CHFA Capital Plan Property Assessment - Ivy Street Apts

Property Identification

Ivy Street Apts
BRANFORD, CT

Total Current Unit Count:	29
Census Tract:	1847.00
Connecticut Congressional District:	3

CHFA Property Identification #: 91009D
Current State Sponsored Housing Program: SH Affordable Housing

This is a single, stand-alone property. As there are no other adjacent properties under common ownership, there are no opportunities for consolidation to achieve greater efficiencies of scale.

Property Description

Tenancy Type:	Family
Structure Type:	Garden/Townhouse
Number of buildings:	5
Maximum # of Stories:	2
Elevator?	None

Summary property description:

The Ivy Street Apts property has 3 one-bedroom, 11 two-bedroom and 15 three-bedroom units. Generally, the property consists of reasonably sized units. It features amenities such as in-unit laundry hook-ups and semi-private outdoor space.

Current Operating & Capital Needs Status

Aggregate Capital Needs (without market enhancements):	$	1,967,458
Capital Needs per Unit:	$	67,843
Projected Year 1 (2014) Operating Income:	$	(38,145)

Current operations at the property are projected to generate negative $38,100 in net operating income (NOI, or revenue after operating expenses) in Year 1 (2014). With incomes and expenses trending at 2% and 3% respectively, which is a standard affordable housing industry convention, the NOI figure decreases annually and this shortfall continues to grow. As a result, the property is not sustainable and cannot adequately address its future basic capital needs, projected to be approximately $1.97 million ($67,843 per unit) over the next 20 years.

Current average income relative to the Area Median Income (AMI): 34%

	Current Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:	320	21%
Two-bedroom unit:	380	20%
Three-bedroom unit:	400	19%
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

	Proposed Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:	466	30%
Two-bedroom unit:	559	30%
Three-bedroom unit:	645	30%
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

Number of current households that would be impacted by the proposed increase in Base Rent: 16

Rental operating subsidy necessary in 2014 to generate revenue equal to raising the base rent as proposed: $ 53,904

Total rental operating subsidy necessary assuming a turnover-based leasing strategy: $ 314,992

In order for the property to operate in a sustainable manner into the foreseeable future, the property would benefit from greater revenues. This can happen in one of two ways - either the property could get operating subsidy from the state or federal government, or it could charge higher rents. A higher rent structure burdens low-income households to pay a greaterheir income for housing and it will require that the property serve tenants with modestly higher incomes.

Currently, base rents are set by the owner of each property, often in consultation with CHFA staff. While there varying definitions of affordability, this study considers a rent which exceeds 30% of a household's adjusted gross income to be burdensome on the household's monthly budget. In the table to the left, the base rent is identified for each unit size. The table also identifies the minimum household income level for which the base rent would be considered "affordable." The household income level is presented as a percentage of the local Area Median Income.

There are strong reasons to keep the base rents low, as low base rents provide affordable housing options for the state's lowest income residents and reduce the burden of operating subsidies on the State budget. However, if the property's revenue stream (including any available operating subsidy and any cross-subsidy from higher income residents) does not cover the cost of actually operating the property, including the cost of ongoing maintenance and capital improvements, the property itself is at risk.

The Capital Plan is intended to identify the real estate needs of the State Sponsored Housing Portfolio. In order to ensure a minimum revenue stream and in order to implement programmatic consistency regarding base rent levels, this analysis assumes that all base rents are adjusted in 2014 to equal the greater of a) the current base rent or b) 30% of the adjusted gross income of a household at 30% of AMI for the applicable household size, provided these levels do not exceed the local market. This base rent adjustment would represent a significant increase for some households. The analysis identifies the number of households that would be affected by such a change and the amount of operating subsidy needed to protect these households. If the owners elect not to raise the base rents as assumed in this analysis, the property is more likely to experience tight operating budgets towards the end of the Capital Plan subsidy period and will be less able to access leverage funding such as private debt.

Protecting the 16 Family Households at risk in the event of a base rent increase is clearly a major concern. In 2014, the base rent increase creates the need for operating subsidy of $53,904 to protect these households while generating the revenue equivalent to the proposed increase in the base rent.

This 2014 rental operating subsidy would recur annually, with inflation increases, for the next 20 years if the State determines that, as a policy matter, the property should continue serving households with an income profile equivalent to the current residents at the property. An alternative formulation assumes that, upon turnover, new residents would move in for whom the proposed base rent is affordable and tenant protection operating subsidies would no longer be necessary. This turnover strategy requires less operating subsidy from the State, but also reduces the number of units of housing available to the lowest income residents of the community. The total tenant protection operating subsidy associated with the increase in the base rent assuming that, on turnover, the units are leased to households able to pay the new base rent without assistance is $314,992.

Household Income Level	Current Income Mix	Proposed Income Mix
0-25% of AMI	16	14
25-50% of AMI	8	8
50% of AMI or greater	5	7
Total number of units	29	29

While the revenue generated by the increase in the base rent or the provision of an equivalent operating subsidy improves the property's income and expense picture, it is insufficient for the property to operate sustainably for the foreseeable future. (The capital plan analysis considers sustainable operations to be a level of operating income sufficient to cover operating expenses and servicing of any capital leverage necessary to maintain the physical asset for the next 15-20 years without routine capital subsidies from the State.) Consequently, the capital plan has identified additional revenue adjustments based on an income-tier structure which would be necessary to reach a sustainable operating picture.

	Pre-Trans. Base Rent	Post-Trans. Base Rent
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:	466	466
Two-bedroom unit:	559	559
Three-bedroom unit:	645	645
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

An income-tier structure would require a specified number of units to pay a higher base rent, affordable to households with a higher (albeit still low) income. For example, a tier serving households in the 50%-60% of AMI would pay a base rent equal to 30% of the adjusted gross income of a household earning 55% of AMI. The capital plan has adopted income tiers which correspond to CHFA's commonly used affordability thresholds.

As is the case with the base rent analysis, above, in income tier structure makes the units allocated to a higher-income tier unaffordable to those currently served by this housing. As state funds for operating subsidy are limited, the capital plan analysis has assumed that any available operating subsidy will be focused on protecting current residents until they move away from the property. On turnover, households earning incomes consistent with the income tier structure will be offered units on a preferrential basis. However, additional operating subsidy beyond that reflected here would mitigate this loss of housing options for lower income households.

Rental operating subsidy in the transaction year which would be necessary to generate additional revenue equal to that generated by income mixing: $ 8,469

Transitional rental operating subsidy necessary to protect current residents and permit a five-year transition to income tier occupancy: $ 21,601

Property used for market reference: Ivy Street Apartments

Based on the market conditions reflected in the most closely applicable property market condition assessment, tenants in the 25% to 80% of AMI range are available in the market. This analysis has increased the number of households at the property with incomes between 25% and 80% of AMI from 13 in 2014 to 15 post-transaction, which results in an increase in property revenue. The remaining units would continue to serve residents with incomes below 25% of AMI.

In order to attract the additional households in the 25% to 80% of AMI income tiers, the property condition must meet the market conditions these households would expect. However, the property could benefit from some curb appeal upgrades. In order to attract higher AMI tenants and thus increase the gross potential revenue at the property, the capital transaction will need to include funds to address these concerns. Specifically, curb appeal enhacements would improve the property's marketability.

	Capital Surplus or (Gap)	Total (Gap) Funded by Subsidy inc. Capital & Operating
Current Scenario (excluding transaction costs):	(1,405,659)	(2,781,098)
Recoverable Grant Scenario:	(2,916,473)	(2,798,260)
CHFA/FHA Scenario:	(2,707,769)	(2,894,637)
4% LIHTC Scenario:	(2,152,264)	(2,275,753)
9% LIHTC Scenario:	(791,439)	(913,778)

The Capital Plan analysis considers five scenarios and the prospect under each scenario to address the property's capital and operational needs. Each scenario's capacity to address the property's capital needs is listed to the left, as represented by the Replacement Reserve (RM&R) balance at the end of 20 years. Also at left is the total gap, including both operating subsidy needs and capital subsidy needs, over the 20 year study period.

- The first scenario, the "Current Scenario" assumes the property continues operating as it currently is operated - no material change in the base rent and no implementation of income mixing strategies to shift the property's revenue picture. Consequently, there is no adverse impact on residents or on the opportunity to serve the income demographic currently holding tenancies. The current scenario uses the baseline capital needs as the anticipated capital investment for purposes of identifying the surplus or gap. However, the current scenario - unlike the other four scenarios - does not include any allowance for soft costs (architecture or design, relocation, developer overhead, etc.) or for general contractor overhead and profit (as it is assumed each trade would come to the site independently, without the need for overarching coordination).

- The second scenario, the "Recoverable Grant Scenario" assumes any revenue adjustments described above (i.e., if the analysis suggested an increase in base rent and/or introduction of a mixed-income framework, or the equivalent revenue from federal or state operating subsidy). The Recoverable Grant Scenario envisions a streamlined allocation of funds from the State to the property, implemented with standardized documents and minimal legal or due diligence transaction costs. The Recoverable Grant would be repaid to the State to the extent possible from cash flow. The Recoverable Grant Scenario is most frequently selected when the transaction is too small to warrant the transaction costs associated with alternative financing or if the market is too weak to support debt or equity leverage.

- The three remaining scenarios - "CHFA/FHA," "4% LIHTC" and "9% LIHTC" correspond to three different leverage transaction structures. Each scenario includes transaction costs appropriate to the nature of the transaction. (For example, legal fees in the two LIHTC scenarios are higher than in the CHFA/FHA scenario.) Typically, the CHFA/FHA scenario would generate the least amount of funds for capital improvements and the 9% LIHTC scenario would generate the greatest amount, with the 4% LIHTC scenario falling in between. The CHFA/FHA scenario is a debt-only scenario, using either CHFA or FHA-insured financing. The two LIHTC scenarios assume both debt and a syndication of low income housing tax credits. The 4% tax credits rely on the use of tax exempt bond financing and are generally available when needed. (The analysis assumes that the tax exempt bonds will be used for construction funding in order to generate the tax credits, but may not remain outstanding at the full amount after permanent debt conversion.) The 9% tax credits are a competitive and scarce resource so cannot be assumed to be available for all properties.

Recommended Transaction and Transaction Assumptions

Recommended Transaction Option:	4% LIHTC
Recommended Transaction Year	2015
Replacement Reserve Deposit PUPY:	425
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year:	2.890
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year 15:	1.102
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	-
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	2,152,264

The capital plan recommends using the 4% low income housing tax credit scenario to finance the capital needs at this property. The debt-only scenario leaves significant capital needs unaddressed, while the use of 9% tax credits at this property would be an inefficient use of the scarce 9% resource given the competing needs within the portfolio and within the State as a whole. The 4% LIHTC scenario, however, covers the capital needs appropriately while minimizing the need for State capital subsidies.
This analysis has suggested a potential transaction year of 2015 based on a series of criteria outlined in the capital plan report. In short, the transaction year has been informed by the distribution of critical capital needs year-by-year at the property (i.e., roof, mechanical, structural components) and by the need to distribute the timing of capital transaction for properties within the State Sponsored Housing Portfolio over a period of years in order to manage scarce State-wide resources.

This property has been underwritten assuming replacement reserve deposits of $425 per unit per year, assuming debt service coverage is maintained over 1.102 throughout the first 15 years of the new financing, and assuming hard construction capital needs of $1.97 million plus $73,000 for property enhancements (curb appeal enhacements.).

The property is able to cover its capital needs from current replacement reserves through the date of the capital transaction, so no interim State support is needed.

Summary of Recommended Transaction

Under the 4% LIHTC scenario, the property yields $55,571 in NOI in the transaction completion year, which includes $425 per unit per year in replacement reserve deposits. After debt service, the property generates $31,342 in cash flow in the capital transaction's completion year, trending to $2,466 fifteen years thereafter. Post-transaction, distribution of cash flow is governed by the terms of the transaction documents and, to the extent not restricted by the documents, could be used at the owner's discretion for ongoing capital needs, owner's working capital or the owner's other priorities. The transaction raises $317,000 in debt and $1,091,000 in equity. The transaction results in a gap of $2,152,000, all of which would need to be covered by State capital subsidy. This compares to a needs gap of over $2,781,000 if no transaction takes place at the property and the capital needs are addressed through routine maintenance or a needs gap of over $2,916,000 if the capital needs are addressed in a consolidated transaction relying entirely on State capital subsidy.

Immediate Emergency Capital Needs:	0
Current Deferred Capital Needs:	0
Current Routine Capital Needs:	165,986

The chart below indicates the year-by-year capital investment needs at the property as projected by On-Site Insight. One should note, however, that On-Site Insight used a state-wide cost basis generated from the RS Means database for capital needs. Some high-cost communities can experience a premium of 10%-15% in excess of the State-wide figures. The chart also indicates the timing of State capital and operating subsidy needs assuming the transaction scenario described above.

		Capital Subsidy		**Operating Subsidy**		
Year	**Annual Capital Needs (per CNA)**	Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Operating Deficit Subsidy Needs	Base Rent Operating Subsidy Needs	Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needs
2013	**165,986**	-	-	-	-	-
2014	**208,544**	-	-	-	53,904	-
2015	**179,606**	-	2,152,264	-	49,484	-
2016	**159,028**	-	-	-	44,865	8,469
2017	**55,474**	-	-	-	40,042	6,479
2018	**29,426**	-	-	-	35,008	4,406
2019	**30,307**	-	-	-	29,757	2,247
2020	**31,218**	-	-	-	24,282	-
2021	**32,154**	-	-	-	18,576	-
2022	**33,118**	-	-	-	12,631	-

		Capital Subsidy		**Operating Subsidy**		
Year	**Annual Capital Needs (per CNA)**	Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Operating Deficit Subsidy Needs	Base Rent Operating Subsidy Needs	Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needs
2023	**34,113**	-	-	-	6,442	-
2024	**35,613**	-	-	-	-	-
2025	**36,189**	-	-	-	-	-
2026	**37,275**	-	-	-	-	-
2027	**38,395**	-	-	-	-	-
2028	**227,707**	-	-	-	-	-
2029	**234,537**	-	-	-	-	-
2030	**257,453**	-	-	-	-	-
2031	**100,314**	-	-	-	-	-
2032	**41,001**	-	-	567	-	-

Scenario Pro Formas

Ivy Street Apts, continued

Income and Expense Analysis

	CURRENT		RECOVERABLE GRANT		CHFA/FHA		4% LIHTC		9% LIHTC	
2023 ANNUAL INCOME	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**
Gross Potential Rent	207,096	7,141.26	333,148	11,487.88	333,148	11,488	333,148	11,488	333,148	11,488
Vacancy/Loss	(2,362)	(81.46)	(2,471)	(85.19)	(16,657)	(574)	(23,320)	(804)	(23,320)	(804)
Other Income	13,091	451.42	13,091	451.42	13,091	451	13,091	451	13,091	451
Effective Gross Income	**217,825**	**7,511.22**	**343,769**	**11,854.11**	**329,582**	**11,365**	**322,919**	**11,135**	**322,919**	**11,135**
2023 ANNUAL EXPENSES										
Operating Expenses	267,315	9,218	266,647	9,195	260,194	8,972	259,861	8,961	259,861	8,961
Replacement Reserve Deposits	20,326	701	20,326	701	17,542	605	17,542	605	14,447	498
Total Operating Expenses	**287,641**	**9,919**	**286,972**	**9,896**	**277,737**	**9,577**	**277,403**	**9,566**	**274,308**	**9,459**
2023 NET OPERATING INCOME	**(69,815)**	**(2,407)**	**56,797**	**1,959**	**51,846**	**1,788**	**45,516**	**1,570**	**48,612**	**1,676**
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	31,006	1,069	24,229	835	27,583	951
2023 CASH FLOW	**(69,815)**	**(2,407)**	**56,797**	**1,959**	**20,840**	**719**	**21,287**	**734**	**21,029**	**725**

Sources and Uses Analysis

	CURRENT		RECOVERABLE GRANT		CHFA/FHA		4% LIHTC		9% LIHTC	
SOURCES	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**
Hard Debt										
Commercial Debt 1	-	-	-	-	539,546	18,605	317,776	10,958	479,977	16,551
Commercial Debt 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tax-Exempt Bond	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soft Debt										
Seller Financing/Take Back Note	-	-	-	-	-	-	870,000	30,000	870,000	30,000
State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other										
From Operations	-	-	18,562	640	30,887	1,065	30,887	1,065	28,712	990
Cash Escrows	-	-	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746
Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deferred Developer Fee	-	-	-	-	177,252	6,112	185,089	6,382	184,416	6,359
Equity										
GP Contribution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LIHTC	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,091,022	37,621	2,291,235	79,008
Other	-		-		-		-		-	
Total Sources of Funds	**-**	**-**	**185,203**	6,386	**914,325**	31,528	**2,661,415**	91,773	**4,020,981**	138,655
USES										
Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	870,000	30,000	870,000	30,000
Construction Costs	-	-	2,460,184	84,834	2,460,184	84,834	2,487,447	85,774	2,487,447	85,774
Soft Costs - Design & Construction	-	-	274,697	9,472	270,819	9,339	277,287	9,562	277,287	9,562
Soft Costs - Due Diligence	-	-	11,902	410	20,852	719	23,379	806	23,379	806
Soft Costs - Transaction Costs	-	-	39,062	1,347	119,062	4,106	247,795	8,545	247,795	8,545
Soft Costs - Financing	-	-	74,551	2,571	228,468	7,878	254,773	8,785	254,941	8,791
Soft Costs - Other	-	-	16,675	575	18,850	650	18,850	650	18,850	650
Soft Cost Contingency	-	-	20,844	719	32,903	1,135	36,711	1,266	36,141	1,246
Reserves	-	-	-	-	27,828	960	134,714	4,645	135,540	4,674
Developer Fee	-	-	203,760	7,026	443,129	15,280	462,723	15,956	461,040	15,898
Total Uses of Funds	**-**	**-**	**3,101,676**	106,954	**3,622,095**	124,900	**4,813,680**	165,989	**4,812,420**	165,946
TRANSACTION SURPLUS (GAP)	**-**	**-**	**(2,916,473)**	(100,568)	**(2,707,769)**	(93,371)	**(2,152,264)**	(74,216)	**(791,439)**	(27,291)

Scenario Pro Formas (continued)

Ivy Street Apts, continued

Coverage of Capital Needs Analysis

	CURRENT		RECOVERABLE GRANT		CHFA/FHA		4% LIHTC		9% LIHTC	
	Total	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**
FUNDS										
Transaction Rehab	-	-	1,826,143	62,970	1,826,143	62,970	1,826,143	62,970	1,826,143	62,970
Capital Needs Funded Using Subsidy	1,405,659	48,471	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Existing Replacement Reserve Balance	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746	166,641	5,746
Replacement Reserves	395,158	13,626	395,158	13,626	341,048	11,760	341,048	11,760	280,863	9,685
Total Funds	**1,967,458**	**67,843**	**2,387,941**	**82,343**	**2,333,831**	**80,477**	**2,333,831**	**80,477**	**2,273,647**	**78,402**
USES										
Estimated Capital Needs	1,967,458	67,843	1,967,458	67,843	1,967,458	67,843	1,967,458	67,843	1,967,458	67,843
Enhancements	-	-	-	-	72,500	2,500	72,500	2,500	72,500	2,500
Total Uses	**1,967,458**	**67,843**	**1,967,458**	**67,843**	**2,039,958**	**70,343**	**2,039,958**	**70,343**	**2,039,958**	**70,343**
YEAR 20 REPLACEMENT RESERVE BALANCE	**-**	**-**	**420,484**	**14,499**	**293,874**	**10,134**	**293,874**	**10,134**	**233,689**	**8,058**

Subsidy Analysis

	CURRENT		RECOVERABLE GRANT		CHFA/FHA		4% LIHTC		9% LIHTC	
	Total	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**	**Total**	**Per Unit**
OPERATING SUBSIDY										
Base Rent Operating Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	314,992	10,862	314,992	10,862	314,992	10,862	314,992	10,862
Operating Deficit Subsidy Needed	1,375,439	47,429	-	-	0	-	567	20	0	-
Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	21,601	745	21,601	745	21,601	745	21,601	745
Total Operating Subsidy	**1,375,439**	**47,429**	**336,594**	**11,607**	**336,594**	**11,607**	**337,161**	**11,626**	**336,594**	**11,607**
CAPITAL SUBSIDY										
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	1,405,659	48,471	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recoverable Cash Flow	n/a	n/a	(454,806)	(15,683)	(149,726)	(5,163)	(213,672)	(7,368)	(214,254)	(7,388)
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	2,916,473	100,568	2,707,769	93,371	2,152,264	74,216	791,439	27,291
Total Capital Subsidy	**1,405,659**	**48,471**	**2,461,667**	**84,885**	**2,558,043**	**88,208**	**1,938,592**	**66,848**	**577,185**	**19,903**
TOTAL SUBSIDY NEEDED	**2,781,098**	**95,900**	**2,798,260**	**96,492**	**2,894,637**	**99,815**	**2,275,753**	**78,474**	**913,778**	**31,510**