

CHFA Capital Plan Property Assessment - Rye Field Manor

Property Identification

Rye Field Manor
OLD LYME, CT

CHFA Property Identification #: 97055D

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: 39

Census Tract: 6601.02

Connecticut Congressional District: 2

Property Description

Tenancy Type: Elderly/Disabled

Structure Type: Duplex

Number of buildings: 14

Maximum # of Stories: 1

Elevator? None

Summary property description:

The Rye Field Manor property has 39 one-bedroom units. Generally, the property consists of reasonably sized units. It features amenities such as common laundry, owner-provided air conditioning, semi-private outdoor space, and a common room.

Current Operating & Capital Needs Status

Aggregate Capital Needs
(without market enhancements): \$ 1,773,640

Capital Needs per Unit: \$ 45,478

Projected Year 1 (2014) Operating Income: \$ (49,645)

Current operations at the property are projected to generate negative \$49,600 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 \$1.77 million (\$45,477 per unit) over the next 20 years.

Revenue Adjustments Prior to a Recapitalization Transaction

Rye Field Manor, continued

Current average income relative to the Area Median Income (AMI): 28%

	Current Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:	510	33%
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

	Proposed Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:	510	33%
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

In order for the property to operate in a sustainable manner into the foreseeable future, the property would benefit from greater revenues. This property currently has a rental assistance payments contract with the State, which allow the residents to pay an affordable rent based on their income, but generally only yields the base rent amount as revenue. Currently, base rents are set by the property owners in consultation with CHFA.

Low base rent levels maximize affordability for households in the community. However, if the property's revenue stream (including any available operating subsidy) does not cover the cost of actually operating the property, including the cost of ongoing maintenance and capital improvements, necessary repairs and maintenance will get deferred. An extended period of deferred maintenance can put the property itself at risk, which would be a significant blow to the availability of affordable housing in the area.

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, 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.

The figures to the left indicate the additional rental operating subsidy which would be necessary in 2014 to cover this base rent increase as well as the total 20 year impact given that this subsidy need will recur annually, with inflation increases. Since the rental assistance payment protects the residents of the property, none of the actual households would be impacted by the increase in the base rent and the property would continue to serve the current resident demographic.

Number of current households that would be impacted by the proposed increase in Base Rent: 0

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

Additional rental assistance payments subsidy over a 20 year period due to revised base rent: \$ -

Revenue Adjustments Concurrent with a Recapitalization Transaction

Rye Field Manor, continued

Household Income Level	Current Income Mix	Proposed Income Mix
0-25% of AMI	33	37
25-50% of AMI	4	0
50% of AMI or greater	2	2
Total number of units	39	39

	Pre-Trans. Base Rent	Post-Trans. Base Rent
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:	510	663
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

While the revenue generated by the increase in the base rent 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.) However, as noted above, the property receives a rental assistance payment. A RAP arrangement provides operating support to the property while permitting residents to pay based on what they can afford, so income mixing is neither needed nor appropriate. For extremely low income households, properties with a RAP contract are their only viable option. In order to ensure long-term stability, a post-transaction base rent increase, which would be covered by the RAP subsidy, is used to generate enough income for the property to operate at a sustainable level.

The rental assistance payment ensures that the property receives the base rent. However, since the base rent increase suggested above is insufficient over the long term, the only alternative is to increase the base rent again in conjunction with the recapitalization transaction. (An income-tier structure in this situation would only serve to reduce housing options to the lowest income households, without increasing revenue to the property.)

An increase in the base rent at a property with a rental assistance payment translates into an increase in the operating subsidy necessary to sustain the property over time.

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

Additional rental operating subsidy necessary to
sustain Rental Assistance Payments based on
the adjusted base rent: \$ 1,323,276

Property used for market reference: Rye Field Manor

	Capital Surplus or (Gap)	Total (Gap) Funded by Subsidy inc. Capital & Operating
Current Scenario (excluding transaction costs):	(679,409)	(2,512,448)
Recoverable Grant Scenario:	(2,607,071)	(3,842,160)
CHFA/FHA Scenario:	(2,132,473)	(3,299,613)
4% LIHTC Scenario:	(1,647,177)	(2,744,808)
9% LIHTC Scenario:	(452,279)	(1,548,047)

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

Rye Field Manor, continued

Recommended Transaction Option:	4% LIHTC	<p>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 2014 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.</p> <p>This property has been underwritten assuming replacement reserve deposits of \$350 per unit per year, and assuming hard construction capital needs of \$1.77 million.</p>
Recommended Transaction Year	2014	
Replacement Reserve Deposit PUPY:	350	
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year:	2.090	
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year 15:	1.104	
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	-	<p>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.</p>
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	1,647,177	

Summary of Recommended Transaction

Under the 4% LIHTC scenario, the property yields \$69,506 in NOI in the transaction completion year, which includes \$350 per unit per year in replacement reserve deposits. After debt service, the property generates \$31,249 in cash flow in the capital transaction's completion year, trending to \$3,975 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 \$549,000 in debt and \$1,059,000 in equity. The transaction results in a gap of \$1,647,000, all of which would need to be covered by State capital subsidy. This compares to a needs gap of over \$2,512,000 if no transaction takes place at the property and the capital needs are addressed through routine maintenance or a needs gap of over \$2,607,000 if the capital needs are addressed in a consolidated transaction relying entirely on State capital subsidy.

Summary of Capital Needs & State Subsidy Needs

Rye Field Manor, continued

Immediate Emergency Capital Needs: 0
 Current Deferred Capital Needs: 0
 Current Routine Capital Needs: 500,759

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	500,759	-	-	-	-	-
2014	218,043	-	1,647,177	-	-	-
2015	189,878	-	-	-	61,800	-
2016	29,133	-	-	-	63,036	-
2017	5,980	-	-	-	64,296	-
2018	25,225	-	-	-	65,582	-
2019	54,310	-	-	-	66,894	-
2020	29,486	-	-	-	68,232	-
2021	23,328	-	-	-	69,597	-
2022	10,216	-	-	-	70,988	-

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	59,209	-	-	-	72,408	-
2024	95,230	-	-	-	73,856	-
2025	51,444	-	-	-	75,334	-
2026	14,328	-	-	-	76,840	-
2027	14,758	-	-	-	78,377	-
2028	18,637	-	-	-	79,945	-
2029	338,563	-	-	-	81,543	-
2030	33,622	-	-	-	83,174	-
2031	34,631	-	-	-	84,838	-
2032	26,858	-	-	2,126	86,535	-

Scenario Pro Formas

Rye Field 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	303,528	7,782.76	391,454	10,037.28	391,454	10,037	391,454	10,037	391,454	10,037
Vacancy/Loss	(10,763)	(275.97)	(13,437)	(344.53)	(19,573)	(502)	(27,402)	(703)	(27,402)	(703)
Other Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Effective Gross Income	292,765	7,506.79	378,017	9,692.76	371,881	9,535	364,052	9,335	364,052	9,335
2023 ANNUAL EXPENSES										
Operating Expenses	321,218	8,236	294,425	7,549	286,486	7,346	286,095	7,336	286,095	7,336
Replacement Reserve Deposits	64,358	1,650	64,358	1,650	19,428	498	19,428	498	19,428	498
Total Operating Expenses	385,576	9,887	358,783	9,200	305,915	7,844	305,523	7,834	305,523	7,834
2023 NET OPERATING INCOME	(92,811)	(2,380)	19,235	493	65,967	1,691	58,529	1,501	58,529	1,501
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	45,972	1,179	38,257	981	38,190	979
2023 CASH FLOW	(92,811)	(2,380)	19,235	493	19,994	513	20,272	520	20,339	522

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	-	-	-	-	799,984	20,512	549,603	14,092	664,566	17,040
Commercial Debt 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tax-Exempt Bond	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soft Debt										
Seller Financing/Take Back Note	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,170,000	30,000	1,170,000	30,000
State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other										
From Operations	-	-	34,608	887	48,258	1,237	48,258	1,237	48,258	1,237
Cash Escrows	-	-	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514
Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deferred Developer Fee	-	-	-	-	159,827	4,098	167,805	4,303	167,156	4,286
Equity										
GP Contribution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LIHTC	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,059,177	27,158	2,139,484	54,859
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Sources of Funds	-	-	171,636	4,401	1,145,096	29,361	3,131,871	80,304	4,326,491	110,936
USES										
Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,170,000	30,000	1,170,000	30,000
Construction Costs	-	-	2,174,969	55,768	2,174,969	55,768	2,199,071	56,386	2,199,071	56,386
Soft Costs - Design & Construction	-	-	244,300	6,264	240,872	6,176	246,590	6,323	246,590	6,323
Soft Costs - Due Diligence	-	-	12,060	309	21,510	552	24,893	638	24,893	638
Soft Costs - Transaction Costs	-	-	55,108	1,413	135,108	3,464	261,089	6,695	261,089	6,695
Soft Costs - Financing	-	-	67,245	1,724	211,824	5,431	245,752	6,301	245,179	6,287
Soft Costs - Other	-	-	22,425	575	25,350	650	25,350	650	25,350	650
Soft Cost Contingency	-	-	20,057	514	31,733	814	35,908	921	35,359	907
Reserves	-	-	-	-	36,636	939	150,883	3,869	153,349	3,932
Developer Fee	-	-	182,543	4,681	399,567	10,245	419,512	10,757	417,890	10,715
Total Uses of Funds	-	-	2,778,706	71,249	3,277,569	84,040	4,779,047	122,540	4,778,770	122,533
TRANSACTION SURPLUS (GAP)	-	-	(2,607,071)	(66,848)	(2,132,473)	(54,679)	(1,647,177)	(42,235)	(452,279)	(11,597)

Scenario Pro Formas (continued)

Rye Field 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	-	-	1,678,528	43,039	1,678,528	43,039	1,678,528	43,039	1,678,528	43,039
Capital Needs Funded Using Subsidy	679,409	17,421	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Existing Replacement Reserve Balance	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514	137,028	3,514
Replacement Reserves	1,251,211	32,082	1,251,211	32,082	377,712	9,685	377,712	9,685	377,712	9,685
Total Funds	2,067,648	53,017	3,066,767	78,635	2,193,269	56,238	2,193,269	56,238	2,193,269	56,238
USES										
Estimated Capital Needs	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478
Enhancements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Uses	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478	1,773,640	45,478
YEAR 20 REPLACEMENT RESERVE BALANCE	294,008	7,539	1,293,128	33,157	419,629	10,760	419,629	10,760	419,629	10,760

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	1,323,276	33,930	1,323,276	33,930	1,323,276	33,930	1,323,276	33,930
Operating Deficit Subsidy Needed	1,833,039	47,001	72,205	1,851	953	24	2,126	55	2,059	53
Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Operating Subsidy	1,833,039	47,001	1,395,480	35,782	1,324,228	33,955	1,325,401	33,985	1,325,335	33,983
CAPITAL SUBSIDY										
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	679,409	17,421	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recoverable Cash Flow	n/a	n/a	(160,391)	(4,113)	(157,087)	(4,028)	(227,770)	(5,840)	(229,567)	(5,886)
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	2,607,071	66,848	2,132,473	54,679	1,647,177	42,235	452,279	11,597
Total Capital Subsidy	679,409	17,421	2,446,680	62,735	1,975,385	50,651	1,419,407	36,395	222,712	5,711
TOTAL SUBSIDY NEEDED	2,512,448	64,422	3,842,160	98,517	3,299,613	84,605	2,744,808	70,380	1,548,047	39,694