

Ann Sewill, General Manager
Tricia Keane, Executive Officer

Daniel Huynh, Assistant General Manager
Anna E. Ortega, Assistant General Manager
Luz C. Santiago, Assistant General Manager

City of Los Angeles



Karen Bass, Mayor

LOS ANGELES HOUSING DEPARTMENT
1910 Sunset Blvd, Ste 300
Los Angeles, CA 90026
Tel: 213.808.8808

housing.lacity.org

September 26, 2024

Council File: 23-0624
Council Districts: Citywide
Contact Persons: Elizabeth Selby: (213) 256-2336

Honorable Members of the City Council
City of Los Angeles
c/o City Clerk, City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL: REPORT BACK FROM THE LOS ANGELES HOUSING DEPARTMENT RELATIVE TO STREAMLINING THE CITY'S AFFORDABLE HOUSING MANAGED PIPELINE (AHMP) PROGRAM, PROJECTS THAT HAVE RECEIVED AHMP FUNDING, AND RELATED MATTERS

SUMMARY

On June 30, 2023 (C.F. No. 23-0624), the City Council directed the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD), in consultation with the City Administrative Officer (CAO), along with other relevant departments, to report within 60 days with recommendations to improve the City's Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline (AHMP) program. The requested report back was to include recommendations to reduce the number of times a project needs to return to Council for approvals and other steps to help deliver units faster and at lower costs. This transmittal presents recommended changes to the current Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline and other LAHD funding processes to achieve the goals set forth in the motion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. That the City Council, subject to the approval of the Mayor:
 - A. DIRECT the Department to adopt a revised AHMP process, which contains the following key provisions:
 - i. To recommend to City Council annually a Notice of Funding Availability with project and subpopulation priorities, income targeting, a process for utilizing publicly owned land, loan term sheets with minimum and maximum loan amounts, and a schedule;

- ii. Authorize the General Manager of LAHD, or designee, to select projects and approve funding awards based on the approved NOFA criteria, for projects applying for less than \$25 million that are within the per unit funding limits set in each annual NOFA. Direct LAHD to bring projects seeking higher per unit or per project amounts than set limits, that are recommended for funding, to City Council and Mayor for approval;
 - iii. Authorize the General Manager of LAHD, or designee, to earmark funds to awarded projects based on Council and Mayor-approved criteria; and to notify borrowers, City Council and Mayor of selected projects.
- B. DIRECT the Department to inform City Council, Mayor and program stakeholders of an annual calendar of all funding dates for awarded projects intended to align with applications for other public funding sources;
- C. Authorize the General Manager of LAHD, or designee, subject to review and approval of the City Attorney as to form, to prepare, negotiate and execute all necessary loan and regulatory documents;
- D. AUTHORIZE the General Manager of LAHD or designee to use the authority granted by City Council and Mayor to make the following changes on existing AHMP, HHH, Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities or Project HomeKey projects effective immediately:
- i. Authorize the General Manager of LAHD, or designee, to amend project awards, including: financial terms; interest rate; distribution of units; income targeting within program guidelines; addresses; correct and final name of borrower; and other administrative amendments that comply with the requirements of the funding program;
 - ii. Provide a commitment term of two years for AHMP awards, with delegated authority to Department provide up to two two-year extensions if justified;
 - iii. Authorize the General Manager of LAHD, or designee, to review, approve, negotiate and execute new loan agreements, amendments to existing loan agreements or amended and restated loan agreements for each project that receives a loan or loan increase, subject to the review and approval of the City Attorney as to form;

BACKGROUND

The City's Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline was established by the Mayor and City Council in June 2013 (C.F. No. 13-0824). The action authorized LAHD to issue a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) to enable an open competition of new projects selected for the LAHD AHMP on an ongoing basis. In the same year, the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) established a new geographic apportionment of 9% LIHTCs (low income housing tax credits) for projects located within the City of Los Angeles' boundaries. LAHD recognized the opportunity to set forth clear recommendations for local LIHTC priorities, creating a situation where city projects only competed with other city projects, and established the selection process for management of the 9% LIHTC in the CTCAC's City of Los Angeles Geographic set-aside.

The process has evolved to require Mayor and City Council approvals at eight stages:

1. Council approval of the competitive Notice of Funding Availability or RFP to select projects.
2. Council approval of the staff-recommended projects and initial funding amounts for each project selected in response to competitive notices.
3. Approval of issuance of tax exempt bond financing.
4. Adoption of resolution certifying that public hearing for the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA) was held.
5. Approval of final funding amount for projects in AHMP.
6. Approval of extensions of commitments if needed.
7. Approval of increases in City funding amounts of any amount.
8. Approval of changes in project such as reduction in number of units if designs change during plan check, or change in affordability levels such as the veteran's income limit issue.

Most projects are approved by City Council and Mayor at least four times and often up to six.

There are several much-needed improvements to the AHMP process, to streamline AHMP project approvals and funding. This report includes recommendations that condense this eight-step process, beginning with the AHMP award through the project groundbreaking, into two or three steps. Implementation of these recommendations will shorten the time between funding application submittal and award announcement, reduce burdens on housing sponsors, and facilitate better coordination between LAHD and other funders. While it is difficult to predict the numerous factors that can extend the timeline on a project and approvals, LAHD generally anticipates shortening the department's processes by up to a year with implementation of these recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS REQUESTED IN MOTION

The motion asked LAHD to return with recommendations for improvements to the AHMP program including:

Delegating Council and Mayor authority to LAHD staff to approve initial funding awards for applications below \$25 million

The second recommendation above is to allow LAHD to approve projects requesting up to \$25 million that are also within the per unit funding limits approved by Council and Mayor in the NOFA. For example, if the per unit limit is \$150,000, as is currently typical, a project with 85 units would have a maximum project limit of \$12,750,000 and could be approved by LAHD. A project with 200 units requesting the maximum per unit limit would ask for \$30 million, and LAHD would need to seek approval of Council and Mayor to approve.

Reducing the number of times a project needs to return to Council for approvals

As shown above, affordable housing developments seeking AHMP funding are currently brought before committees and City Council multiple times.

The streamlined annual NOFA process will include:

Step 1: The Department will submit an annual proposed NOFA for approval by the Council and Mayor. The recommendation will include project and subpopulation recommendations, income targeting, priorities for

locations or special needs, loan term sheets for the programs to be awarded through the NOFA which may apply to new construction or preservation projects. The proposed NOFA will include a copy of applicable program regulations, highlighting any changes from the past NOFA.

The NOFA transmittal will also include a calendar with anticipated dates including posting of program regulations; NOFA release, open and close dates; Bidder's Conference dates; appeal periods and award announcements. The calendar will be set in order to align with the TCAC and CDLAC schedule. This revised process will improve clarity around the NOFA process and increase transparency around the City's determination of priorities, establish a timeline by which potential sponsors can plan the development process. It will also allow LAHD to maximize HACLA voucher utilization by setting priorities aligned with voucher availability, where applicable

Step 2: Once the NOFA is approved by Council and Mayor, the Department will score projects based on the criteria set forth in the NOFA and select awardees according to eligibility of the project and applicant. The Department will award a "not to exceed" amount based on the requested funds in the application. This eliminates a trip to Council to seek project recommendations and a subsequent return to Council to seek earmarks for project funds.

Step 3: The Department recommends providing LAHD with delegated authority that would allow for changes to be approved on an as-needed basis, as long as income target requirements, and project and unit loan limits remain intact. The Council and Mayor will be notified of any changes in project awards.

This revised AHMP process will condense the current process and reduce the number of times a project needs to return to Council for approvals to once or twice, if financed with tax-exempt bonds. This revised process will improve transparency, and improve the overall developer experience with the City of Los Angeles. The number of times a project will be required to submit materials after initial approval will be based on the changes in project status or costs, rather than on additional required approvals of earlier conditional commitments.

Allowing for LAHD staff approval of gap funding based on an analysis of increased funding awards over the preceding three years, updated on an annualized basis.

LAHD recommends that this analysis and delegated authority be included in each year's NOFA submission to Council and Mayor.

Initiating a time limit to act between funding submittal and awards announcement from LAHD for affordable or permanent supportive housing projects, that also takes other non-City processes into account, and improving clarity around NOFA announcements, feedback windows, and award notices.

The NOFA will establish the schedule and time limit. Delegation of authority to staff will mean that the timeline will not be impacted by delays such as Council recesses, or seasonal changes in committee meeting schedules. The NOFA schedule will also indicate, when known, the dates approved projects will be able to apply to other funding sources such as Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities funding, or the County Housing Trust Fund. To the greatest extent possible, the AHMP deadlines will be coordinated with other funding deadlines.

Increasing transparency around LAHD's determination of project type and subpopulation prioritization for the pipeline and establishing a set timeline for publishing this information on an annual basis. Prioritizing deep income targeting in both initial awards as well as in any subsequent gap funding.

Suggested changes to the NOFA will put forward clear requirements for the development community. The recommended process changes include publishing a calendar each year that will improve clarity around NOFA announcements, stakeholder meetings and award notices. The annual or biannual NOFA will include underwriting guidelines for project and sponsor, and funding program term sheets with key loan terms and specific project requirements. This improved clarity will also work to reduce investment risk to the City, by setting parameters for project readiness and sponsor financial health.

The annual NOFA will also make recommendations concerning allocations to project types and populations to be served, such as supportive housing or affordable housing for seniors, families, individuals experiencing homelessness, transition aged youth, veterans or domestic violence survivors. While prioritizing deep income targeting is always a goal and consistent with ending homelessness, projects with deep affordability, including Permanent Supportive Housing projects require the availability of project-based vouchers to operate. Therefore, maximizing voucher utilization where possible, and requiring alternative rent targeting where projects must operate without vouchers, will be reflected in the annual NOFA priorities.

Creating an updated list of qualified non-profit developers for affordable housing opportunities.

The motion asks for LAHD's recommendation concerning creating an updated list of qualified non-profit developers for affordable housing opportunities. The Department maintains a comprehensive mailing list of potential and interested project sponsors, including non-profits, to inform the development community of affordable housing opportunities. The revised AHMP process will expand communication between LAHD and the development community. However, the Department does not recommend decoupling project approval from sponsor approval at time of the NOFA release. It is important to assess the sponsor's capacity in connection with to the size and complexity of the proposed project, Market shifts can have sudden and significant effects on sponsor health and financial capacity. The Department's ability to assess this status at the time of application is critical to mitigating risk to the City's housing investments. Trying to pre-approve sponsors would create an extra step, as the pre-approval would have to be updated to be current when sponsor was applying.

Putting forward a clear set of requirements and documents needed for qualifying developers at the outset, and not introducing new processes after admission.

Communicating clear project development standards, and project and organizational financial standards for project sponsors, as well as opportunities for less capable developers to partner with more experienced developers while building capacity, will create a stronger development community, better projects and less risk. It should be noted that there are times when requirements change in the year or more between funding awards and loan closings. One example of this is the new Build America Buy America requirement on federally funded projects. LAHD will continue to communicate these changing requirements as quickly and clearly as possible.

Limiting the number of times qualified developers have to resubmit materials after admission. Consolidating applications and timelines for qualified developers seeking to utilize the Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline.

As currently structured, the AHMP requires that projects secure additional funds from County, State and Low Income Housing Tax Credits. This process can take between twelve and twenty-four months, depending on the project's success in competitive cycles. During this period the developer's financial condition or development capacity may change. For this reason, LAHD requires that some materials be updated such as background checks and financial statements.

By streamlining the process and better coordinating with other funders, the revised AHMP process would improve and speed the predevelopment period, limiting the developer's need to resubmit changing project information.

Establish priority scoring in the Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline program for projects proposed on public land.

A review of the 130 HHH projects completed or underway shows that projects on public land cost more per unit and took longer than projects on land purchased privately by the developer. Typically, this is because the public land owner, whether the City or Metro or another entity, added requirements such as replacement parking, lower density or additional public serving elements such as open space or small markets. Often the cost of these requirements to the housing project exceeded the appraised cost of the land. The primary benefit of public land from the housing sponsor's point of view is that the land seller is patient and the holding costs of the land during predevelopment are typically carried by the land seller.

LAHD recommends that the proposed NOFAs for the AHMP include priority scoring for public land if the value of the public land sold or leased to the housing project and the requirements of the land owner will reduce the total per unit cost.

Consequences of Leveraged Funding

The current AHMP process requires that a project follow a convoluted and repetitious path to City Council multiple times. The recommendations in this report will shorten that path. Unless the project loan amount is in excess of Department authority to provide or the project is also financed with tax exempt bonds, the project will not require further trips to City Council to progress through the development process.

The AHMP program and most public agency housing programs require that projects seek additional funding from the County, the California Department of Housing & Community Development, and the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee or California Tax Credit Allocation Committee. This leveraging significantly increases the number of units that can be produced annually with City funds, but it adds time and costs. Developers frequently point out how much faster projects could advance if the City would provide all the funding, approximately \$450,000 per unit instead of \$150,000 per unit, by not requiring any leveraging except possibly Low Income Housing Tax Credits. These developers are correct in saying that a few projects would go faster. A typical AHMP allocation of \$75 million would produce 166 units instead of 500. The County and state funders typically use local investment amounts as a competitive factor in awarding funds, so that their funds go to projects with significant city support. If Los Angeles were to fully fund a few projects and then send the rest to other funders for full funding, they would not win as currently structured.

However, if Los Angeles were successful in securing cooperation from the County and State housing agencies to fully coordinate leveraged funding into one or two annual funding rounds so that each agency set aside and brought to a common table the City's "fair share" and awarded that to projects jointly with the City, AHMP projects could enjoy the benefits of leveraging without the long processes. Those conversations with County and State partners began when ULA passed, and should be pursued.

Current and Completed AHMP Projects

The motion requested a list of all completed projects and projects currently in the development pipeline that have received AHMP funding, broken down by Council District, with an analysis of how long it takes on average to approve, permit, and construct projects, along with comments regarding a project's current delays. This information is shown in Attachment A. It details 31 projects that were in the pipeline since 2014, 25 of which are now completed.

As Attachment A shows, the average length of time between a AHMP project being admitted into the pipeline and project completion is 3.75 years. Twelve to eighteen months of this time is typically inactive time for the City during which the developer seeks other funding sources. When those sources are secured, the developer comes in for final plan approvals and building permits, then embarks on an 18 to 24-month construction period. The recommended improvements to the AHMP structure, developer selection process, and project amendments will shorten this time and reduce the burden on the developer.

Recommendations for Immediate Changes

Several of the authorities that will be included in the NOFA would have immediate impact to accelerate the resolution of problems on current projects now:

- (1) Currently, projects in the AHMP that need extensions to their commitments must be submitted to Council and Mayor. LAHD recommends that the authority to extend commitments for up to two years based on the department's assessment of need and feasibility, be delegated to the General Manager of LAHD or designee.
- (2) LAHD recommends that it be given the discretion to reduce loan interest from 3% to 1% to facilitate faster conversions from high interest construction loans to lower interest permanent loans will allow projects to be completed successfully even if costs have increased. Similar changes to allow use of residual receipts payments from one project owned by a sponsor to support another struggling project owned by the sponsor; distribution of unit sizes within approved totals; and income targeting; as well as technical corrections to project addresses; name of borrower; and other administrative amendments that comply with the requirements of the funding program should be delegated.

Recommendation C above asks for that authority to be granted by City Council and Mayor now for existing projects.

Applicability of Streamlining Changes to Project HomeKey, Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities and Proposition HHH Projects

The motion requests recommendations on whether similar improvements to the current funding approvals processes for Proposition HHH, Project HomeKey, Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities and other related programs would expedite the production of affordable housing. LAHD recommends that it be given the same delegated authority to make technical changes to projects funded from these sources when they have been approved by City Council.

The ability to streamline the initial project selection process would vary by funding source. HHH funds are fully awarded, except for some savings and residual receipts paid to the department. The AHSC projects are submitted to City Council not only for the housing component approvals, but because the City is making a commitment to carry out the infrastructure component of each project. And the Project HomeKey local match requirements have changed in the state's funding rounds. At this time LAHD recommends returning to Council for additional streamlining improvements identified as these programs are released by the state in the coming year.

Approval Processes – Other Jurisdictions

The motion directed LAHD to report on the affordable housing funding approval processes of Santa Monica, West Hollywood, and New York City; the effectiveness of their structures in expediting housing development; and how those structures can be implemented in Los Angeles.

City of Santa Monica

A few decades ago the City of Santa Monica made a decision to streamline affordable housing funding by giving staff broad authority to make housing trust fund loans consistent with Council approved [guidelines](#) that have been revised periodically.

In addition to streamlining the process for affordable housing financing by delegating to City staff the ability to make housing trust fund loans. Santa Monica has always had an 'over the counter' process for accepting applications for housing trust funds. However, it should be noted that the City is currently not accepting applications for funding.

City of West Hollywood

West Hollywood typically only funds one trust fund project per year, and uses an over the counter process to review and select that project. City staff from several departments collaborate to decide on the project approval and funding commitments.

New York City

Historically, the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) has not used an RFP/NOFA process. It has an over-the-counter process under several published term sheets. HPD staff slot projects into the pipeline based on funding availability. There are seven new construction programs and 11 preservation programs. These include the Extremely Low & Low-Income Affordability (ELLA) Program; Supportive Housing Opportunity Program (SHOP); and Homes for Working Families Initiative (HWF). The City also has a Year 15 Tax Credit Repositioning program for projects that need to be syndicated and rehabilitated. Some of their programs have a maximum subsidy per unit tied to Area Median Income levels (AMI) ranging from \$192,500 for units at 27% AMI to down to \$37,500 for units at 120% AMI.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no impact to the General Fund.

Approved By:



ANN SEWILL
General Manager
Los Angeles Housing Department

ATTACHMENT:

Attachment A: Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline September 2024

Attachment A: Affordable Housing Managed Pipeline September 2024

Project Name	Address	CD	Pipeline Admitted	Permit Application Date	Plan Check Approval Date	Permit Application to Approval	Permit Issued Date	Plan check Approval to Ready to Issue	Time to permit	Construction Completion	Admitted to completed
7th & Wilmer Apartments	1301 W 7th St, Los Angeles, CA 90017	1	11/3/15	12/27/16	12/13/17	351	12/14/17	1	352	12/31/19	1519
Casa Carmen Senior Apartments	1800 W 11th St, Los Angeles, CA 90006	1	11/3/15	5/10/16	3/22/17	316	5/2/17	41	357	3/27/19	1240
Grace Villas	224 S Avenue 24, Los Angeles, CA 90036	1	4/25/23								
Miramar Gold	1434 W Miramar St, CA 90026	1	11/29/21	12/23/21	11/15/22	327	12/7/22	22	349		
Parque Vista - 2851 E. Chaucer St.	2851 E Chaucer St, Los Angeles, CA 90085	1	10/19/18	9/29/20	11/10/20	42	11/19/20	9	51	11/30/21	1138
Third Thyme	1435 W 3rd St, CA 90017	1	11/29/21	11/30/22	4/28/23	149	4/28/23	0	149		
Projects in CD 1:		6				7 months, 24 days	5 days	15 days	8 months, 8 days		3 years, 6 months, 22 days
Hamony Senior Apartments	11416 W Burbank Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 91601	2	4/25/23	7/9/24							
Projects in CD 2:		1									
Pico Robertson Senior Community	8866 W Pico Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90035	5	11/3/15	3/30/17	11/17/17	232	11/22/17	5	237	8/7/20	1739
Projects in CD 5:		6				7 months, 19 days		5 days	7 months, 24 days		4 years, 9 months, 4 days
Luna Vista Apartments	8767 N Parthenia Pl 1-73, Los Angeles, CA 91343	6	11/29/21	12/16/19	11/16/22	1066	11/29/22	13	1079		
Projects in CD 6:		1				2 years, 11 months, 1 days		13 days	2 years, 11 months, 14 days		
Crenshaw & 50th	5008 S Crenshaw Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90043	8	4/25/23								
King 1101	1107 W Martin Luther King Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90037	8	6/16/14	6/30/16	11/26/16	149	11/28/16	2	151	9/7/18	1544
Manchester Apartments	823 W Manchester Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90044	8	4/25/23	6/22/23	2/1/24	224	2/1/24	0	224		
Rolland Curtis West	1077 W 38th St, Los Angeles, CA 90037	8	11/3/15	9/9/16	12/14/16	96	12/14/16	0	96	5/7/19	1281
The Carlton	5423 S Western Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90062	8	4/25/23	7/15/21	5/8/24	1028	5/8/24	0	1028		
West Angeles City Place Senior Apartments	5414 S Crenshaw Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90043	8	11/3/15	9/26/17	3/8/18	163	3/14/18	6	169	9/23/19	1420
Projects in CD 8:		6				10 months, 27 days		2 days	10 months, 29 days		3 years, 10 months, 15 days
Florence Mills	1036 E 35th St, Los Angeles, CA 90011	9	1/21/14	5/4/18	12/11/18	221	12/19/18	8	229	3/24/21	2619
La Prensa Libre - 4%	210 E Washington Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90015	9	10/20/18	12/20/19	11/19/20	335	11/25/20	6	341	1/30/24	1928
La Prensa Libre- 9% (fka Washington/ LA)	200 E Washington Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90015	9	10/19/18	12/20/19	11/19/20	335	11/25/20	6	341	1/30/24	1929
Paul Williams Family Apartments	1010 E Jefferson Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90011	9	11/3/15	8/9/16	3/6/17	209	3/29/17	23	232	3/28/19	1241
Peak Plaza (fka 306 E Washington)	306 E Washington, Los Angeles, CA 90015	9	4/25/23	5/31/23	7/12/23	42					
Projects in CD 9:		5				7 months, 15 days		11 days	9 months, 12 days		5 years, 3 months, 12 days
Crenshaw Gardens	3411 S Crenshaw Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90016	10	11/3/15	5/31/16	12/1/16	184	12/5/16	4	188	12/24/18	1147
Crenshaw Villas	2631 1/2 S Crenshaw Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90016	10	11/3/15	5/5/16	11/7/16	186	11/16/16	9	195	9/7/18	1039
PATH Villas Montclair/Gramercy(Recap-Site 2 of 2)	3317 W Washington Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90018	10	10/19/17	8/14/19	1/14/20	153	12/8/20	329	482	7/26/22	1741
Steps on St. Andrews	1808 S St Andrews Place, Los Angeles, CA 90019	10	4/25/23	2/9/02	4/23/24	8109	4/30/24	7	8116		
Ybarra Village (fka New Directions West Adams)	3023 1/2 S West View St, Los Angeles, CA 90016	10	1/21/14	12/14/15	10/19/17	675	12/6/17	48	723	12/20/19	2159
Projects in CD 10:		5				1 years, 1 months, 3 days		2 months, 20 days	5 years, 3 months, 24 days		4 years, 1 months, 29 days
Red Tail Crossing (fka Kite Crossing)	8333 S Airport Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90045	11	11/29/21	10/19/20	12/19/22	791	12/21/22	2	793		
Vista Ballona	3960 S Grand View Blvd 1-27, Los Angeles, CA 90066	11	10/19/18	3/11/19	11/21/19	255	11/22/19	1	256	6/22/22	1342
Projects in CD 11:		2				1 years, 5 months, 6 days		2 days	1 years, 5 months, 8 days		3 years, 8 months, 3 days
Alvarado Kent Apartments	707 N Alvarado St, Los Angeles CA 90026	13	11/29/21	9/20/22	12/21/22	92	12/21/22	0	92		
Coronel Apartments	1601 N Hobart Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90027	13	1/21/14	12/23/13	5/18/17	1242	6/7/17	20	1262	1/31/19	1836
Hollywood Arts Collective	1630 N Schrader Blvd, Hollywood, CA 90028	13	10/19/18	2/3/20	11/19/20	290	11/23/20	4	294	3/22/23	1615
Locke Lofts	345 N Madison Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90004	13	4/25/23								
PATH Metro Villas Phase I	345 N Westmoreland Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90004	13	1/21/14	4/8/16	12/5/16	241	12/15/16	10	251	8/31/18	1683
Rampart Mint Apartments	252 S Rampart Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90057	13	1/21/14	8/3/16	12/27/17	511	2/23/18	58	569	11/9/20	2484
Westlake Supportive Housing	405 N Westlake Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90026	13	4/25/23								
Projects in CD 13:		7				1 years, 3 months, 20 days		19 days	1 years, 4 months, 8 days		5 years, 2 months, 18 days
Cielito II- 1st and Soto TOD Apts Phase II	2423 3/4 E 1st St, Los Angeles, CA 90033	14	11/3/15	1/12/17	3/28/18	440	4/2/18	5	445	12/31/19	1519
Crocker (Umeya) Apartments	411 S Towne Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90013	14	11/29/21	12/30/22	3/29/23	89	4/24/23	26	115		
Oune House	545 S San Julian Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013	14	4/25/23	2/15/23	3/13/23	26					
LAMP Lodge	660 S Stanford Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90021	14	11/16/17	7/22/19	7/22/19	0	12/16/19	147	147	10/4/22	1783
Rosa's Place (fka Downtown Women's Ctr Campus Exp)	501 E 5th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013	14	4/25/23	3/26/21							
Projects in CD 14:		5				4 months, 18 days		6 days	7 months, 23 days		4 years, 6 months, 8 days
9th Street Lofts (456 West)	456 W 9th St, San Pedro, CA 90731	15	10/19/18	8/25/20	12/21/20	118	12/28/20	7	125	8/22/23	1768
127th Street Apartments	550 W 127th St, Los Angeles, CA 90044	15	6/16/14	10/6/15	8/12/16	311	8/15/16	3	314	7/26/18	1501
El Segundo Apartments	535 W El Segundo Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90248	15	11/3/15	6/16/16	11/15/16	152	11/15/16	0	152	7/26/18	996
Jordan Downs Phase S5	S Lou Dillon Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90002	15	4/25/23	8/12/22							
Projects in CD 15:		4				6 months, 12 days		3 days	6 months, 15 days		3 years, 10 months, 21 days
Key:	Not started construction										
	Not complete										
Cumulative City Council District projects:			42			Cumulative Averages:	1 years, 2 months, 31 days	24 days	1 years, 7 months, 8 days		4 years, 7 months, 1 days