CHFA Capital Plan Property Assessment - Elm Grove

Property Identification

Elm Grove
WEST HARTFORD, CT

Total Current Unit Count:	40
Census Tract:	4962.00
Connecticut Congressional District:	1

CHFA Property Identification #: 85216D
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.

Property Description

Tenancy Type:	Elderly/Disabled
Structure Type:	Low rise (1-4 floors)
Number of buildings:	2
Maximum # of Stories:	2
Elevator?	None

Summary property description:
The Elm Grove property has 30 efficiency or studio and 10 one-bedroom units. Generally, the property consists of reasonably sized units. It features amenities such as common laundry, some exterior amenities, and a common room.

Current Operating & Capital Needs Status

Aggregate Capital Needs (without market enhancements):	$ 1,119,008
Capital Needs per Unit:	$ 27,975
Projected Year 1 (2014) Operating Income:	$ (4,664)

Current operations at the property are projected to generate negative $4,700 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 $1.12 million ($27,975 per unit) over the next 20 years.

Owner Comments to Property Assessment:

-Report has a projected operating loss of $4,664. However, actual and projected loss are significantly greater.
-Aggregate Capital Needs estimate of $1.1M, we feel does not adequately address the property’s needs.
-Raising rent to 30% AMI does not protect our residents. It is not clear from the report where subsidy would come from. The turn-over concept mentioned would be very lengthy given the low turn-over we experience at this location.
-Raising the rent to 30% of AMI does not support the debt coverage and the operating costs… and does not address replacement reserves we feel are needed.

RECAP Response: Recap encourages property owners to develop their own recapitalization solutions that work for their specific situation, with the Capital Plan Property Assessment to be used as a starting point for discussions internally and with the State. Regarding the recommended base rent increases, the Capital Plan has proposed the creation of base rent operating subsidies, which will provide funding to reach the new base rent revenue levels while permitting current residents to stay in their homes.

Current average income relative to the Area Median Income (AMI): 21%

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.

	Current Base Rent	Affordability (% AMI)
Studio/efficiency unit:	155	10%
One-bedroom unit:	175	11%
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
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:	450	30%
One-bedroom unit:	482	30%
Two-bedroom unit:		
Three-bedroom unit:		
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: 30

Protecting the 30 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 $85,558 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: $ 85,559

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 $499,967.

Total rental operating subsidy necessary assuming a turnover-based leasing strategy: $ 499,968

Revenue Adjustments Concurrent with a Recapitalization Transaction

Household Income Level	Current Income Mix	Proposed Income Mix
0-25% of AMI	30	30
25-50% of AMI	8	8
50% of AMI or greater	2	2
Total number of units	40	40

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:	450	450
One-bedroom unit:	482	482
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: $ -

Property used for market reference: Elm Grove

	Capital Surplus or (Gap)	Total (Gap) Funded by Subsidy inc. Capital & Operating
Current Scenario (excluding transaction costs):	(993,826)	(1,484,098)
Recoverable Grant Scenario:	(1,835,098)	(1,765,073)
CHFA/FHA Scenario:	(1,442,786)	(1,822,786)
4% LIHTC Scenario:	(1,139,439)	(1,516,707)
9% LIHTC Scenario:	(281,795)	(658,689)

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:	CHFA/FHA
Recommended Transaction Year	2017
Replacement Reserve Deposit PUPY:	350
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year:	1.690
Debt Service Coverage in Transaction Year 15:	1.103
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	13,250
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed:	1,442,786

The capital plan recommends using the debt-only scenario to finance the capital needs at this property. The property has positive NOI which can leverage debt sufficient to cover the long-term capital needs without the complexity of a tax credit transaction.

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 $350 per unit per year, assuming debt service coverage is maintained over 1.103 throughout the first 15 years of the new financing, and assuming hard construction capital needs of $1.12 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 CHFA/FHA scenario, the property yields $63,935 in NOI in the transaction completion year, which includes $350 per unit per year in replacement reserve deposits. After debt service, the property generates $26,103 in cash flow in the capital transaction's completion year, trending to $3,877 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 $658,000 in debt. The transaction results in a gap of $1,442,000, plus the pre-transaction need of $13,000, all of which would need to be covered by State capital subsidy. This compares to a needs gap of over $1,484,000 if no transaction takes place at the property and the capital needs are addressed through routine maintenance or a needs gap of over $1,835,000, plus the pre-transaction need of $13,000, if the capital needs are addressed in a consolidated transaction relying entirely on State capital subsidy.

Summary of Capital Needs & State Subsidy Needs	Elm Grove, continued

Immediate Emergency Capital Needs:	0
Current Deferred Capital Needs:	16,330
Current Routine Capital Needs:	39,157

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	**55,487**	13,250	-	-	-	-
2014	**86,066**	-	-	-	85,559	-
2015	**17,250**	-	-	-	78,543	-
2016	**23,504**	-	-	-	71,212	-
2017	**34,846**	-	1,442,786	-	63,557	(0)
2018	**68,705**	-	-	-	55,567	0
2019	**75,864**	-	-	-	47,232	-
2020	**11,696**	-	-	-	38,541	-
2021	**12,047**	-	-	-	29,484	-
2022	**17,223**	-	-	-	20,049	-

		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	**85,969**	-	-	-	10,225	-
2024	**15,586**	-	-	-	-	-
2025	**13,559**	-	-	-	-	-
2026	**13,965**	-	-	-	-	-
2027	**165,652**	-	-	-	-	-
2028	**30,138**	-	-	-	-	-
2029	**70,367**	-	-	-	-	-
2030	**29,035**	-	-	-	-	-
2031	**116,083**	-	-	-	-	-
2032	**175,966**	-	-	-	-	-

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	184,074	4,601.85	303,414	7,585.34	303,414	7,585	303,414	7,585	303,414	7,585
Vacancy/Loss	(1,458)	(36.46)	(1,458)	(36.46)	(15,171)	(379)	(21,239)	(531)	(21,239)	(531)
Other Income	7,214	180.34	7,214	180.34	7,214	180	7,214	180	7,214	180
Effective Gross Income	**189,829**	**4,745.73**	**309,169**	**7,729.23**	**295,457**	**7,386**	**289,389**	**7,235**	**289,389**	**7,235**
2023 ANNUAL EXPENSES										
Operating Expenses	207,434	5,186	222,892	5,572	216,383	5,410	216,079	5,402	216,079	5,402
Replacement Reserve Deposits	6,439	161	6,439	161	19,926	498	19,926	498	19,926	498
Total Operating Expenses	**213,873**	**5,347**	**229,331**	**5,733**	**236,309**	**5,908**	**236,006**	**5,900**	**236,006**	**5,900**
2023 NET OPERATING INCOME	**(24,043)**	**(601)**	**79,838**	**1,996**	**59,148**	**1,479**	**53,383**	**1,335**	**53,383**	**1,335**
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	37,832	946	31,448	786	31,398	785
2023 CASH FLOW	**(24,043)**	**(601)**	**79,838**	**1,996**	**21,316**	**533**	**21,935**	**548**	**21,985**	**550**

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	-	-	-	-	658,325	16,458	437,080	10,927	546,369	13,659
Commercial Debt 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tax-Exempt Bond	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Soft Debt										
Seller Financing/Take Back Note	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,200,000	30,000	1,200,000	30,000
State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other										
From Operations	-	-	22,546	564	36,546	914	36,546	914	36,546	914
Cash Escrows	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deferred Developer Fee	-	-	-	-	109,180	2,729	116,384	2,910	115,970	2,899
Equity										
GP Contribution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LIHTC	-	-	-	-	-	-	812,568	20,314	1,562,646	39,066
Other	-		-		-		-		-	
Total Sources of Funds	**-**	**-**	**22,546**	564	**804,051**	20,101	**2,602,578**	65,064	**3,461,532**	86,538
USES										
Acquisition Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,200,000	30,000	1,200,000	30,000
Construction Costs	-	-	1,432,796	35,820	1,432,796	35,820	1,448,674	36,217	1,448,674	36,217
Soft Costs - Design & Construction	-	-	165,202	4,130	162,944	4,074	166,710	4,168	166,710	4,168
Soft Costs - Due Diligence	-	-	11,219	280	20,719	518	24,178	604	24,178	604
Soft Costs - Transaction Costs	-	-	43,046	1,076	123,046	3,076	241,868	6,047	241,868	6,047
Soft Costs - Financing	-	-	45,926	1,148	151,268	3,782	186,191	4,655	186,411	4,660
Soft Costs - Other	-	-	23,000	575	26,000	650	26,000	650	26,000	650
Soft Cost Contingency	-	-	14,420	360	24,199	605	28,514	713	28,163	704
Reserves	-	-	-	-	32,916	823	128,921	3,223	131,396	3,285
Developer Fee	-	-	122,035	3,051	272,949	6,824	290,961	7,274	289,926	7,248
Total Uses of Funds	**-**	**-**	**1,857,644**	46,441	**2,246,837**	56,171	**3,742,017**	93,550	**3,743,327**	93,583
TRANSACTION SURPLUS (GAP)	**-**	**-**	**(1,835,098)**	(45,877)	**(1,442,786)**	(36,070)	**(1,139,439)**	(28,486)	**(281,795)**	(7,045)

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	-	-	1,105,758	27,644	1,105,758	27,644	1,105,758	27,644	1,105,758	27,644
Capital Needs Funded Using Subsidy	993,826	24,846	13,250	331	13,250	331	13,250	331	13,250	331
Existing Replacement Reserve Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Replacement Reserves	125,182	3,130	125,182	3,130	387,397	9,685	387,397	9,685	387,397	9,685
Total Funds	**1,119,008**	**27,975**	**1,244,189**	**31,105**	**1,506,405**	**37,660**	**1,506,405**	**37,660**	**1,506,405**	**37,660**
USES										
Estimated Capital Needs	1,119,008	27,975	1,119,008	27,975	1,119,008	27,975	1,119,008	27,975	1,119,008	27,975
Enhancements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Uses	**1,119,008**	**27,975**	**1,119,008**	**27,975**	**1,119,008**	**27,975**	**1,119,008**	**27,975**	**1,119,008**	**27,975**
YEAR 20 REPLACEMENT RESERVE BALANCE	**-**	**-**	**125,182**	**3,130**	**387,397**	**9,685**	**387,397**	**9,685**	**387,397**	**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	499,968	12,499	499,968	12,499	499,968	12,499	499,968	12,499
Operating Deficit Subsidy Needed	490,271	12,257	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Income Mixing Operating Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Operating Subsidy	**490,271**	**12,257**	**499,968**	**12,499**	**499,968**	**12,499**	**499,968**	**12,499**	**499,968**	**12,499**
CAPITAL SUBSIDY										
Pre-Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	993,826	24,846	13,250	331	13,250	331	13,250	331	13,250	331
Recoverable Cash Flow	n/a	n/a	(583,243)	(14,581)	(133,218)	(3,330)	(135,950)	(3,399)	(136,324)	(3,408)
Transaction Capital Subsidy Needed	n/a	n/a	1,835,098	45,877	1,442,786	36,070	1,139,439	28,486	281,795	7,045
Total Capital Subsidy	**993,826**	**24,846**	**1,265,105**	**31,628**	**1,322,818**	**33,070**	**1,016,739**	**25,418**	**158,722**	**3,968**
TOTAL SUBSIDY NEEDED	**1,484,098**	**37,102**	**1,765,073**	**44,127**	**1,822,786**	**45,570**	**1,516,707**	**37,918**	**658,689**	**16,467**