form of general indenture designed for the Fannie Mae Index Option Program and approved by Resolution No. 94-01, adopted January 13, 1994 (the “Fannie Mae Index Option Program Indenture”),

(h) those certain indentures pertaining to the SFMor Bonds (the “SFMor Indentures”),

(i) the form of draw down bond indenture approved by Resolution No. 01-04, as amended by Resolution No. 01-39, adopted November 8, 2001, and/or

(j) the form of bond indenture approved by Resolution No. 02-01, as amended by Resolution 02-17, adopted June 6, 2002.

Each such New Indenture may be executed, acknowledged and delivered with such changes therein as the officers executing the same approve upon consultation with the Agency’s legal counsel, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof. Changes reflected in any New Indenture may include, without limitation, provision for a supplemental pledge of Agency moneys or assets (including but not limited to, a deposit from the Supplementary Bond Security Account created under Section 51368 of the Act) and provision for the Agency’s general obligation to additionally secure the Bonds if appropriate in furtherance of the objectives of the Program.

Section 4. Approval of Forms of Supplemental Indenture. The Executive Director and the Secretary are hereby authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency, to execute and acknowledge and to deliver with respect to each series of Bonds, if and to the extent appropriate, a supplemental indenture (a “Supplemental Indenture”) pertaining to such series in substantially the form of the respective supplemental indentures previously executed and delivered or approved, each with such changes therein as the officers executing the same approve upon consultation with the Agency’s legal counsel, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof. Changes reflected in any Supplemental Indenture may include, without limitation, provision for a supplemental pledge of
Agency moneys or assets (including but not limited to, a deposit from the Supplementary Bond Security Account created under Section 51368 of the Act) and provision for the Agency’s general obligation to additionally secure the Bonds if appropriate in furtherance of the objectives of the Program.

The Executive Director is hereby expressly authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency, to determine in furtherance of the objectives of the Program those matters required to be determined under the SFMP Indenture, the HOHI Indenture, the HOM Indentures, the HMP Indentures or any New Indenture, as appropriate, in connection with the issuance of each such series, including, without limitation, any reserve account requirement or requirements for such series.

Section 5. Approval of Forms and Terms of Bonds. The Bonds shall be in such denominations, have such registration provisions, be executed in such manner, be payable in such medium of payment at such place or places within or without California, be subject to such terms of redemption (including from such sinking fund installments as may be provided for) and contain such terms and conditions as each Supplemental Indenture as finally approved shall provide. The Bonds shall have the maturity or maturities and shall bear interest at the fixed, adjustable or variable rate or rates deemed appropriate by the Executive Director in furtherance of the objectives of the Program; provided that no Bond shall have a term in excess of fifty years or bear interest at a stated rate in excess of fifteen percent (15%) per annum (in the case of variable rate bonds, a maximum floating interest rate of twenty-five percent (25%) per annum). Any of the Bonds and the Supplemental Indenture(s) may contain such provisions as may be necessary to accommodate an option to put such Bonds prior to maturity for purchase by or on behalf of the Agency or a person other than the Agency, to accommodate the requirements of any provider of bond insurance or other credit or liquidity enhancement or to accommodate the requirements of purchasers of Dutch auction bonds or indexed floaters.

Section 6. Authorization of Disclosure. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to circulate one or more Preliminary Official Statements relating to the Bonds and, after the sale of the Bonds, to execute and circulate one or more Official Statements relating to the Bonds, and the circulation of such Preliminary Official Statements and such Official Statements to prospective and actual purchasers of the Bonds is hereby approved. The Executive Director is further authorized to hold information meetings concerning the Bonds and to distribute other information and material relating to the Bonds.

Section 7. Authorization of Sale of Bonds. The Bonds are hereby authorized to be sold at negotiated or competitive sale or sales. The Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, to execute and deliver one or more purchase contracts (including one or more forward purchase agreements) relating to the Bonds, by and among the Agency, the Treasurer and such underwriters or other purchasers (including, but not limited to, Fannie Mae) as the Executive Director may select (the “Purchasers”), in the form or forms approved by the Executive Director upon consultation with the Agency’s legal counsel, such approval to be evidenced conclusively by the execution and delivery of said purchase contract by the Executive Director.

The Treasurer is hereby authorized and requested, without further action of the Board and unless instructed otherwise by the Board, to sell each series of Bonds at the time and
place and pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in each such purchase contract as finally executed. The Treasurer is hereby further authorized and requested to deposit the proceeds of any good faith deposit to be received by the Treasurer under the terms of a purchase contract in a special trust account for the benefit of the Agency, and the amount of said deposit shall be retained by the Agency, applied at the time of delivery of the applicable Bonds as part of the purchase price thereof, or returned to the Purchasers, as provided in such purchase contract.

Section 8. Authorization of Execution of Bonds. The Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed to execute, and the Secretary is hereby authorized to attest, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency and under its seal, the Bonds, in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount authorized hereby, in accordance with the Supplemental Indenture(s) or the New Indenture(s) and in one or more of the forms set forth in the Supplemental Indenture(s) or the New Indenture(s), as appropriate.

Section 9. Authorization of Delivery of Bonds. The Bonds, when so executed, shall be delivered to the Trustees to be authenticated by, or caused to be authenticated by, the Trustees. The Trustees are hereby requested and directed to authenticate, or cause to be authenticated, the Bonds by executing the certificate of authentication and registration appearing thereon, and to deliver the Bonds when duly executed and authenticated to the Purchasers in accordance with written instructions executed on behalf of the Agency by the Executive Director, which instructions said officer is hereby authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency, to execute and deliver. Such instructions shall provide for the delivery of the Bonds to the Purchasers upon payment of the purchase price or prices thereof.

Section 10. Authorization of Related Financial Agreements. The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, any and all agreements and documents designed (i) to reduce or hedge the amount or duration of any payment, interest rate, spread or similar risk, (ii) to result in a lower cost of borrowing when used in combination with the issuance or carrying of bonds or investments, or (iii) to enhance the relationship between risk and return with respect to the Program or any portion thereof. To the extent authorized by Government Code Section 5922, such agreements or other documents may include (a) interest rate swap agreements, (b) forward payment conversion agreements, (c) futures or other contracts providing for payments based on levels of, or changes in, interest rates or other indices, (d) contracts to exchange cash flows for a series of payments, or (e) contracts, including, without limitation, interest rate floors or caps, options, puts or calls to hedge payment, interest rate, spread or similar exposure, and in each such case may be entered into in anticipation of the issuance of bonds at such times as may be determined by such officers. Such agreements and other documents are authorized to be entered into with parties selected by the Executive Director, after giving due consideration for the creditworthiness of the counterparties, where applicable, or any other criteria in furtherance of the objectives of the Program.

Section 11. Authorization of Program Documents. The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more mortgage purchase and servicing agreements (including mortgage-backed security pooling agreements) and one or more loan servicing agreements with such lender or lenders or such servicer or servicers as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the purposes of the Program, and any such selection of a lender or lenders or a
servicer or servicers is to be deemed approved by this Board as if it had been made by this Board. The mortgages to be purchased may be fixed rate, step rate, adjustable rate, graduated payment or any combination of the foregoing, may have terms of 30 years or less and may be insured by such mortgage insurers as are selected by the Executive Director in furtherance of the objectives of the Program.

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more mortgage sale agreements with such purchasers as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the objectives of the Program. Any such sale of Loans may be on either a current or a forward purchase basis.

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, contracts to conduct foreclosures of mortgages owned or serviced by the Agency with such attorneys or foreclosure companies as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the objectives of the Program.

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, contracts for the sale of foreclosed properties with such purchasers as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the objectives of the Program. Any such sale of foreclosed properties may be on either an all cash basis or may include financing by the Agency. The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are also authorized to enter into any other agreements, including but not limited to real estate brokerage agreements, and construction contracts, necessary or convenient for the rehabilitation, listing and sale of such foreclosed properties.

Section 12. *Authorization of Short-term Credit Facilities.* The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more short-term credit facilities for the purposes of (i) financing the purchase of Loans on an interim basis, prior to the financing of such Loans with Bonds, whether issued or to be issued and (ii) financing expenditures of the Agency incident to, and necessary or convenient to, the issuance of Bonds, including, but not limited to, Agency expenditures to pay costs of issuance, capitalized interest, redemption price of prior bonds of the Agency, costs relating to credit or liquidity support, costs relating to investment products, or net payments and expenses relating to interest rate hedges and other financial products. Any such short-term credit facility may be from any appropriate source, including, but not limited to, the Pooled Money Investment Account pursuant to Government Code Section 16312; provided, however, that the aggregate outstanding principal amount of short-term credit facilities from the Pooled Money Investment Account authorized under this resolution or Resolution No. 04-04 (the multifamily financing resolution adopted at the same meeting) may not at any time exceed $400,000,000 (separate and apart from the amount of Bonds authorized by Section 1 of this resolution).

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to use available Agency moneys (other than and in addition to the proceeds of bonds) to make or purchase Loans to be financed by bonds (including bonds authorized by prior resolutions of this Board) in anticipation of draws on a credit facility, the issuance of Bonds or the availability of Bond proceeds for such purposes.
Section 13. **Authorization of Long-Term Credit Facilities.** The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more long-term credit facilities for the purposes of financing the making or purchase of non-traditional loan products or other assets, including, but not limited to, loans for downpayment assistance or loans to local public entities, in each case for the purpose of providing, directly or indirectly, financial assistance to persons and families of low or moderate income to enable them to purchase single family residences. As determined by the officer of the Agency executing any such credit facility, the Agency's payment obligations under such credit facility may be secured by a pledge of any such loans or assets and may be general obligations of the Agency; provided that loans and assets financed from proceeds of any such credit facility are not required to have scheduled or expected payments sufficient to produce amounts sufficient to satisfy the obligations of the Agency under such credit facility when due. Any such credit facility may be from any appropriate source, including, but not limited to, Fannie Mae. The aggregate outstanding principal amount of such credit facilities authorized under this resolution or Resolution No. 04-04 (the multifamily financing resolution adopted at the same meeting) may not at any time exceed $300,000,000 (separate and apart from the amount of Bonds authorized by Section 1 of this resolution), and no such credit facility shall have a term in excess of twenty (20) years or bear interest at a stated rate in excess of fifteen percent (15%) per annum (or in the case of any such credit facility pursuant to which interest accrues at a variable rate, a maximum floating interest rate of twenty-five percent (25%) per annum). Each such credit facility may be executed, acknowledged and delivered with terms not inconsistent with the requirements of this paragraph as the officer or officers executing the same approve upon consultation with the Agency's legal counsel, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

Section 14. **Local Agency Cooperation.** (a) The Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, to execute and deliver one or more agreements with one or more Local Agencies providing that the Agency shall sell Local Agency Bonds for the purpose of providing funds for the Program for the purchase of Loans financing Residences within the jurisdiction of the applicable Local Agency. Each such agreement shall contain the provisions required by Section 52062 of the Local Agency Assistance Act and shall provide that the method by which the Agency shall utilize the proceeds of Local Agency Bonds in the Agency's Program shall be for the Agency to borrow such proceeds by the issuance of Bonds to the Local Agency. The Bonds shall be in the form and shall be issued under the terms and conditions authorized by this resolution, applied as appropriate under the circumstances. The Bonds shall serve as the primary source of payment of and as security for the Local Agency Bonds.

The Local Agency Bonds are hereby authorized to be sold at such time or times, on or before the day 30 days after the date on which is held the first meeting of the Board in the year 2005 at which a quorum is present, as the Executive Director deems appropriate, upon consultation with the Treasurer as to the timing of each such sale.

(b) The Executive Director is hereby authorized to circulate one or more Preliminary Official Statements relating to the Local Agency Bonds and, after the sale of the Local Agency Bonds, to execute and circulate one or more Official Statements relating to the Local Agency Bonds, and the circulation of such Preliminary Official Statements and such
Official Statements to prospective and actual purchasers of the Local Agency Bonds is hereby approved. The Executive Director is further authorized to hold information meetings concerning the Local Agency Bonds and to distribute other information and material relating to the Local Agency Bonds.

(c) The Local Agency Bonds are hereby authorized to be sold at negotiated or competitive sale or sales. The Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency and the Local Agency, to execute and deliver one or more purchase contracts (including one or more forward purchase agreements) relating to the Local Agency Bonds, by and among the Agency, the Treasurer, the Local Agency (if appropriate) and such underwriters or other purchasers (including, but not limited to, Fannie Mae) as the Executive Director may select (the “Local Agency Bond Purchasers”), in the form or forms approved by the Executive Director upon consultation with the Agency’s legal counsel, such approval to be evidenced conclusively by the execution and delivery of said purchase contract by the Executive Director.

(d) The Treasurer is hereby authorized and requested, without further action of the Board and unless instructed otherwise by the Board, to sell each series of Local Agency Bonds at the time and place and pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in each such purchase contract as finally executed. The Treasurer is hereby further authorized and requested to deposit the proceeds of any good faith deposit to be received by the Treasurer under the terms of a purchase contract in a special trust account for the benefit of the Agency and the Local Agency, and the amount of said deposit shall be applied at the time of delivery of the applicable Local Agency Bonds, as the case may be, as part of the purchase price thereof or returned to the Local Agency Bond Purchasers as provided in such purchase contract.

Section 15. Ratification of Prior Actions. All actions previously taken by the Agency relating to the implementation of the Program, the issuance of the Bonds, the issuance of any prior bonds, the execution and delivery of related financial agreements and related program agreements and the implementation of any credit facilities as described above, including, but not limited to, such actions as the distribution of the Agency’s Lender Program Manual, Mortgage Purchase and Servicing Agreement, Servicing Agreement, Developer Agreement, Servicer’s Guide, Program Bulletins and applications to originate and service loans, and the sale of any foreclosed property, are hereby ratified.

Section 16. Authorization of Related Actions and Agreements. The Treasurer, the Executive Director and the officers of the Agency, or the duly authorized deputies thereof, are hereby authorized and directed, jointly and severally, to do any and all things and to execute and deliver any and all agreements and documents which they deem necessary or advisable in order to consummate the issuance, sale, delivery, remarketing, conversion and administration of Bonds and otherwise to effectuate the purposes of this resolution, including any amendment or supplement to any agreement or document relating to Bonds in any manner that would be authorized under this resolution if such agreement or document related to Bonds authorized by this resolution. Such agreements may include, but are not limited to, remarketing agreements, tender agreements or similar agreements regarding any put option for the Bonds, broker-dealer agreements, market agent agreements, auction agent agreements or other agreements necessary or desirable in connection with the issuance of Bonds in, or the conversion of Bonds to, an auction rate mode or an indexed rate mode, agreements for the investment of moneys relating to
the Bonds, reimbursement agreements relating to any credit or liquidity enhancement or put option provided for the Bonds, continuing disclosure agreements and agreements for necessary services provided in the course of the issuance of the bonds, including but not limited to, agreements with bond underwriters and placement agents, bond trustees, bond counsel and financial advisors and contracts for consulting services or information services relating to the financial management of the Agency, including advisors or consultants on interest rate swaps, cash flow management, and similar matters, and contracts for financial printing and similar services. The Agency's reimbursement obligation under any such reimbursement agreement may be a special, limited obligation or a general obligation and may, subject to the rights of the Bondholders, be secured by a pledge of the same revenues and assets that may be pledged to secure Bonds.

This resolution shall constitute full, separate, complete and additional authority for the execution and delivery of all agreements and instruments described in this resolution, without regard to any limitation in the Agency’s regulations and without regard to any other resolution of the Board that does not expressly amend and limit this resolution.

Section 17. Additional Delegation. All actions by the Executive Director approved or authorized by this resolution may be taken by the Chief Deputy Director of the Agency, the Director of Financing of the Agency, the Comptroller of the Agency or any other person specifically authorized in writing by the Executive Director.
SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Thomas C. Hughes, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of Resolution No. 04-03 duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency duly called and held on the 22nd day of January, 2004, of which meeting all said directors had due notice; and that at said meeting said Resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have executed this certificate and affixed the seal of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency hereto this 22nd day of January, 2004.

[SEAL]

Thomas C. Hughes
Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency
SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Thomas C. Hughes, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of Resolution No. 04-03 duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency duly called and held on the 22nd day of January, 2004, of which meeting all said directors had due notice; and that at said meeting said Resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

I further certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing copy with the original minutes of said meeting on file and of record in my office; that said copy is a full, true, and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted at said meeting and entered in said minutes; and that said Resolution has not been amended, modified or rescinded in any manner since the date of its adoption, and the same is now in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have executed this certificate and affixed the seal of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency hereto this ___ day of ___________, ___.

[SEAL]

Thomas C. Hughes
Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency
MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors

Ken Carlson, Director of Financing

From: CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Date: January 7, 2004

Subject: ANNUAL MULTIFAMILY BOND REAUTHORIZATION
RESOLUTION 04-04

Resolution 04-04 would authorize the sale and issuance of CalHFA multifamily bonds (with related interest rate swaps and other financial agreements) for another year. In addition, the resolution would authorize the Agency to borrow for multifamily purposes using both short-term and long-term credit facilities.

Annual reauthorization, a practice approved by the Board every year since 1987, enables the staff to schedule and size our bond transactions to meet the demand for loan funds throughout the year without regard to the timing of individual Board meetings.

Resolution 04-04 would authorize multifamily bonds to be issued in various amounts by category, as follows:

1. equal to the amount of prior multifamily bonds being retired, including eligible bonds of other issuers;

2. equal to the amount of private activity bond volume cap made available for our multifamily program by the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee;

3. up to $800 million for the combined amount of 501(c)(3) bonds, "governmental purpose" bonds, and federally-taxable multifamily bonds (in addition to any taxable bonds issued under the first category);

4. up to $300 million for financing or refinancing the acquisition of existing multifamily loans;

While bonds would be authorized to be issued under any of the previously-approved forms of indenture as listed in the resolution, we again anticipate continuing to utilize the Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds III indenture, which relies on the Agency's general obligation ratings of Aa3/AA- for its credit. The $1.08 billion of bonds outstanding (as of February 1) under this 7-year-old indenture constitutes approximately 14.6% of our $7.4 billion of debt. Our general obligation is pledged to a total of $1.28 billion (17.6%) of our bonds, and $1.25 billion of these are multifamily bonds. Our G.O. acts as the primary credit enhancement for our multifamily program, thus reducing the cost of outside sources of credit, while preserving our program's independence. As an example, we were able to obtain bond insurance at a relatively inexpensive premium for last year's multifamily auction bonds.
The resolution would also authorize the full range of related financial agreements, including contracts for investment of bond proceeds, for warehousing of mortgages pending the availability of bond proceeds, for interest rate hedging (including the continued use of interest rate swaps), and for forward delivery of bonds through August 1, 2006. The resolution would also authorize contracts for consulting services or information services related to the financial management of the Agency, including advisors or consultants on interest rate swaps, cash flow management, and similar matters, and contracts for financial printing and similar services.

The resolution would also reauthorize short-term credit facilities in an aggregate amount not to exceed $400 million (for both the Homeownership and Multifamily Programs). This authorization would allow us to continue to utilize our $300 million warehouse line from the State's Pooled Money Investment Board and our $100 million line of credit from the Bank of America. This bank line of credit is primarily used for multifamily loan warehousing.

A new section of the resolution would authorize long-term credit facilities in an aggregate amount not to exceed $300 million (for both the Homeownership and Multifamily Programs). A long-term credit facility has been offered by Fannie Mae, and we believe that it will be a useful borrowing tool for carrying loans made for downpayment assistance or made to local agencies under the HELP program or the new multifamily Locality Initiatives program. The downpayment assistance loans (primarily for the Agency-funded CHAP program) and the HELP loans are currently carried directly by the Agency's Housing Assistance Trust; the Locality Initiatives program is being developed by our Multifamily Programs staff.

In order to allow for necessary overlap of authority for bond issues scheduled during the time that reauthorization is being considered, Resolution 04-04 would not expire until 30 days after the first Board meeting in the year 2005 at which there is a quorum. Likewise, last year's multifamily resolution (03-06) will not expire until 30 days after this meeting.

During 2004 we anticipate a small issue of multifamily drawdown bonds and two issues of our Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds III -- in June and November -- each in connection with the CDLAC allocation meeting schedule. We expect both of the MHRB-III transactions to include additional bonds to be authorized by this resolution, such as 501(c)(3) bonds, refunding bonds, and taxable bonds.

Attachment
RESOLUTION NO. 04-04

RESOLUTION OF THE CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
AUTHORIZING THE AGENCY’S MULTIFAMILY BOND INDENTURES, THE ISSUANCE
OF MULTIFAMILY BONDS, SHORT- AND LONG-TERM CREDIT FACILITIES FOR
MULTIFAMILY PURPOSES, AND RELATED FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS AND
CONTRACTS OF SERVICES

WHEREAS, the California Housing Finance Agency (the “Agency”) has
determined that there exists a need in California for the financing of mortgage loans for the
construction or development of multi-unit rental housing developments (the “Developments”) for
the purpose of providing housing for persons and families of low or moderate income;

WHEREAS, the Agency has determined that it is in the public interest for the
Agency to provide such financial assistance by means of an ongoing program (the “Program”) to
make or acquire, or to make loans to lenders to make or acquire, mortgage loans, for the purpose
of financing such Developments (the “Loans”);

WHEREAS, pursuant to Parts 1 through 4 of Division 31 of the Health and Safety
Code of the State of California (the “Act”), the Agency has the authority to issue bonds to
provide sufficient funds to finance the Program, including the making of Loans, the payment of
capitalized interest on the bonds, the establishment of reserves to secure the bonds, and the
payment of other costs of the Agency incident to, and necessary or convenient to, the issuance of
the bonds; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Act, the Agency has the authority to enter into short-
term and long-term credit facilities for the purposes of financing the Program, including the
making of Loans and the payment of other costs of the Agency incident to, and necessary or
convenient to, the issuance of the bonds, and for the purposes of financing the making or
purchase of non-traditional loan products or other assets, including, but not limited to, loans to
local public entities, in each case for the purpose of providing, directly or indirectly, rental
housing for persons and families of low or moderate income;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the California Housing Finance
Agency as follows:

Section 1. Determination of Need and Amount. The Agency is of the opinion
and hereby determines that the offer, sale and issuance of one or more series of multifamily
housing revenue bonds (the “Bonds”), in an aggregate amount not to exceed the sum of the
following amounts is necessary to provide sufficient funds for the Program:
the aggregate amount of prior multifamily bonds of the Agency (or of other issuers to the extent permitted by law) to be redeemed or maturing in connection with such issuance;

(b) the aggregate amount of private activity bond allocations under federal tax law heretofore or hereafter made available to the Agency for such purpose;

(c) if and to the extent the Bonds are "qualified 501(c)(3) bonds" under federal tax law, are not "private activity bonds" under federal tax law, or are determined by the Executive Director of the Agency (the "Executive Director") to be intended not to be tax-exempt for federal income tax purposes, $800,000,000; and

(d) if and to the extent the Bonds are issued for the purpose of financing or refinancing the acquisition of existing Loans that finance existing Developments, or for the purpose of refinancing such Developments, $300,000,000.

Section 2. Authorization and Timing. The Bonds are hereby authorized to be issued at such time or times on or before the day 30 days after the date on which is held the first meeting in the year 2005 of the Board of Directors of the Agency at which a quorum is present, as the Executive Director deems appropriate, upon consultation with the Treasurer of the State of California (the "Treasurer") as to the timing of each such issuance; provided, however, that if the Bonds are sold at a time on or before the day 30 days after the date on which is held such meeting, pursuant to a forward purchase or drawdown agreement providing for the issuance of such Bonds on a later date on or before August 1, 2006, upon specified terms and conditions, such Bonds may be issued on such later date; and provided, further, that Bonds being issued to refund Bonds of the type described in Section 1(d) of this resolution or to refinance Developments financed by Bonds of the type described in such Section 1(d) may be issued at any time prior to the original maturity date of the original Loans financed by such Bonds.

Section 3. Approval of Indentures, Supplemental Indentures and Certain Other Financing Documents. (a) The Executive Director and the Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Agency (the "Secretary") are hereby authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency in connection with the issuance of Bonds, to execute and acknowledge and to deliver to a duly qualified bank or trust company selected by the Executive Director to act, with the approval of the Treasurer, as trustee (the "Trustee"), one or more new indentures (the "New Indentures"), in one or more forms similar to one or more of the following (collectively, the "Prior Indentures"):

(1) the Multi-Family Revenue Bonds (Federally Insured Loans) Indenture, dated as of April 17, 1979;

(2) the Multi-Unit Rental Housing Revenue Bonds Indenture, dated as of July 12, 1979;

(3) the Rental Housing Revenue Bonds (FHA Insured Loans) Indenture, dated as of June 1, 1982.
the Multi-Unit Rental Housing Revenue Bonds II Indenture, dated as of September 1, 1982;

the Multifamily Rehabilitation Revenue Bonds, 1983 Issue A Indenture, dated as of December 1, 1983;

the Multifamily Housing Revenue Bond (Insured Letter of Credit 1984-I) Indenture, dated as of March 1, 1984;

the Housing Revenue Bond Indenture, dated as of July 1, 1984;

the Multifamily Rehabilitation Revenue Bond, 1985 Issue A, Indenture, dated as of March 1, 1985;

the form of indenture approved by the Board of Directors of the Agency at its May 11, 1989 meeting for the Financial Guaranty Insurance Company program;

the Housing Revenue Bond II Indenture, dated as of July 1, 1992;

the Multifamily Housing Revenue Refunding Bond Indentures, dated as of July 1, 1993 (including as originally delivered and as amended and restated);

the Multifamily Housing Revenue Bond (Tara Village Apartments), 1994 Series A, Indenture, dated as of November 1, 1994;

the Multifamily Housing Revenue Bond (FHA Insured Mortgage Loans) Indenture, dated February 1, 1995;

the Multifamily Housing Revenue Bond II Indenture, dated as of October 1, 1995;

the Multifamily Housing Revenue Bond III Indenture, dated as of March 1, 1997;

the form of commercial paper note indenture presented to the May 11, 2000 meeting of the Agency;

the Multifamily Loan Purchase Bond Indenture, dated as of July 1, 2000;

the form of draw down bond indenture approved by Resolution No. 01-05, as amended by Resolution No. 01-39, adopted November 8, 2001; or

the form of bond indenture approved by Resolution No. 02-02, as amended by Resolution 02-17, adopted June 6, 2002.

Each such New Indenture may be executed, acknowledged and delivered with such changes therein as the officers executing the same approve upon consultation with the
Agency's legal counsel, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

(b) For each series of Bonds, the Executive Director and the Secretary are hereby authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency, if appropriate, to execute and acknowledge and to deliver with respect to each series of Bonds, a supplemental indenture (a "Supplemental Indenture") pertaining to such series in substantially the form of any supplemental indenture or series indenture executed or approved in connection with any of the Prior Indentures, in each case, with such changes therein as the officers executing the same approve upon consultation with the Agency's legal counsel, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

The Executive Director is hereby expressly authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency, to determine in furtherance of the objectives of the Program those matters required to be determined under the New Indentures, as appropriate, in connection with the issuance of each such series.

(c) For each series of Bonds, the Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed to execute, and the Secretary is hereby authorized to attest, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency and under its seal, if and to the extent appropriate, a reimbursement agreement, a letter of credit agreement or any other arrangement with respect to credit or liquidity support in substantially the forms of the reimbursement agreements, letter of credit agreements or other such arrangements contemplated under the New Indentures or used in connection with the bonds issued under one or more of the Prior Indentures.

(d) Any New Indenture, Supplemental Indenture or reimbursement agreement, letter of credit agreement or other such arrangement as finally executed may include such modifications as the Executive Director may deem necessary or desirable in furtherance of the objectives of the Program, including, but not limited to, one or more of the following provisions:

(1) for the Agency's insured or uninsured, limited or general, obligation to pay any debt secured thereby,

(2) for a pledge of an amount of the Supplementary Bond Security Account to the extent necessary to obtain an appropriate credit rating or appropriate credit enhancement,

(3) for a pledge of additional revenues which may be released periodically to the Agency from the lien of one or more indentures heretofore entered into by the Agency, including but not limited to one or more of the following:

(A) the Prior Indentures,

(B) the Home Mortgage Revenue Bond Indenture, dated as of September 1, 1982, as amended, and
(C) the indentures under which are issued the Single Family Mortgage Bonds,

(4) for a deposit of such other available assets of the Agency in an appropriate amount in furtherance of the Program,

(5) for risk sharing provisions dividing between the Agency and any credit provider and/or FHA, in such manner as the Executive Director may deem necessary or desirable in furtherance of the objectives of the Program, the credit and financing risks relating to the Bonds and the Developments financed by the Bonds,

(6) for a liquidity facility,

(7) for contingent or deferred interest, or

(8) for the use or application of payments or receipts under any arrangement entered into under Section 9 of this resolution.

Section 4. Approval of Forms and Terms of Bonds. The Bonds shall be in such denominations, have such registration provisions, be executed in such manner, be payable in such medium of payment at such place or places within or without California, be subject to such terms of redemption (including from such sinking fund installments as may be provided for) and contain such terms and conditions as each Indenture as finally approved shall provide. The Bonds shall have the maturity or maturities and shall bear interest at the fixed, adjustable or variable rate or rates deemed appropriate by the Executive Director in furtherance of the objectives of the Program; provided that no Bond shall have a term in excess of fifty years or bear interest at a stated rate in excess of fifteen percent (15%) per annum (in the case of variable rate bonds, a maximum floating interest rate of twenty-five percent (25%) per annum). Commercial paper shall be treated for these purposes as variable rate bonds. Any of the Bonds and the Supplemental Indenture(s) may contain such provisions as may be necessary to accommodate an option to put such Bonds prior to maturity for purchase by or on behalf of the Agency or a person other than the Agency, to accommodate the requirements of any provider of bond insurance or other credit or liquidity enhancement or to accommodate the requirements of purchasers of Dutch auction bonds or indexed floaters.

Section 5. Authorization of Disclosure. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to circulate one or more preliminary official statements relating to the Bonds and, after the sale of the Bonds, to execute and circulate one or more official statements relating to the Bonds, and the circulation of such preliminary official statement and such official statement to prospective and actual purchasers of the Bonds is hereby approved. The Executive Director is further authorized to hold information meetings concerning the Bonds and to distribute other information and material relating to the Bonds.

Section 6. Authorization of Sale of Bonds. The Bonds are hereby authorized to be sold at negotiated or competitive sale or sales. The Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, to execute and deliver one or more agreements, by and among the Agency, the Treasurer and such purchasers or underwriters
as the Executive Director may select (the "Purchasers"), relating to the sale of the Bonds, in such form as the Executive Director may approve upon consultation with the Agency’s legal counsel, such approval to be evidenced conclusively by the execution and delivery of said agreements by the Executive Director.

The Treasurer is hereby authorized and requested, without further action of this Board and unless instructed otherwise by this Board, to sell the Bonds pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in each such agreement as finally executed on behalf of the Agency. The Treasurer is hereby further authorized and requested to deposit the proceeds of any good faith deposit to be received by the Treasurer under the terms of such agreement in a special trust account for the benefit of the Agency, and the amount of such deposit shall be retained by the Agency, applied at the time of delivery of the applicable Bonds as part of the purchase price thereof, or returned to the Purchasers, as provided in such agreement.

Section 7. Authorization of Execution of Bonds. The Executive Director is hereby authorized and directed to execute, and the Secretary of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to attest, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency and under its seal, the Bonds, in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount authorized hereby, in accordance with each New Indenture or Supplemental Indenture in one or more of the forms set forth in such New Indenture or Supplemental Indenture.

Section 8. Authorization of Delivery of Bonds. The Bonds when so executed, shall be delivered to the Trustee to be authenticated by or caused to be authenticated by the Trustee. The Trustee is hereby requested and directed to authenticate, or cause to be authenticated, the Bonds by the execution of the certificate of authentication and registration appearing thereon, and to deliver or cause to be delivered the Bonds when duly executed and authenticated to the Purchasers in accordance with written instructions executed on behalf of the Agency by the Executive Director, which instructions said officer is hereby authorized and directed, for and on behalf and in the name of the Agency, to execute and deliver to the Trustee. Such instructions shall provide for the delivery of the Bonds to the Purchasers, upon payment of the purchase price thereof.

Section 9. Authorization of Related Financial Agreements. The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, any and all agreements and documents designed (i) to reduce or hedge the amount or duration of any payment, interest rate, spread or similar risk, (ii) to result in a lower cost of borrowing when used in combination with the issuance or carrying of bonds or investments, or (iii) to enhance the relationship between risk and return with respect to the Program or any portion thereof. To the extent authorized by Government Code Section 5922, such agreements or other documents may include (a) interest rate swap agreements, (b) forward payment conversion agreements, (c) futures or other contracts providing for payments based on levels of, or changes in, interest rates or other indices, (d) contracts to exchange cash flows for a series of payments, or (e) contracts, including, without limitation, interest rate floors or caps, options, puts or calls to hedge payment, interest rate, spread or similar exposure, and in each such case may be entered into in anticipation of the issuance of bonds at such times as may be determined by such officers. Such agreements and other documents are authorized to be entered
into with parties selected by the Executive Director, after giving due consideration for the creditworthiness of the counterparties, where applicable, or any other criteria in furtherance of the objectives of the Program.

Section 10. **Authorization of Program Documents.** The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized and directed to execute all documents they deem necessary in connection with the Program, including, but not limited to, regulatory agreements, loan agreements, origination and servicing agreements (or other loan-to-lender documents), servicing agreements, developer agreements, financing agreements, investment agreements, agreements to enter into escrow and forward purchase agreements, escrow and forward purchase agreements, refunding agreements and continuing disclosure agreements, in each case with such other parties as the Executive Director may select in furtherance of the objectives of the Program.

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more mortgage sale agreements with such purchasers as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the objectives of the Program. Any such sale of Loans may be on either a current or a forward purchase basis.

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, contracts to conduct foreclosures of mortgages owned or serviced by the Agency with such attorneys or foreclosure companies as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the objectives of the Program.

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, contracts for the sale of foreclosed properties with such purchasers as the Executive Director may select in accordance with the objectives of the Program. Any such sale of foreclosed properties may be on either an all cash basis or may include financing by the Agency. The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are also authorized to enter into any other agreements, including but not limited to real estate brokerage agreements, and construction contracts, necessary or convenient for the rehabilitation, listing and sale of such foreclosed properties.

Section 11. **Authorization of Short-Term Credit Facilities.** In addition, the Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more short-term credit facilities for the purposes of (i) financing the purchase of Loans on an interim basis, prior to the financing of such Loans with Bonds, whether issued or to be issued and (ii) financing expenditures of the Agency incident to, and necessary or convenient to, the issuance of Bonds, including, but not limited to, Agency expenditures to pay costs of issuance, capitalized interest, redemption price of prior bonds of the Agency, costs relating to credit or liquidity support, costs relating to investment products, or net payments and expenses relating to interest rate hedges and other financial products. Any such short-term credit facility may be from any appropriate source, including, but not limited to, the Pooled Money Investment Account pursuant to Government Code Section 16312; provided, however, that the aggregate outstanding principal amount of short-term credit
facilities from the Pooled Money Investment Account authorized under this resolution or Resolution No. 04-03 (the single family financing resolution adopted at the same meeting) may not at any time exceed $400,000,000 (separate and apart from the amount of Bonds authorized by Section 1 of this resolution).

The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to use available Agency moneys (other than and in addition to the proceeds of bonds) to make or purchase loans to be financed by bonds (including bonds authorized by prior resolutions of this Board) in anticipation of draws on a credit facility, the issuance of Bonds or the availability of Bond proceeds for such purposes.

Section 12. **Authorization of Long-Term Credit Facilities.** The Executive Director and the other officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to enter into, for and in the name and on behalf of the Agency, one or more long-term credit facilities for the purposes of financing the making or purchase of non-traditional loan products or other assets, including, but not limited to, loans to local public entities, in each case for the purpose of providing, directly or indirectly, rental housing for persons and families of low or moderate income. As determined by the officer of the Agency executing any such credit facility, the Agency’s payment obligations under such credit facility may be secured by a pledge of any such loans or assets and may be general obligations of the Agency; provided that loans and assets financed from proceeds of any such credit facility are not required to have scheduled or expected payments sufficient to produce amounts sufficient to satisfy the obligations of the Agency under such credit facility when due. Any such credit facility may be from any appropriate source, including, but not limited to, Fannie Mae. The aggregate outstanding principal amount of such credit facilities authorized under this resolution or Resolution No. 04-03 (the single family financing resolution adopted at the same meeting) may not at any time exceed $300,000,000 (separate and apart from the amount of Bonds authorized by Section 1 of this resolution), and no such credit facility shall have a term in excess of twenty (20) years or bear interest at a stated rate in excess of fifteen percent (15%) per annum (or in the case of any such credit facility pursuant to which interest accrues at a variable rate, a maximum floating interest rate of twenty-five percent (25%) per annum). Each such credit facility may be executed, acknowledged and delivered with terms not inconsistent with the requirements of this paragraph as the officer or officers executing the same approve upon consultation with the Agency’s legal counsel, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

Section 13. **Ratification of Prior Actions.** All actions previously taken by the officers of the Agency in connection with the implementation of the Program, the issuance of the Bonds, the issuance of any prior bonds (the “Prior Bonds”), the execution and delivery of related financial agreements and related program agreements and the implementation of any credit facilities as described above are hereby approved and ratified.

Section 14. **Authorization of Related Actions and Agreements.** The Treasurer, the Executive Director and the officers of the Agency, or the duly authorized deputies thereof, are hereby authorized and directed, jointly and severally, to do any and all things and to execute and deliver any and all agreements and documents which they deem necessary or advisable in order to consummate the issuance, sale, delivery, remarketing, conversion and administration of
Bonds and Prior Bonds and otherwise to effectuate the purposes of this resolution, including any amendment or supplement to any agreement or document relating to Bonds or Prior Bonds in any manner that would be authorized under this resolution if such agreement or document related to Bonds authorized by this resolution. Such agreements may include, but are not limited to, remarketing agreements, tender agreements or similar agreements regarding any put option for Bonds or Prior Bonds, broker-dealer agreements, market agent agreements, auction agent agreements or other agreements necessary or desirable in connection with the issuance of Bonds in, or the conversion of Bonds or Prior Bonds to, an auction rate mode or an indexed rate mode, agreements for the investment of moneys relating to the Bonds or Prior Bonds, reimbursement agreements relating to any credit or liquidity enhancement or put option provided for the Bonds or the Prior Bonds, continuing disclosure agreements and agreements for necessary services provided in the course of the issuance of the bonds, including but not limited to, agreements with bond underwriters and placement agents, bond trustees, bond counsel and financial advisors and contracts for consulting services or information services relating to the financial management of the Agency, including advisors or consultants on interest rate swaps, cash flow management, and similar matters, and contracts for financial printing and similar services. The Agency’s reimbursement obligation under any such reimbursement agreement may be a special, limited obligation or a general obligation and may, subject to the rights of the Bondholders, be secured by a pledge of the same revenues and assets that may be pledged to secure Bonds.

This resolution shall constitute full, separate, complete and additional authority for the execution and delivery of all agreements and instruments described in this resolution, without regard to any limitation in the Agency’s regulations and without regard to any other resolution of the Board that does not expressly amend and limit this resolution.

Section 15. **Additional Delegation.** All actions by the Executive Director approved or authorized by this resolution may be taken by the Chief Deputy Director of the Agency, the Director of Financing of the Agency, the Comptroller of the Agency or any other person specifically authorized in writing by the Executive Director.
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SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Thomas C. Hughes, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of Resolution No. 04-04 duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency duly called and held on the 22nd day of January, 2004, of which meeting all said directors had due notice; and that at said meeting said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have executed this certificate and affixed the seal of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency hereto this 22nd day of January, 2004.

[SEAL]

Thomas C. Hughes
Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency
SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Thomas C. Hughes, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the Resolution No. 04-04 duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency duly called and held on the 22nd day of January, 2004, of which meeting all said directors had due notice; and that at said meeting said resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

I further certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing copy with the original minutes of said meeting on file and of record in my office; that said copy is a full, true, and correct copy of the original resolution adopted at said meeting and entered in said minutes; and that said resolution has not been amended, modified, or rescinded in any manner since the date of its adoption, and the same is now in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have executed this certificate and affixed the seal of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency hereto this ___ day of _____________, ___.

[SEAL]

Thomas C. Hughes
Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency
MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors

Date: January 7, 2004

Ken Carlson, Director of Financing

From: CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE APPLICATION
TO THE CALIFORNIA DEBT LIMIT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION 04-05

The California Debt Limit Allocation Committee ("CDLAC") is the State entity which, under California law, allocates the federal volume cap for "private activity bonds" to be issued each year by State and local bond issuers. Private activity bonds are federally tax-exempt bonds which are issued to benefit non-governmental borrowers such as first-time homebuyers or owners of affordable rental housing developments.

Resolution 04-05 would authorize application to CDLAC for a maximum of $600 million of single family allocation and $400 million of multifamily allocation. Such authorization would be in effect during the period of time in which Resolutions 04-03 and 04-04, which authorize the issuance of single family and multifamily bonds, are themselves in effect.

CDLAC met on December 17 to award an unprecedented fourth round of allocations of 2003 volume cap. At this meeting, the committee also took action to grant to CalHFA the amount of any remaining unused 2003 volume cap for use in our homeownership program. As of this writing, this amount remaining was $74.1 million, but it could grow if issuers report any additional failures to use in their entirety allocations granted in 2003. In December of 2002 we were similarly allocated $139.7 million of unused 2002 volume cap. The amount of 2004 volume cap to be allocated to the Agency will be partially offset by the amount of this unused 2003 volume cap we receive and carry forward.

CDLAC is tentatively scheduled to meet on January 21 to officially establish the new State ceiling amount, i.e., the amount of volume cap that can be allocated during 2004. Based on state population increases and an inflation adjustment, the 2004 State ceiling is estimated to be in excess of $2.8 billion. At this same meeting CDLAC is also expected to determine amounts for each type of private activity - e.g., homeownership (including the division between CalHFA and local issuers), multifamily, student loans, exempt facilities, industrial development. At the Board meeting we expect to be able to report what amounts CDLAC has set aside for housing in 2004.
CDLAC staff will be recommending to the committee that only two application rounds be scheduled during 2004, with a third round to be implemented only if volume cap is still available at the end of the year. If the recommendation is accepted, then applications for both single family and multifamily may be taken and allocations granted according to the tentative schedule below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications Due</td>
<td>2/18/04</td>
<td>7/7/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Meeting</td>
<td>4/21/04</td>
<td>9/15/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amounts proposed in Resolution 04-05 are greater than we would expect to apply for. However, the presumption is that the Board would want CalHFA to be authorized to apply and eligible to do so under CDLAC rules if applications for CalHFA loans greatly increase and allocation is available.

The attached table shows the amount of volume cap allocated to housing purposes over the past five years and what portion of these amounts were allocated to CalHFA.

Attachments
# CDLAC Allocations 1999 - 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume Cap for all Programs</th>
<th>All Multifamily</th>
<th>To CalHFA</th>
<th>% of MF Total</th>
<th>SINGLE FAMILY</th>
<th>All Single Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1,633,327,500</td>
<td>$889,099,275</td>
<td>$36,782,500</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>$471,906,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$1,657,256,050</td>
<td>$911,644,686</td>
<td>$159,315,000</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>$434,254,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$2,122,538,462</td>
<td>$1,099,132,743</td>
<td>$123,550,000</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>$670,707,371</td>
<td>(1) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$2,587,584,750</td>
<td>$1,294,941,472</td>
<td>$119,445,000</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>$843,197,582</td>
<td>(1) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$2,633,702,475</td>
<td>$1,436,702,475</td>
<td>$227,370,000</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>$724,000,000</td>
<td>(1) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes MRBs and te Extra Credit Teacher Home Purchase Program.
(2) Includes $1,700,000 multifamily carry forward allocation.
(3) Includes $73,775,798 single family carry forward allocation.
(4) Includes $139,255,188 single family carry forward allocation.
(5) Includes an estimated $74,100,000 single family carry forward allocation.
RESOLUTION NO. 04-05

RESOLUTION OF THE CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY
APPROVING APPLICATIONS TO THE CALIFORNIA DEBT LIMIT ALLOCATION
COMMITTEE FOR PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND ALLOCATIONS
FOR THE AGENCY’S HOMEOWNERSHIP AND MULTIFAMILY PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the California Housing Finance Agency (the “Agency”) has
determined that there exists a need in California for providing financial assistance to persons and
families of low or moderate income to enable them to purchase moderately priced single family
residences (the “Residences”);

WHEREAS, the Agency has determined that it is in the public interest for the
Agency to provide such financial assistance by means of ongoing programs (collectively, the
“Homeownership Program”) to make lower-than-market-rate loans for the permanent financing
of Residences;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Parts 1 through 4 of Division 31 of the Health and Safety
Code of the State of California (the “Act”), the Agency has the authority to issue bonds to
provide sufficient funds to finance the Homeownership Program;

WHEREAS, the Agency has by its Resolution No. 04-03 authorized the issuance
of bonds for the Homeownership Program and desires to authorize application to the California
Debt Limit Allocation Committee for private activity bond allocations to be used in connection
with the issuance of a portion of such bonds in order for interest on such bonds to be excludable
from gross income for federal income tax purposes;

WHEREAS, the Agency has also determined that there exists a need in California
for the financing of mortgage loans for the construction or development of multifamily rental
housing developments (the “Developments”) for the purpose of providing housing for persons
and families of low or moderate income;

WHEREAS, the Agency has determined that it is in the public interest for the
Agency to provide such financial assistance by means of an ongoing program (the “Multifamily
Program”) to make or acquire, or to make loans to lenders to make or acquire, mortgage loans,
for the purpose of financing such Developments; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Act, the Agency has the authority to issue bonds to
provide sufficient funds to finance the Multifamily Program;

WHEREAS, the Agency has by its Resolution No. 04-04 authorized the issuance
of bonds for the Multifamily Program and desires to authorize application to the California Debt
Limit Allocation Committee for private activity bond allocations to be used in connection with
the issuance of a portion of such bonds in order for interest on such bonds to be excludable from
gross income for federal income tax purposes;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors (the “Board”) of the California Housing Finance Agency as follows:

Section 1. **Authorization to Apply to CDLAC for the Homeownership Program.** The officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to apply from time to time to the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (“CDLAC”) for private activity bond allocations in an aggregate amount of up to $600,000,000 per year to be used in connection with bonds issued under Resolution No. 04-03 or resolutions heretofore or hereafter adopted by the Agency for the Homeownership Program. In the alternative, subject to the approval of CDLAC and under such terms and conditions as may be established by CDLAC, any such allocation received is authorized by this Board to be used in connection with a mortgage credit certificate program or in connection with a teacher home purchase program.

Section 2. **Authorization to Apply to CDLAC for the Multifamily Program.** The officers of the Agency are hereby authorized to apply from time to time to CDLAC for private activity bond allocations in an aggregate amount of up to $400,000,000 per year, to be used in connection with bonds issued under Resolution No. 04-04 or resolutions heretofore or hereafter adopted by the Agency for the Multifamily Program.

Section 3. **Authorization of Related Actions and Agreements.** The officers of the Agency, or the duly authorized deputies thereof, are hereby authorized and directed, jointly and severally, to do any and all things and to execute and deliver any and all agreements and documents which they may deem necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purposes of this resolution.
SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Thomas C. Hughes, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency, hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of Resolution No. 04-05 duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency duly called and held on the 22nd day of January, 2004, of which meeting all said directors had due notice; and that at said meeting said Resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have executed this certificate and affixed the seal of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency hereto this 22nd day of January, 2004.

Thomas C. Hughes
Secretary of the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency

[SEAL]
MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors

Date: January 22, 2004

From: Tom Hughes, General Counsel

CALIFORNIA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

Subject: 2004 Contracting Resolution

At the first meeting of each year the Agency presents to the Board for its approval resolutions relating to contracting for the upcoming year. The 2004 contracting resolution is substantially identical to resolution 03-09, adopted by the Board on January 9, 2003.

By statute, the Board has the power to approve “major contractual obligations”. By regulation, contracts involving over $500,000 require Board approval, or delegation authority by the Board. Over the years, one of the primary functions of the Board has been to approve multi-family loans at each meeting. However, vendor and other similar third party contracts also fall within the statutory provision. Historically, each January the Board has, in the annual bond authority resolutions, granted the Agency the authority to enter into any vendor or other operational contracts needed to implement bond funded programs. Beginning in 2003, the Board extended that authority to non-bond funded programs and other operational expenditures in an annual contracting resolution.

There are two primary reasons for requesting the authority each year. The first is that the Agency, as a self-supporting competitive business, needs to be able to execute contracts in the regular course of business without waiting up to two months for the next Board meeting. Secondly, many of the affected contracts are multi-year arrangements, and there is frequently no way of knowing when or if the total compensation will exceed the threshold amount. In those circumstances, without the proposed delegation, the authority to continue payments under such contractual commitments may be questioned. There are some obligations which the Agency knows will exceed the threshold in a single year, such as bond counsel and related costs (which are also authorized by the annual bond resolutions), and lease payments for the Agency’s three office spaces. Litigation costs in ongoing major litigation described in the resolution will also exceed the threshold in 2004.

The proposed resolution attempts to describe categories of contracts for which the Executive Director may contract. Each of these relates to the implementation of the day to day activities of the Agency. The expenditures under such contracts are also part of the Agency’s annual budget, which is subject to the Board’s review and approval each May.
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RESOLUTION 04-06

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the California Housing Finance Agency ("Agency") is empowered by California Health & Safety Code Section 50914(a) to authorize "major contractual obligations" of the Agency; and

WHEREAS, Title 25 California Code of Regulations Section 13302(b) defines such major contractual obligations as those exceeding the sum of $500,000; and

WHEREAS, Title 25 California Code of Regulations Section 13302(b) and (g) permit the General Counsel of the Agency to make certain determinations and interpretations regarding the need for approval of particular contracts by the Board of Directors of the Agency; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has determined that the Executive Director should have the authority to enter into certain types of major contractual obligations on a continuing basis, without the need for additional approval beyond the authority granted in this resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors finds that the grant of such authority is necessary and proper to insure that the Executive Director of the Agency will be able to execute new contracts, and amend existing contracts, on a timely basis; and

WHEREAS, this resolution is intended to assist the General Counsel of the Agency in making the determinations and interpretations provided for by regulation, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Agency as follows:

1. The Executive Director of the Agency, or the officers or employees of the Agency, duly authorized by the Executive Director, may, during the calendar year 2004, and for that portion of calendar year 2005 that precedes the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Directors in such year, execute such new or amended contracts in which the financial obligation or liability exceeds $500,000 over the term of such contract, as specified by this resolution, without the need for further Board approval.

2. The contracts and agreements authorized by the Board of Directors, as provided above, are as follows:

   (a) **Homeownership Programs**

      (i) Contracts authorized by Resolution 04-03, including loan servicing and loan origination agreements.
(ii) Contracts for consulting services or information services relating to homeownership lending programs.

(iii) Contracting relating to the sale of properties acquired by foreclosure

(b) **Multifamily Lending Programs**

(i) Contracts authorized by Resolution 04-04.

(ii) Contracts for consulting services or information services relating to multifamily lending programs.

(iii) Contracts for underwriting of multifamily loans.

(c) **Special Programs**

(i) Contracts and loan documents relating to the award of HELP loans to localities.

(ii) Contracts and loan documents relating to the award of tax increment loans to redevelopment agencies.

(d) **Mortgage Insurance Services**

(i) Contracts for consulting services or information services relating to mortgage insurance programs.

(ii) Contracts for services relating to reinsurance or co-insurance of obligations insured by the Agency.

(e) **Administration**

(i) Contracts for consulting or information services relating to personnel and human relations issues.

(ii) Lease agreements for space, including leases, lease amendments and related agreements for the premises at the Senator Office Building, at 1121 L Street, Sacramento, CA; the premises at 100 Corporate Pointe, Culver City, CA; and the premises at the Meridian Plaza Building, 14th and L Street, Sacramento, CA.
(iii) Policies or contracts of insurance, including commercial liability, property, earthquake, and other forms of commercial insurance.

(f) Office of General Counsel

(i) Contracts for retention of counsel in any pending or anticipated litigation, including the pending actions of West LB AG v. California Housing Finance Agency, United States district Court, Southern District of New York, and California Housing Finance Agency v. Hanover California Management & Accounting Center et al., Orange County Superior Court No. 02CC10634.

(ii) Contracts for legal services as needed relating to the lending or insurance programs of the Agency, or the administrative functions of the Agency.

(g) Financing

(i) Contracts authorized by Resolutions 04-03 and 04-04.

(ii) Contracts for consulting services or information services relating to the financial management of the Agency, including advisors on interest rate swaps, cash flow, and similar matters.

(iii) Contracts for financial printing and similar services.

(h) Marketing

(i) Contracts for CalHFA branding and marketing services.

(ii) Contracts for advertising.

(i) Asset Management

(i) Contracts for property management or inspection services.

(ii) Contracts for consulting or information services relating to the management of properties financed by Agency loans.

(iii) Sales of multi-family or single family real estate owned by the Agency;
Resolution 04-06
Page 4

(j) **Accounting and Loan Servicing**
   
   (i) Contracts for auditing and accounting services.
   
   (ii) Contracts for consulting or information services relating to financial reporting or accounting issues.

(k) **Information Technology**
   
   (i) Contracts for computer and information technology hardware and software for Agency programs or administration.

3. Nothing in this resolution is intended to supercede any Agency policies or procedures regarding contracting, nor is it intended to abrogate compliance with any provision of statute, regulation, or other law regarding contracting, other than to authorize the contracts specified herein without further Board action.

4. Nothing in this resolution is intended to imply that any contract not described herein, but fully and completely authorized by another resolution of this Board of Directors, is not fully and completely authorized by such other resolution without regard to this resolution or any limitation in any regulation defining the term 'major contractual obligation'.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of Resolution 04-06 adopted at a duly constituted meeting of the Board of Directors of the Agency held on January 22, 2004, at Millbrae, California.

ATTEST: ______________________

Secretary