CHFA Capital Plan Property Assessment - King Court

Property Identification

King Court
EAST HARTFORD, CT

Total Current Unit Count:	80
Census Tract:	5106.00
Connecticut Congressional District:	1

CHFA Property Identification #: 85035D
Current State Sponsored Housing Program: SH Moderate Rental

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:	Low rise (1-4 floors)
Number of buildings:	1
Maximum # of Stories:	2
Elevator?	None

Summary property description:

The King Court property has 60 two-bedroom and 20 three-bedroom units. Generally, the property consists of reasonably sized units. It features amenities such as semi-private patios and an outdoor basketball court.

Current Operating & Capital Needs Status

Aggregate Capital Needs (without market enhancements):	$	3,035,840
Capital Needs per Unit:	$	37,948
Projected Year 1 (2014) Operating Income:	$	(130,575)

Current operations at the property are projected to generate negative $130,600 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 $3.04 million ($37,948 per unit) over the next 20 years.

Current average income relative to the Area Median Income (AMI): 18%

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 percentage of their income for housing and it will require that the property serve tenants with modestly higher incomes.

	Current Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:		
Two-bedroom unit:	380	20%
Three-bedroom unit:	400	18%
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

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.

	Proposed Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:		
Two-bedroom unit:	578	30%
Three-bedroom unit:	668	30%
Four-bedroom unit:		
Five-bedroom unit:		
Six-bedroom unit:		

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.

Number of current households that would be impacted by the proposed increase in Base Rent: 62

Protecting the 62 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 $175,200 to protect these households while generating the revenue equivalent to the proposed increase in the base rent.

Rental operating subsidy necessary in 2014 to generate revenue equal to raising the base rent as proposed: $ 175,200

Total rental operating subsidy necessary assuming a turnover-based leasing strategy: $ 1,023,795

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 $1,023,794.

Household Income Level	Current Income Mix	Proposed Income Mix
0-25% of AMI	62	27
25-50% of AMI	16	27
50% of AMI or greater	2	26
Total number of units	80	80

While the 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.) The capital plan has examined additional revenue adjustments based on an income-tier structure, which could supplement the revenue picture. However, the potential for additional revenue adjustments through income mixing is limited because the market will not support such a strategy.

	Pre-Trans. Base Rent	Post-Trans. Base Rent
Studio/efficiency unit:		
One-bedroom unit:		
Two-bedroom unit:	578	578
Three-bedroom unit:	668	668
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: $ 60,610

Transitional rental operating subsidy necessary to protect current residents and permit a five-year transition to income tier occupancy: $ 154,586

Property used for market reference: Veteran Terrace

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 preferential basis. However, additional operating subsidy beyond that reflected here would mitigate this loss of housing options for lower income households. The owner of this property has indicated that they have up to 86 Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers which could, potentially, be project based. If the mobile Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers are not fully utilized, the owner's election to project-base them at this property could help mitigate the impact of income tiering on the availability of units for the lowest income households.

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 18 in 2014 to 53 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. Fortunately, this property would not require significant physical enhancements beyond routine capital improvements in order to attract these potential tenants.

	Capital Surplus or (Gap)	Total (Gap) Funded by Subsidy inc. Capital & Operating
Current Scenario (excluding transaction costs):	(3,035,840)	(6,895,757)
Recoverable Grant Scenario:	(5,435,711)	(5,965,501)
CHFA/FHA Scenario:	(5,238,660)	(6,128,647)
4% LIHTC Scenario:	(3,552,273)	(4,464,641)
9% LIHTC Scenario:	(870,524)	(1,791,701)

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	2017
Replacement Reserve Deposit PUPY:	425
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year:	60.00
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year 15:	1.09
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	81,510
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	3,552,273

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 2017 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 1.095 throughout the first 15 years of the new financing, and assuming hard construction capital needs of $3.04 million.

Given the 2017 transaction year, the property will struggle to meet its capital needs purely from its own resources prior to that date. The capital plan recommends that the State establish an interim recoverable grant structure to cover the needs until the transaction year. This interim recoverable grant would be repaid to the State to the extent possible from cash flow, but has not been included as a required repayment in the proposed transaction.

Summary of Recommended Transaction

Under the 4% LIHTC scenario, the property yields $85,743 in NOI in the transaction completion year, which includes $425 per unit per year in replacement reserve deposits. After debt service, the property generates $79,314 in cash flow in the capital transaction's completion year, trending to $609 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 $23,000 in debt and $2,311,000 in equity. The transaction results in a gap of $3,552,000, plus the pre-transaction need of $81,000, all of which would need to be covered by State capital subsidy. This compares to a needs gap of over $6,895,000 if no transaction takes place at the property and the capital needs are addressed through routine maintenance or a needs gap of over $5,435,000, plus the pre-transaction need of $81,000, if the capital needs are addressed in a consolidated transaction relying entirely on State capital subsidy.

Summary of Capital Needs & State Subsidy Needs

Immediate Emergency Capital Needs: 0
Current Deferred Capital Needs: 401,575
Current Routine Capital Needs: 506,769

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	**908,344**	81,510	-	-	-	-
2014	**132,995**	-	-	-	175,200	-
2015	**136,985**	-	-	-	160,834	-
2016	**141,094**	-	-	-	145,822	-
2017	**276,931**	-	3,552,273	13,581	130,147	(0)
2018	**324,199**	-	-	-	113,785	60,610
2019	**43,417**	-	-	-	96,717	46,367
2020	**44,719**	-	-	-	78,921	31,529
2021	**64,429**	-	-	-	60,375	16,080
2022	**47,443**	-	-	-	41,055	-

		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	**244,727**	-	-	-	20,938	-
2024	**50,332**	-	-	-	-	-
2025	**51,842**	-	-	-	-	-
2026	**53,397**	-	-	-	-	-
2027	**54,999**	-	-	-	-	-
2028	**197,198**	-	-	-	-	-
2029	**74,396**	-	-	-	-	-
2030	**60,099**	-	-	-	-	-
2031	**61,902**	-	-	-	-	-
2032	**66,390**	-	-	-	-	-

Scenario Pro Formas

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	505,268	6,315.84	867,962	10,849.53	867,962	10,850	867,962	10,850	867,962	10,850
Vacancy/Loss	(205,704)	(2,571.30)	(232,604)	(2,907.55)	(232,604)	(2,908)	(232,604)	(2,908)	(232,604)	(2,908)
Other Income	5,098	63.73	5,098	63.73	5,098	64	5,098	64	5,098	64
Effective Gross Income	**304,662**	**3,808.28**	**640,457**	**8,005.71**	**640,457**	**8,006**	**640,457**	**8,006**	**640,457**	**8,006**
2023 ANNUAL EXPENSES										
Operating Expenses	502,993	6,287	535,016	6,688	525,362	6,567	525,362	6,567	525,362	6,567
Replacement Reserve Deposits	-	-	-	-	48,393	605	48,393	605	39,853	498
Total Operating Expenses	**502,993**	**6,287**	**535,016**	**6,688**	**573,754**	**7,172**	**573,754**	**7,172**	**565,214**	**7,065**
2023 NET OPERATING INCOME	**(198,331)**	**(2,479)**	**105,441**	**1,318**	**66,702**	**834**	**66,702**	**834**	**75,242**	**941**
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	6,394	80	6,429	80	17,873	223
2023 CASH FLOW	**(198,331)**	**(2,479)**	**105,441**	**1,318**	**60,308**	**754**	**60,273**	**753**	**57,369**	**717**

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	-	-	-	-	111,265	1,391	23,617	295	311,021	3,888
Commercial Debt 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tax-Exempt Bond	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soft Debt										
Seller Financing/Take Back Note	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,296,012	28,700	2,296,012	28,700
State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other										
From Operations	-	-	22,812	285	56,812	710	56,812	710	50,812	635
Cash Escrows	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deferred Developer Fee	-	-	-	-	273,141	3,414	284,840	3,560	283,460	3,543
Equity										
GP Contribution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LIHTC	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,311,783	28,897	4,707,321	58,842
Other	-		-		-		-		-	
Total Sources of Funds	**-**	-	**22,812**	285	**441,218**	5,515	**4,973,064**	62,163	**7,648,627**	95,608
USES										
Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	103,988	1,300	2,400,000	30,000	2,400,000	30,000
Construction Costs	-	-	4,348,445	54,356	3,828,101	47,851	3,870,523	48,382	3,870,523	48,382
Soft Costs - Design & Construction	-	-	475,941	5,949	414,451	5,181	424,515	5,306	424,515	5,306
Soft Costs - Due Diligence	-	-	16,718	209	27,719	346	34,525	432	34,525	432
Soft Costs - Transaction Costs	-	-	43,312	541	123,312	1,541	265,241	3,316	265,241	3,316
Soft Costs - Financing	-	-	133,732	1,672	361,319	4,516	430,314	5,379	430,034	5,375
Soft Costs - Other	-	-	46,000	575	52,000	650	52,000	650	52,000	650
Soft Cost Contingency	-	-	35,785	447	48,940	612	54,237	678	53,069	663
Reserves	-	-	-	-	37,197	465	281,883	3,524	280,596	3,507
Developer Fee	-	-	358,589	4,482	682,853	8,536	712,100	8,901	708,649	8,858
Total Uses of Funds	**-**	-	**5,458,523**	68,232	**5,679,878**	70,998	**8,525,338**	106,567	**8,519,151**	106,489
TRANSACTION SURPLUS (GAP)	**-**	-	**(5,435,711)**	(67,946)	**(5,238,660)**	(65,483)	**(3,552,273)**	(44,403)	**(870,524)**	(10,882)

Scenario Pro Formas (continued)

King Court, 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	-	-	3,355,905	41,949	2,954,330	36,929	2,954,330	36,929	2,954,330	36,929
Capital Needs Funded Using Subsidy	3,035,840	37,948	81,510	1,019	81,510	1,019	81,510	1,019	81,510	1,019
Existing Replacement Reserve Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Replacement Reserves	-	-	-	-	940,822	11,760	940,822	11,760	774,794	9,685
Total Funds	**3,035,840**	**37,948**	**3,437,415**	**42,968**	**3,976,662**	**49,708**	**3,976,662**	**49,708**	**3,810,634**	**47,633**
USES										
Estimated Capital Needs	3,035,840	37,948	3,035,840	37,948	3,035,840	37,948	3,035,840	37,948	3,035,840	37,948
Enhancements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Uses	**3,035,840**	**37,948**	**3,035,840**	**37,948**	**3,035,840**	**37,948**	**3,035,840**	**37,948**	**3,035,840**	**37,948**
YEAR 20 REPLACEMENT RESERVE BALANCE	**-**	**-**	**401,575**	**5,020**	**940,822**	**11,760**	**940,822**	**11,760**	**774,794**	**9,685**

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	1,023,795	12,797	1,023,795	12,797	1,023,795	12,797	1,023,795	12,797
Operating Deficit Subsidy Needed	3,859,917	48,249	-	-	10,979	137	13,581	170	6,832	85
Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	154,586	1,932	154,586	1,932	154,586	1,932	154,586	1,932
Total Operating Subsidy	**3,859,917**	**48,249**	**1,178,381**	**14,730**	**1,189,360**	**14,867**	**1,191,962**	**14,900**	**1,185,213**	**14,815**
CAPITAL SUBSIDY										
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	3,035,840	37,948	81,510	1,019	81,510	1,019	81,510	1,019	81,510	1,019
Recoverable Cash Flow	n/a	n/a	(730,101)	(9,126)	(380,883)	(4,761)	(361,104)	(4,514)	(345,546)	(4,319)
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	5,435,711	67,946	5,238,660	65,483	3,552,273	44,403	870,524	10,882
Total Capital Subsidy	**3,035,840**	**37,948**	**4,787,120**	**59,839**	**4,939,287**	**61,741**	**3,272,679**	**40,908**	**606,488**	**7,581**
TOTAL SUBSIDY NEEDED	**6,895,757**	**86,197**	**5,965,501**	**74,569**	**6,128,647**	**76,608**	**4,464,641**	**55,808**	**1,791,701**	**22,396**