THE CALIFORNIA DEBT LIMIT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE February 18, 2020 Staff Report REQUEST FOR A QUALIFIED PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND ALLOCATION FOR A QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROJECT

| Applicant: | City of Los Angeles | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Allocation Amount Requested: | | | | |
| Tax-exempt: | \$17,000,000 | | | |
| Project Information: | | | | |
| Name: | Amani Apartments | | | |
| Project Address: | 4200 W. Pico Blvd. | | | |
| Project City, County, Zip Code: | Los Angeles, Los Angeles, 90019 | | | |
| Project Sponsor Information: | | | | |
| Name: | Amani Apartments LP (Wakeland Amani LLC) | | | |
| Principals: | Kenneth L. Sauder, Rebecca Louie, Joan Edelman and Peter Armstrong for Wakeland Amani, LLC | | | |
| Property Management Company: | ConAm | | | |
| Project Financing Information: | | | | |
| Bond Counsel: | Kutak Rock LLP | | | |
| Private Placement Purchaser: | Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (const)/ California Community | | | |
| Private Placement Purchaser: | Reinvestment Corporation (perm) | | | |
| Cash Flow Permanent Bond: | Not Applicable | | | |
| Public Sale: | Not Applicable | | | |
| Underwriter: | Not Applicable | | | |
| Credit Enhancement Provider: | Not Applicable | | | |
| Rating: | Not Applicable | | | |
| TEFRA Noticing Date: | November 14, 2019 | | | |
| TEFRA Adoption Date: | December 10, 2019 | | | |
| Description of Proposed Project: | | | | |
| State Ceiling Pool: | General | | | |
| Total Number of Units: | 54 | | | |
| Manager's Units: | 1 Unrestricted | | | |
| Туре: | New Construction | | | |
| Population Served: | Family/Special Needs | | | |

Amani Apartments is a new construction project located in Los Angeles on a .29-acre site. The project consists of 53 restricted rental units and 1 unrestricted manager unit. The project will have 53 studios and 1 one-bedroom unit. The building will be 5-stories of wood frame construction. Common amenities include large community spaces, on site management offices. Each unit will have owner provided furniture, bed kitchen appliances, along with a kitchen, bathroom. The project will be meeting the Green code in addition to California Building Requirements. The construction is expected to begin July 2020 and will be completed in January 2022.

100%

Description of Public Benefits:

Percent of Restricted Rental Units in the Project:

100% (53 units) restricted to 50% or less of area median income households.

Unit Mix: Studio & 2 bedroom

The proposed project will be receiving service amenity points.

| Ferm of Restrictions: Income and Rent Restrictions: | | 55 years | | | |
|--|----------|--------------|--|------------|-----|
| Details of Project Financing: | | | | | |
| Estimated Total Development Cost: | \$ | 32,737,106 | | | |
| Estimated Hard Costs per Unit: | \$ | 277,258 | (\$14,971,950 /54 units including mgr. uni | | |
| Estimated per Unit Cost: | \$ | 606,243 | 243 (\$32,737,106 /54 units including mgr. uni | | |
| Allocation per Unit: | \$ | 314,815 | 5 (\$17,000,000 /54 units including mgr. unit | | |
| Allocation per Restricted Rental Unit: | \$ | 320,755 | (\$17,000,000 /53 restricted units) | | |
| Sources of Funds: | | Construction | | Permanent | |
| Tax-Exempt Bond Proceeds | \$ | 17,000, | 000 \$ | 3,212,9 | 060 |
| LIH Tax Credit Equity | \$ | 1,315, | | | 51 |
| Deferred Developer Fee | \$ | | 0 \$ | | 90 |
| Deferred Costs | \$ | 3,089, | | | 0 |
| LACDA NPLH | \$ | 2,178, | 000 \$ | 3,420,0 | 000 |
| HCIDLA HHH | \$ | 8,731, | 500 \$ | 5 11,410,0 | 00 |
| HCIDLA Accrued/deferred Interest | \$ | 338, | 205 \$ | 338,2 | .05 |
| CDLAC Refundable PD | \$ | | 000 106 | 8 85,0 | 000 |
| Total Sources | \$ | 32,737, | 106 \$ | 32,737,1 | 06 |
| Uses of Funds: | | | | | |
| Land Cost/Acquisition | \$ | 3,515, | 000 | | |
| New Construction | \$ | 16,638, | 585 | | |
| Contractor Overhead & Profit | \$ | 971, | 349 | | |
| Architectural Fees | \$ | 1,110, | 000 | | |
| Survey and Engineering | \$ | 777, | 759 | | |
| Construction Interest and Fees | \$ | 2,188, | 555 | | |
| Legal Fees | \$ | | 000 | | |
| Reserves | \$ | 933, | | | |
| Appraisal | \$ | | 000 | | |
| Hard Cost Contingency | \$ | 880, | | | |
| Other Project Costs (Soft Costs, Marketing, etc.) | \$ | 2,456, | | | |
| Developer Costs | \$ \$ | 3,155, | | | |
| Total Uses | \$ | 32,737, | 106 | | |

Analyst Comments:

This project is considered a high cost per unit project. Type III construction is more costly than traditional Type V wood framed construction methods, but necessary to support the additional units and building height required.. As an infill the site, the site shares the northern property line with a commercial building to ensure no impacts to the neighboring structure. These methods will add project scope and cost, however, they are necessary to maintain the integrity of the neighboring structures. The Site is located in a Methane Zone Design Level II site. As a result, a passive methane mitigation system will be designed and installed. The Phase I and Limited Phase II ESA revealed the presence of cadmium and lead in near surface soil samples. The Phase I and Limited Phase II ESA recommendation is to excavate cadmium and lead-impacted soil and provide for proper offsite disposal. Pursuant to Section 6.6 of the Los Angeles County Development Authority's Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for No Place Like Home (NPLH) Round 2019-1 funding, the Project will be subject to the State of California Prevailing Wage laws. This is to certify that contractors and subcontractors will comply with Section 1725.5 of the Labor Code. State Prevailing Wage increases the labor costs associated with construction, and also adds soft cost for monitoring.

Legal Questionnaire:

The Staff has reviewed the Applicant's responses to the questions contained in the Legal Status portion of the application. No information was disclosed to question the financial viability or legal integrity of the Applicant.

Total Points:

125 out of 140

[See Attachment A]

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Committee approves \$17,000,000 in tax-exempt bond allocation.

ATTACHMENT A

EVALUATION SCORING:

| Point Criteria | Maximum Points Allowed for Non- Mixed Income Projects | Maximum Points Allowed for Mixed Income Projects | Points Scored |
|---|--|--|---------------|
| Preservation Project | 20 | 20 | 0 |
| Exceeding Minimum Income Restrictions: | 35 | 15 | 35 |
| Exceeding Minimum Rent Restrictions [Allowed if 10 pts not awarded above in Preservation Project] | [10] | [10] | 10 |
| Gross Rent | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Large Family Units | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Leveraging | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Community Revitalization Area | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Site Amenities | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Service Amenities | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| New Construction or Substantial Renovation | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Sustainable Building Methods | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Forgone Eligible Developer Fee (Competitive Allocation Process Only) | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Minimum Term of Restrictions (Competitive Allocation Process Only) | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Negative Points (No Maximum) | -10 | -10 | 0 |
| Total Points | 140 | 120 | 125 |