

CHFA Capital Plan Property Assessment - Greenwood Manor

Property Identification

Greenwood Manor
VOLUNTOWN, CT

CHFA Property Identification #: 85202D

Current State Sponsored Housing Program: SH Elderly

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.

Total Current Unit Count: 20

Census Tract: -

Connecticut Congressional District: 2

Property Description

Tenancy Type: Elderly/Disabled

Structure Type: -

Number of buildings: -

Maximum # of Stories: -

Elevator? None

Summary property description:

The Greenwood Manor property has 16 efficiency or studio and 4 one-bedroom units. Generally, the property consists of relatively small units. It features amenities such as common laundry and a common room.

Current Operating & Capital Needs Status

Aggregate Capital Needs
(without market enhancements): \$ 1,098,693

Capital Needs per Unit: \$ 54,935

Projected Year 1 (2014) Operating Income: \$ (8,642)

Current operations at the property are projected to generate negative \$8,600 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 \$1.1 million (\$54,934 per unit) over the next 20 years.

Current average income relative to
the Area Median Income (AMI): 22%

	Current Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:	150	10%
One-bedroom unit:	175	11%
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

	Proposed Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:	435	30%
One-bedroom unit:	466	30%
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

Number of current households that would be
impacted by the proposed increase in Base Rent: 12

Rental operating subsidy necessary in 2014 to
generate revenue equal to raising the base rent
as proposed: \$ 43,823

Total rental operating subsidy necessary
assuming a turnover-based leasing strategy: \$ 256,080

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 greater their 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 12 Elderly/Disabled 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 \$43,822 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 \$256,080.

Revenue Adjustments Concurrent with a Recapitalization Transaction

Greenwood Manor, continued

Household Income Level	Current Income Mix	Proposed Income Mix
0-25% of AMI	12	12
25-50% of AMI	8	8
50% of AMI or greater	0	0
Total number of units	20	20

With the revenue generated by the increase in the base rent or the provision of an equivalent operating subsidy, the property should operate under a sustainable revenue picture for the foreseeable future. As a result, no additional revenue adjustments from income mixing are recommended in connection with the transaction.

	Pre-Trans. Base Rent	Post-Trans. Base Rent
Studio/efficiency unit:	435	435
One-bedroom unit:	466	466
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

Rental operating subsidy in the transaction year
which would be necessary to generate additional
revenue equal to that generated by income
mixing: \$ (0)

Transitional rental operating subsidy necessary
to protect current residents and permit a five-
year transition to income tier occupancy: \$ (0)

Property used for market reference: Ashland Manor

	Capital Surplus or (Gap)	Total (Gap) Funded by Subsidy inc. Capital & Operating
Current Scenario (excluding transaction costs):	(864,226)	(1,239,184)
Recoverable Grant Scenario:	(1,864,169)	(1,849,203)
CHFA/FHA Scenario:	(1,695,541)	(1,865,694)
4% LIHTC Scenario:	(1,270,076)	(1,470,155)
9% LIHTC Scenario:	(425,166)	(604,331)

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

Greenwood Manor, continued

Recommended Transaction Option:	Recoverable Grant	
Recommended Transaction Year	2019	The capital plan recommends using the recoverable grant scenario to finance the capital needs at this property. Given the small size of the property, the transaction costs associated with any of the other financing structures outweigh the additional funds which could be achieved by leveraging CHFA/FHA debt or low income housing tax credit equity.
Replacement Reserve Deposit PUPY:	-	This analysis has suggested a potential transaction year of 2019 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.
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year:	-	
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year 15:	-	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.
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	-	
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	1,864,169	

Summary of Recommended Transaction

Under the Recoverable Grant scenario, the property yields \$42,900 in NOI in the transaction completion year, which includes \$0 per unit per year in replacement reserve deposits. The property generates \$42,900 in cash flow in the capital transaction's completion year, trending to \$37,812 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. If there is a recoverable grant, repayment of the recoverable grant would be specified in the transaction documents as a priority use of the funds. The transaction does not support debt or equity leverage. The transaction results in a gap of \$1,864,000, all of which would need to be covered by State capital subsidy. This compares to a needs gap of over \$1,239,000 if no transaction takes place at the property and the capital needs are addressed through routine maintenance.

Summary of Capital Needs & State Subsidy Needs

Greenwood Manor, continued

Immediate Emergency Capital Needs: 0
 Current Deferred Capital Needs: 0
 Current Routine Capital Needs: 115,468

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.

Year	Annual Capital Needs (per CNA)	Capital Subsidy		Operating Subsidy		
		Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Operating Deficit Subsidy Needs	Base Rent Operating Subsidy Needs	Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needs
2013	115,468	-	-	-	-	-
2014	25,693	-	-	-	43,823	-
2015	28,056	-	-	-	40,229	-
2016	66,563	-	-	-	36,474	-
2017	11,531	-	-	-	32,553	(0)
2018	4,341	-	-	-	28,461	-
2019	11,876	-	1,864,169	-	24,192	-
2020	47,418	-	-	-	19,741	(0)
2021	154,151	-	-	-	15,101	-
2022	148,755	-	-	-	10,269	-

Year	Annual Capital Needs (per CNA)	Capital Subsidy		Operating Subsidy		
		Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Transaction Capital Subsidy Needs	Operating Deficit Subsidy Needs	Base Rent Operating Subsidy Needs	Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needs
2023	95,328	-	-	-	5,237	-
2024	36,364	-	-	-	-	-
2025	38,192	-	-	-	-	-
2026	72,858	-	-	-	-	-
2027	35,382	-	-	-	-	-
2028	43,073	-	-	-	-	-
2029	22,124	-	-	-	-	-
2030	37,103	-	-	-	-	-
2031	52,593	-	-	-	-	-
2032	51,825	-	-	-	-	-

Scenario Pro Formas

Greenwood Manor, continued

Income and Expense 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
2023 ANNUAL INCOME										
Gross Potential Rent	80,556	4,027.79	149,289	7,464.44	149,289	7,464	149,289	7,464	149,289	7,464
Vacancy/Loss	(5,222)	(261.11)	(5,222)	(261.11)	(7,464)	(373)	(10,450)	(523)	(10,450)	(523)
Other Income	1,562	78.12	1,562	78.12	1,562	78	1,562	78	1,562	78
Effective Gross Income	76,896	3,844.80	145,629	7,281.46	143,387	7,169	140,401	7,020	140,401	7,020
2023 ANNUAL EXPENSES										
Operating Expenses	89,395	4,470	96,677	4,834	94,911	4,746	94,761	4,738	94,761	4,738
Replacement Reserve Deposits	6,364	318	6,364	318	9,963	498	9,963	498	9,963	498
Total Operating Expenses	95,760	4,788	103,041	5,152	104,874	5,244	104,725	5,236	104,725	5,236
2023 NET OPERATING INCOME	(18,864)	(943)	42,588	2,129	38,513	1,926	35,677	1,784	35,677	1,784
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	23,940	1,197	25,525	1,276	22,308	1,115
2023 CASH FLOW	(18,864)	(943)	42,588	2,129	14,573	729	10,151	508	13,369	668

Sources and Uses 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
SOURCES										
Hard Debt										
Commercial Debt 1	-	-	-	-	416,584	20,829	339,202	16,960	388,184	19,409
Commercial Debt 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tax-Exempt Bond	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soft Debt										
Seller Financing/Take Back Note	-	-	-	-	-	-	600,000	30,000	600,000	30,000
State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other										
From Operations	-	-	6,761	338	13,761	688	13,761	688	13,761	688
Cash Escrows	-	-	116,767	5,838	121,926	6,096	121,926	6,096	121,926	6,096
Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deferred Developer Fee	-	-	-	-	115,617	5,781	122,143	6,107	121,622	6,081
Equity										
GP Contribution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LIHTC	-	-	-	-	-	-	727,091	36,355	1,521,520	76,076
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Sources of Funds	-	-	123,529	6,176	667,888	33,394	1,924,124	96,206	2,767,014	138,351
USES										
Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	600,000	30,000	600,000	30,000
Construction Costs	-	-	1,566,728	78,336	1,566,728	78,336	1,584,090	79,205	1,584,090	79,205
Soft Costs - Design & Construction	-	-	179,476	8,974	177,006	8,850	181,125	9,056	181,125	9,056
Soft Costs - Due Diligence	-	-	10,380	519	18,880	944	20,621	1,031	20,621	1,031
Soft Costs - Transaction Costs	-	-	27,261	1,363	107,261	5,363	227,375	11,369	227,375	11,369
Soft Costs - Financing	-	-	47,945	2,397	149,269	7,463	170,497	8,525	169,330	8,466
Soft Costs - Other	-	-	11,500	575	13,000	650	13,000	650	13,000	650
Soft Cost Contingency	-	-	13,828	691	23,271	1,164	26,986	1,349	26,545	1,327
Reserves	-	-	-	-	18,970	948	65,147	3,257	66,038	3,302
Developer Fee	-	-	130,579	6,529	289,043	14,452	305,358	15,268	304,055	15,203
Total Uses of Funds	-	-	1,987,698	99,385	2,363,429	118,171	3,194,200	159,710	3,192,180	159,609
TRANSACTION SURPLUS (GAP)	-	-	(1,864,169)	(93,208)	(1,695,541)	(84,777)	(1,270,076)	(63,504)	(425,166)	(21,258)

Scenario Pro Formas (continued)

Greenwood Manor, 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	-	-	1,209,120	60,456	1,209,120	60,456	1,209,120	60,456	1,209,120	60,456
Capital Needs Funded Using Subsidy	864,226	43,211	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Existing Replacement Reserve Balance	110,737	5,537	110,737	5,537	110,737	5,537	110,737	5,537	110,737	5,537
Replacement Reserves	123,730	6,187	123,730	6,187	193,699	9,685	193,699	9,685	193,699	9,685
Total Funds	1,098,693	54,935	1,443,587	72,179	1,513,555	75,678	1,513,555	75,678	1,513,555	75,678
USES										
Estimated Capital Needs	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935
Enhancements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Uses	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935	1,098,693	54,935
YEAR 20 REPLACEMENT RESERVE BALANCE	-	-	344,894	17,245	414,862	20,743	414,862	20,743	414,862	20,743

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	256,080	12,804	256,080	12,804	256,080	12,804	256,080	12,804
Operating Deficit Subsidy Needed	374,958	18,748	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Total Operating Subsidy	374,958	18,748	256,080	12,804	256,080	12,804	256,080	12,804	256,080	12,804
CAPITAL SUBSIDY										
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	864,226	43,211	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recoverable Cash Flow	n/a	n/a	(271,046)	(13,552)	(85,927)	(4,296)	(56,001)	(2,800)	(76,916)	(3,846)
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	1,864,169	93,208	1,695,541	84,777	1,270,076	63,504	425,166	21,258
Total Capital Subsidy	864,226	43,211	1,593,123	79,656	1,609,614	80,481	1,214,075	60,704	348,251	17,413
TOTAL SUBSIDY NEEDED	1,239,184	61,959	1,849,203	92,460	1,865,694	93,285	1,470,155	73,508	604,331	30,217