

Developing A Network of “Project Monitors” To Help Preserve Washington’s Subsidized Housing

A partnership of the following:

National Low Income Housing Coalition

Washington Low Income Housing Alliance

AIDS Housing of Washington

WA State Dept. of Community, Trade, & Economic Development



Preservation & Project Monitors in Washington

Project Overview

I. Introduction:

- Why we're here and what we hope to accomplish today

II. Background

- Preservation Catalog defined
- National aspirations
- State-level case studies

III. Key Players in the Process

- NLIHC Partners in Washington
- NLIHC as Initial Preservation Catalog Host
- Project Monitors
- Preservation Groups (TA providers, legal services, tenant organizers, nonprofit developers, sources of funding, etc.)

Washington Preservation Catalog

I. Catalog of Subsidized Housing

- Data sources and variables
- Structure of the database
- Intended uses

II. What the Preservation Data Tell Us

- Summary of assisted projects by subsidy and expiration of affordability period

III. Data Issues

- Discrepancies among data sources
- Essential – but missing – information
- Elements identified as good “at-risk” indicators (next slide)

**A Snapshot of Subsidy Layers in
Washington's Preservation Catalog
(Preliminary)**

Project Also Subsidized By...												
	Project- Based Section 8	Section 236	Sections 202/811	LIHTC	HOME (HUD HQ)	HOME (CTED)	Housing Trust Fund	Other CTED	RHS	No Known Cross- Subsidy	Total Projects (#)	% of Projects in Catalog with Subsidy
Project- Based Section 8		9%	15%	8%	7%	3%	9%	6%	8%	47%	455	26%
FHA Insured Mortgage	96%		0%	0%	6%	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	48	3%
Sections 202/811	100%	0%		0%	0%	1%	9%	0%	0%	0%	68	4%
LIHTC	6%	0%	0%		13%	7%	22%	3%	17%	50%	610	35%
HOME (HUD HQ)	12%	1%	0%	29%		20%	28%	7%	2%	45%	276	16%
HOME (CTED)	13%	1%	1%	44%	53%		36%	7%	2%	19%	102	6%
Housing Trust Fund	10%	0%	1%	30%	17%	8%		2%	2%	51%	442	25%
Other CTED ¹	14%	1%	0%	10%	10%	4%	4%		7%	66%	187	11%
RHS	12%	1%	0%	34%	2%	1%	3%	5%		50%	300	17%

¹ Projects included in a data file provided by CTED for which the type of subsidy is unclear.

**Summary of Subsidized Units and
Estimated Expiration Dates¹**
(Preliminary)

	Expiring										Total
	Before 2008		2008-2010		2011-2015		After 2015		Unknown		
Project-Based Section 8 ²	7,499	39%	7,250	38%	2,970	15%	1,559	8%	0	0%	19,278
FHA Insured Mortgage ³	0	0%	276	9%	2,830	91%	0	0%	0	0%	3,106
Sections 202/811	0	0%	0	0%	590	20%	2,350	80%	0	0%	2,940
LIHTC ⁴	5,291	14%	4,217	11%	15,313	40%	13,041	34%	0	0%	37,862
HOME ⁵	1,311	28%	591	13%	736	16%	2,029	43%	0	0%	4,667
Section 515 ⁶	2,368	27%	1,196	14%	222	3%	3,870	44%	1,126	13%	8,782

¹ Units with more than one subsidy are double-counted in this table. Also, units may remain affordable due to the existence of an additional subsidy that will not expire within the same time period.

² Includes 1,811 that are already listed as expired. Some may have been renewed without a corresponding update in HUD's database.

³ Only projects with income restrictions associated with an FHA mortgage are included here.

⁴ Expiration date is assumed to be 15 years from the year a project was placed in service.

⁵ From HUD's CPD Office. Includes 1,298 units that are already listed as expired. Expiration dates are not yet available for CTED-funded projects.

⁶ Includes 2,255 units that are already listed as expired.

Data Associated with At-Risk Properties

Top-Level Risk Indicators	Requires Digging by Project Monitor or Outreach to State/Local Agency	Potential State/Local Sources
<i>Known for most properties</i>	<i>Most important for properties identified as at-risk by top-level indicators</i>	
expiration dates for federal and some state subsidies	other state/local subsidies with income restrictions	state/local governments
ownership type	notice of opt-out, prepayment or interest in selling <i>(currently available for RD only)</i>	state HUD office and/or WSHFC
target tenant population <i>(e.g., family, elderly)</i>	prepayment eligibility date	HUD/RD
owners with a "reputation"	indicators of a property's physical & financial health	state HUD & RD offices
	capital needs and/or capital improvement plans <i>(especially for nonprofit-owned)</i>	?
	rent-to-FMR ratio <i>(currently available for Section 8 and some RD)</i>	?
	age of project	?

Roles as Currently Envisioned

I. Project Monitor

Basic Activities

- Alerting NLIHC of any known changes to a project's affordability status (e.g., rumored opt-out notice, etc.)
- Responding to requests for information
- Expanding the Project Monitor network

Other Possible Activities

- Obtaining additional preservation-related information and reporting to NLIHC
- Participating in the preservation strategy for monitored projects identified as at-risk

II. NLIHC as Preservation Catalog Host

- Overseeing maintenance – of data and relationships
- Contacting appropriate groups to begin the preservation process, where necessary

III. Preservation Entities

Fleshing Out a Strategy for this Initiative

I. Improve the Preservation Catalog

- Review current Catalog for accuracy
- Identify and add missing projects/subsidies
- Establish a method for organizing the Catalog – and this initiative as a whole – geographically
- Emphasize projects identified as at-risk by extensive data

II. Develop a Roster of Key Players in Washington

- Project Monitors
- Legal services
- Tenant organizers
- Technical assistance providers
- Funding sources
- Nonprofits with capacity and an interest in acquisition

III. Preservation in Action

- Attempt by key players to preserve at-risk projects by regularly discussing the processes and partners appropriate for each property.

Additional Topics for Discussion

I. Project Monitors

- What other groups in Washington might be interested in serving as Project Monitors?
- How can we expand the network of monitors to cover an increasingly larger proportion of the subsidized stock?
- How do we “divvy up” the subsidized projects among monitors?
- Is it OK, or even ideal, to have multiple monitors associated with one project?
- Alternatively, what should the strategy be for maintaining an active network of Project Monitors? How will new monitors be recruited to replace “retiring” ones?

Additional Topics for Discussion (cont'd)

II. Data

- What is the best way to facilitate the flow of information between Project Monitors and NLIHC?
- Beyond the variables listed on Slide 4, what other types of information should be collected? Can the list be clearly defined, or must it vary from project to project?
- Is everyone comfortable with making all data publicly available via the internet? Do we need to protect any information?
- Which organizations are candidates for assuming responsibility of maintaining the Preservation Catalog and working with Project Monitors to preserve at-risk properties?

Additional Topics for Discussion (cont'd)

III. Preservation Strategies

- Which local, state, and national groups have the capacity – both financial and technical – to act on properties in need of preservation in Washington?
- What is the ideal “chain of events” for preserving an at-risk project? How should Slide 6 be amended?
- How do we make sure a project doesn’t fall between the cracks? Who has responsibility for follow-up?

**Thank you for your time and interest.
Please provide comments & feedback to:**

National Low Income Housing Coalition

Keith E. Wardrip
Research Analyst
(202) 662-1530 x245
keith@nlihc.org

Kat Diaz
Outreach Director
(202) 662-1530 x232
kat@nlihc.org

Jake Kirsch
Outreach Associate
(202) 662-1530 x244
jake@nlihc.org



Preservation & Project Monitors in Washington