

1 [Budget Analyst Review of November 1996's Proposition A.]

2  
3 **Motion requesting that the Budget Analyst undertake an expedited review of November**  
4 **1996's Proposition A by auditing already expended and/or committed funds.**

5  
6 WHEREAS, In November 1996, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco  
7 approved Proposition A, authorizing the City to incur bond indebtedness of \$100,000,000 for  
8 the financing of the development of housing affordable to low-income households and down-  
9 payment assistance to low- and moderate-income first-time home buyers; and,

10 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors, who placed this measure on the ballot, stated in  
11 the proponent's argument in favor of Proposition A that "by approving these bonds, we can  
12 leverage federal and private dollars to develop permanently affordable housing and make it  
13 possible for City workers like firefighters, police officers and teachers to buy homes in the City  
14 rather than having to live far from their jobs;" and,

15 WHEREAS, Paid Arguments in favor of Proposition A, stated that "Proposition A's  
16 funds will build 3,000 new apartments and offer homeownership to 1,000 families;" and,  
17 "Proposition A provides funds to create thousands of affordable housing units;" and,

18 WHEREAS, The regulations implementing Proposition A state the funds must be used  
19 "for the construction or rehabilitation of dwelling units;" and,

20 WHEREAS, According to a report prepared by the Mayor's Office of Housing in  
21 November 2001, of the \$84.2 million dollars dedicated to the development of housing  
22 affordable to low-income households, approximately \$10.5 million has been spent, and has  
23 resulted in the creation of 93 new units, 166 rehabilitated units, and 170 beds in rehabilitated  
24 buildings that have 0 units; and,

1 WHEREAS, The same report states that \$16.8 million has been committed to plans  
2 currently under construction that will create 243 units, but it is unclear whether or not those  
3 units are new or if those units are rehabilitated units; and,

4 WHEREAS, The same report states that \$13.1 million dollars has been committed to  
5 plans currently in the planning process that will create 709 units, without mention of whether  
6 or not these units are new or rehabilitated, and create and 94 new beds; and,

7 WHEREAS, The voters of the City and County of San Francisco should be assured  
8 that the bonded indebtedness that they authorized in November 1996 has been spent the way  
9 it was promised it would be spent; and

10 WHEREAS, The voters of the City and County of San Francisco resoundingly  
11 approved Proposition F in the March 5, 2002 election signaling their intent that general  
12 obligation bonds be spent as promised; now, therefore, be it

13 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County requests that the  
14 Budget Analyst undertake an expedited review of November 1996's Proposition A by auditing  
15 already expended and/or committed funds to determine the following information:

16  How many new net units, as opposed to rehabilitated units, of housing have been or  
17 will be created?

18  For those projects in which 0 units have been reported constructed or committed to  
19 be constructed, but a number of beds have been constructed or have been committed to be  
20 constructed, who is being served by these new or rehabilitated facilities?

21  How many firefighters, police officers and teachers have benefited from the  
22 homeownership portion of Proposition A?

23  In the budgets of the completed projects, what were the original total budgets in  
24 comparison to the final budgets; and, in addition to Proposition A funds, what other sources of  
25 funding were used?

1            For each completed project and each project under construction, what building,  
2 planning, and other fees and taxes due to the City and County were paid and/or waived?;

3            For each completed project and each project under construction, how much revenue  
4 in property tax is each project delivering to the City and County?

5            Of the loans made with Proposition A funds for the development of rental housing,  
6 how much of the loans have been repaid, how much of the loans have been forgiven, how  
7 much of the loans remain outstanding, and what is the repayment timetable for those loans to  
8 be repaid?

9            What is the turnover rate for residents in the completed rental housing development?  
10 Of the original tenants in each completed development, how many remain in their units?; and,  
11 be it

12           FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors authorizes the Budget Analyst to  
13 report on any other issues this audit discovers; and, be it

14           FURTHER MOVED, That the Budget Analyst will present its report to the Board of  
15 Supervisors by July 12, 2002.



# City and County of San Francisco

City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

## Tails Motion

**File Number:** 020436

**Date Passed:** March 18, 2002

Motion requesting that the Budget Analyst undertake an expedited review of November 1996's Proposition A by auditing already expended and/or committed funds.

March 18, 2002 Board of Supervisors — APPROVED

Ayes: 11 - Ammiano, Daly, Gonzalez, Hall, Leno, Maxwell, McGoldrick,  
Newsom, Peskin, Sandoval, Yee

File No. 020436

**I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion  
was APPROVED on March 18, 2002 by the  
Board of Supervisors of the City and County  
of San Francisco.**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gloria L. Young", written over a horizontal line.

Gloria L. Young  
Clerk of the Board