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Asset Repositioning

**Portfolio Analysis:** CSG Advisors worked with the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority (MPHA) to evaluate alternative approaches to address the capital needs at its Glendale Townhomes development (AMP 1), multi-family scattered sites (AMP 2) and senior/mixed high-rise buildings (AMPs 3 – 7).

CSG’s work considered MPHA’s Guiding Principles, including:
- Preserving existing and creating new affordable apartments.
- Ensuring long term financial viability.
- Structuring resources and utilizing tools to fully leverage funds.

**Operational Analysis:** CSG also worked with MPHA to analyze its public housing operations to identify efficiencies in order to reduce operating costs, allowing MPHA greater development funding opportunities to strategically leverage debt.

The following slide shows CSG’s integrated approach to asset repositioning.
CSG Approach to Asset Repositioning

Operational Analysis
- Set up feasible development program
- Establish phasing and timelines
- Provide critical path action items
- Assist in building capacity and provide development guidance
- Review expenses and revenues
- Analyze personnel/utility metrics
- Assess work order processes
- Assess overhead functions
- Determine income/expense opportunities

Decrease expenses
- Decrease expenses

Portfolio Analysis
- Asses data to align both key and additional sources with agency priorities
- Increase access to additional funds
- Review capital needs/property characteristics
- Assess financial tools available
- Evaluate financing options
- Prepare financial models
- Identify additional funding options

Asset Repositioning Strategy
- Set up feasible development program
- Establish phasing and timelines
- Provide critical path action items
- Assist in building capacity and provide development guidance
- Assess data to align both key and additional sources with agency priorities
- Increase access to additional funds
Portfolio Strategy

Site Recommendations

Strategic Plan

- Develop a comprehensive plan based on MPHA’s 2017 portfolio strategy efforts.
- Present MPHA’s plan at meetings convened with the City, Minnesota Housing, Federal Home Loan Bank, Hennepin County, Local Foundations, the HUD RAD Office, and the HUD Office of Public Housing/Special Applications Center.

Glendale Townhomes

- Consider opportunities for a mixed-income/mixed-use development program that creates additional affordable apartments.
- Procure a Development Partner that designs a program that allows residents in good standing the right to return and secures the necessary sources to make the project financially feasible.
- Consider options for Section 18 disposition to access voucher subsidy to financially support redevelopment activities.

Scattered Sites

- Further explore options to convert units from public housing to vouchers through HUD’s Section 18 Disposition, voluntary conversion and/or Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) programs in order to increase revenue to cover expenses and capital improvements.
- Establish a local revolving loan fund to address backlog of capital improvements.
- Use MPHA reserve funds and raise local foundation/bank funds by marketing the unique characteristics of the scattered sites (stabilizing integrated workforce housing in opportunity areas).
Portfolio Strategy

Site Recommendations

High Rise Developments

- Further explore options to convert units from public housing to vouchers through HUD’s Section 18 Disposition, voluntary conversion and/or Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) programs.
- Confirm MPHA’s desired approach and program the first group of sites over the next five years.
- Request that the City of Minneapolis set aside volume bond cap for senior public housing preservation projects.
- Determine timing to competitively pursue possible financing sources to stabilize housing for the vulnerable aging population.
- Certain high rise sites have opportunities for infill residential and commercial development. CSG recommends that MPHA, as part of its predevelopment process, assess the feasibility of adding more units and/or commercial space, based on the estimated construction costs and funding sources available to cover the additional development costs.

Overall

- Further evaluate and consider the operations savings strategies proposed by CSG.
- Inventory ongoing and future public and private projects that could present collaborative revitalization efforts.
- Further analyze potential energy performance opportunities to incorporate into rehab/new construction projects.
- Evaluate the feasibility of infill opportunities for the high-rise and scattered sites during predevelopment.
Heritage Park

This site, which includes 440 mixed-income apartments, represents a unique opportunity for MPHA since in 2018-2021 the phases will reach the compliance period, providing MPHA a right of first refusal to purchase.

CSG recommends MPHA take the following steps:

▪ Confirm the condition of the apartments and funding needed.
▪ Review the transactional documents with legal counsel.
▪ Determine if reasonable terms can be negotiated with the Developer and LIHTC Investor.
▪ Convert the 200 (potentially more using transfer of assistance) existing public housing units to RAD.
▪ Refinance the existing debt, if feasible based on the condition of the units.

Considerations

▪ The funding needed to rehab the units at this site will compete with the capital needs at MPHA’s public housing sites.
▪ The vacant land at this site could represent future collaborative development opportunities with public and private investors.
To begin to address MPHA’s capital needs, multiple conversion and financing options must be pursued. CSG recommends that MPHA pursue the following at the end of 2017/early 2018 (each of the items listed below are discussed in greater detail in the following slides):

- Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program
- Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPVs)
- Minneapolis Tax Levy
- 4% LIHTC/Bonds (depending on outcome of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act)
- 9% LIHTC
- Minnesota Housing Programs
- City of Minneapolis Programs
- Federal Home Loan Bank- Affordable Housing Programs
- Private Foundation and Bank Funds

These programs and funds will need to be leveraged with a portion of MPHA’s capital funds, reinvestment of MPHA’s developer fee and MPHA reserves.
Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program

CSG recommends that MPHA place its sites on the RAD waiting list and begin submitting RAD applications, to lock in the 2016 RAD rents.

- It is expected, based on recent historical trends that the base RAD rent will decrease annually.
- MPHA can choose to return its Commitment to enter into a Housing Assistance Payment contract (CHAP) or delay the start of the process.
- Housing authorities with similar physical needs to MPHA ($97K average per unit), often conduct a portfolio strategy to determine a strategic approach in applying available financing and potential gap funding sources, to bring as much public and private external resources to their projects and align redevelopment efforts with their agency priorities.
- Based on the availability of key financing source (bonds/4% LIHTC), housing authorities move forward with one project at time to determine the site-specific sources and uses required for financing.
- At this time, HUD’s voucher programs are best suited to address the physical needs of housing authority assets and stabilize site operations because they: provide higher operating subsidy levels and a portion of those subsidies can be used to support debt to fund improvements.
Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program
Without converting the public housing units to RAD or TPVs, MPHA’s options are limited as further elaborated below:

- While MPHA’s public housing units receive capital funds and operating subsidies from HUD, subsidy levels are insufficient to address immediate needs of the properties and future repairs and rehab.
- Congress is not expected to appropriate higher levels of funding for public housing modernization in the future.
- At this time, housing authorities cannot leverage financing for rehabilitation of public housing units, except by borrowing against future capital funds (Capital Fund Financing Program) or using operating reserves (Operating Fund Financing Program).
- Placing either CFFP or OFFP on public housing units restricts MPHA’s ability convert to RAD and to leverage private financing in the future. CFFP and OFFP funds leveraged for specific sites must be paid back prior to or at conversion.
- To address the 20-year physical needs, which range from $48K to $127K per unit, the operating subsidy program needs to be sufficient to cover operating costs, mortgage payments (including lender-determined debt coverage requirements) and replacement reserves.
- MPHA public housing sites, with the exception of certain scattered sites, does not operate at break even and certainly does not have revenue to fund standard maintenance, capital repairs and reserves.
Tenant Protection Vouchers through Section 18 or Voluntary Conversion
CSG recommends that MPHA pursue the conversion of public housing units to vouchers through HUD’s Section 18 or voluntary conversion programs, providing greater financial feasibility than RAD.

- **Higher project revenue**: HUD funds TPVs at payment standard levels, while RAD is revenue neutral, HUD provides public housing operating subsidy/capital funds.
- **Greater flexibility in the rehab scope**: making a greater number of projects financially feasible.

**TPVs - Replacement Versus Relocation Vouchers**
HUD makes an important distinction between replacement and relocation vouchers (further described in PIH Notice 2015-03), which should be considered when structuring the specific program for each site.

- **Replacement vouchers** replace the public housing unit and remains in MPHA’s inventory.
- **Relocation vouchers** is assistance tied to the household occupying the unit at the time of disposition and sunsets if the household no longer receives subsidy.
Tenant Protection Vouchers through Section 18 or Voluntary Conversion

For Section 18 of the Housing Act of 1937 approval, HUD typically requires that units meet its obsolescence test. HUD generally considers modifications not to be cost-effective if costs exceed 62.5% of total development costs (TDC) for elevator structures and 57.14% of TDC for other types of structures.

CSG has provided MPHA with a calculator tool that provides a preliminary assessment of the obsolescence threshold for the Scattered Sites and the Highrise Buildings. The sites that either met the financial threshold for obsolescence based on Ameresco’s physical needs assessment or warrant further review include:

High Rise Buildings: Rainbow Terrace and Friendly Manor (1900 3rd St and 809 Spring St). Sites that should be examined more closely, since they appear close to the threshold include: Elliott Twins, Cedar High Apartments, Dickman Apartments, James Helzer Manor.

Scattered Sites: Ave S appears to meet the obsolescence threshold. Sites that should be examined more closely: Ave N, St., Ave S, Ave N, Ave S, Ave.

Glendale Townhomes: Based on Ameresco’s PNA, the immediate needs at Glendale do not appear to meet the obsolescence threshold. The 20-year needs appear to meet the threshold. This warrants further review.

Voluntary Conversion approval, HUD requires that MPHA meet all components of Section 18 and demonstrate that the units are non-viable by comparing costs operating the units as public housing versus tenant-based rental assistance.

CSG has provided financial models for MPHA’s sites using the Per Unit Cost and Housing Choice Voucher Administration Fee in the operating assumptions.
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Financing Recommendations

Tax Cuts and Jobs Act Anticipated Impact on Development Financing

Congress recently passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs bill. The House and Senate versions of the bill are currently being reconciled by the Committee on Ways and Means. The final bill is expected in the coming months.

The following items have been proposed in the bill, but are not yet in final form.

- **Lower the Top Corporate Tax Rate from 35% to 20%**, included in both House and Senate Bill. 
  **Potential Impact**: Decreases value of tax credit to investors, which will lower tax credit pricing and total LIHTC equity. CSG assumed tax credit pricing of $0.92 in the financial models to develop the portfolio strategy. This pricing may drop further as a result of the lower tax rate.

- **Eliminate the Tax Exemption on Private Activity Bonds (PABs)**, this was introduced in late 2018 and is only included in the House Bill.
  **Potential House Bill Impact**: 4% tax credits, are only available to projects financed with private activity bonds. Eliminating the tax exemption would make most 4% LIHTC transactions infeasible. The use of PABs/LIHTC is a key component of the portfolio strategy CSG developed for MPHA. If the tax exemption is eliminated, MPHA’s redevelopment efforts will be significantly hindered.

- **Retain the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)** no proposed modifications to the 9% tax credit. The 4% tax credit relies on PABs, which are described above.
Portfolio Strategy

Financing Recommendations

9% Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)

For 2017, the statewide distribution of approximately $12.97M in LIHTC includes: MHFA $9.6M, Minneapolis (as sub-allocator) $1.23M, with the balance of $2.14M going to four other sub-allocators.

- For projects located in Minneapolis: 1) the Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED), who administers the program, recommends awards to City Council; 2) City Council considers approval based on the recommendation; 3) The Minneapolis Housing Finance Board (MHFB) formally allocates the credits.
- The City awards approximately 2 to 3 projects annually; the maximum project allocation is $1.2M.

Private Activity Tax Exempt Bonds/4% LIHTC

Accessing Minneapolis Entitlement Housing Revenue Bond funds has recently become very competitive over $200M was requested in 2017, exceeding Minneapolis’ $36.7M - 2016 carryforward and $49.7M - 2017 funds.

- Minneapolis accepts pre-applications in October/November and applications in January of the following year.
- Projects must close in 180 days upon bond award.
- Minneapolis sets total development cost (TDC) containment thresholds each year. For 2018 rehab of units occupied by singles the threshold is $160K; a number of MPHA’s sites have higher TDCs based on Ameresco’s physical needs assessment, so MPHA’s design team will have to carefully develop the scope of work and look for opportunities to value engineer.
Tax Levy

Annual tax levy funds can be combined with other funding sources and contributed to privately owned tax credit partnerships.

- The difficulty arises if MPHA or the City issues tax-exempt governmental purpose bonds to borrow against future revenues.
- The proceeds of such tax-exempt governmental purpose bonds generally cannot be used for private purposes such as a tax credit partnership.
- CSG recommends discussing possible approaches with bond counsel to determine the optimal use of these funds. Options may include:
  a) contributing annual tax levy revenues (unleveraged) to LIHTC developments
  b) contributing proceeds from a taxable bond to LIHTC developments
  c) contributing proceeds from tax-exempt governmental purpose bonds to non-LIHTC developments.

- In addition to financial considerations, MPHA should strategically determine to which projects the tax levy should be applied, since it will be funded by taxpayers. There may be certain site locations that should be prioritized to generate community support and advocacy for the levy and future affordable housing tax levies.
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Financing Recommendations

Tax Levy
Once the availability of funds from the tax levy are available and the program requirements are in place, MPHA should assess the following to determine which sites to apply these funds:

- Consider projects with low equity to hard cost ratio (CSG Rankings), since these projects are not benefiting as much from the leveraging of tax credits.
- Use Moving To Work (MTW) flexibility to enhance rents to the full payment standard to increase the amount of debt and decrease the amount of funds needed from the tax levy in order to fund more units.
- Both low revenue (rent) and low expenses makes these projects highly sensitive to changes in rent and therefore able to leverage more supportable debt.
Please note the high rise bond allocation needed shown in the schedule above is based on CSG’s baseline financial model.
# High Rise Acq/Rehab Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project (Apartments)</th>
<th>Bonds (% Mpls allocation)</th>
<th>Net Gap (after 50% Dev Fee Inv)</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Dev fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Pentagon AMP 7 (129)</td>
<td>$7.3M (15%)</td>
<td>$6M</td>
<td>$3.7M</td>
<td>$599K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Hiawatha I AMP 5 (140)</td>
<td>$12.4M (25%)</td>
<td>$11M</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Hiawatha II AMP 5 (141)</td>
<td>$12.4M (25%)</td>
<td>$11.1M</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Feeney AMP 3 (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11M</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin AMP 5 (110)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11M</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Third Ave. (199)</td>
<td>$14.1M (28%)</td>
<td>$12M</td>
<td>$8.9M</td>
<td>$1.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>667 units</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58.6 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.1M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: The numbers shown in the financial summary above are based on CSG’s baseline financial model. Minneapolis is expected to make available $49.7K in volume bond cap annually for affordable housing projects.
Financing

Key Financing Sources
MPHA Property Types/Number of Apartments

Glendale Townhomes (184)  Scattered Sites (746)  High Rise Buildings (5,006)

A
Mixed-Finance
Demolition-Disposition
Co-Developed
New Construction
Mixed-Income

Demolition-Disposition 9% LIHTC
Conventional Financing
Gap Financing

B
RAD Conversion
Self-Developed Rehab

Expense Reduction Strategy
Local Revolving Loan Fund
MPHA Reserve Account

C
RAD Conversion
Self-Developed Acquisition/Rehab

Expense Reduction Strategy
Tax Levy
or
4% LIHTC/Bonds
Gap Financing
Financing
Possible Financing Sources

MPHA Annual Capital Funds Allocation
Amount: 60% for development activities (relocation, demo, construction/rehab)
Model assumes capital funds decline over time.
Total estimated value: $80M

Minnesota Housing Finance Agency Publicly Owned Housing Program (PHOP)
Amount: MPHA received $1.2M in 2015. Sites must remain publicly owned.
Model assumes $500K every other year.
Total estimated value: $6M

Minneapolis Affordable Housing Trust Fund (CDBG, HOME and City funds)
Amount: $25K per unit; City of Minneapolis issues the unified RFP annually, typically in July.
Model assumes $1.2M every other year.
Total estimated value: $13M

Federal Home Loan Bank - Affordable Housing Program (FHLB-AHP)
Amount: $500K
Model assumes $500K per project every other year.
Total estimated value: $5M
Financing

Possible Financing Sources

**Minneapolis Housing Tax Levy (Minnesota Statute)**
Amount: Up to $8M a year for public housing needs. Minneapolis City Council must approve any such levy. The City has not agreed to approve a levy since 2009.
*Total: $4M raise over 20 years, or $51M total.*

**MPHA’s Developer Fee Reinvestment**
Model assumes the cash developer fee from previous projects to be reinvested into new projects.
*Total estimated value: $30M*

**MPHA Reserves**
MPHA has about $23M in unrestricted reserves from public housing and central office program funds. Total unrestricted net assets in 2016 are approximately $23M- $27M.
*Model assumes only $15M is needed over the next 20 years.*
Glendale Townhomes

Background Information

AMP 1 includes 184 units (28 townhomes) constructed in 1952; the onsite community building was built in 1995.

- Existing units: 26 one-bedroom, 70 two-bedroom, 70 three bedroom, 18 four-bedroom.
- 12.5 acre site in the Prospect Park neighborhood southeast of Minneapolis.
- Capital needs identified total $15.5M in 2017 and $18.2M over 10 years, $23.3M over 20 years. None of the units meet ADA requirements.
- The development has a mix of families and seniors; approximately 29% of the existing population is over the age of 50.
- MPHA had a Phase I and II conducted in December 2014; it is likely there will be additional costs due to soil conditions and building materials.
- MPHA expects significant costs related to the underground infrastructure of the site due to the age of the utilities and issues that have arisen in the last decade.
The 20-year capital needs, estimated for Glendale Townhomes (AMP 1), include $28M ($84K per unit). This represents $15.5M in existing need, an additional $4M in 2018-2027 and an additional $8M in 2028-2037.

- The 2017 HUD total development cost (TDC) limit $50.8M for the 184 existing units.
- To qualify for obsolescence costs of rehab must exceed 57.14% of HUD TDC.
- Based on immediate needs, Glendale does not meet the HUD obsolescence threshold. The 20-year needs do meet HUD the threshold, so further review is warranted.
- Due to the extent of the rehab needed, the condition of the infrastructure and the potential of the site to include more affordable apartments, demolition and new construction is recommended.
Glendale Townhomes

Recommendations

Glendale Townhomes presents opportunities to redefine MPHA’s role in the affordable housing industry, diversify MPHA’s portfolio and collaborate with the community.

- Transform the Glendale Townhomes site as a mixed-income/mixed-use development that provides potentially a greater number of affordable apartments for both low-income and workforce housing.
- Connect the site to the neighborhood assets and partner with anchor institutions (University, Hospitals) to offer access to jobs and services.
- Explore avenues to include a “build-first model” and a community benefit agreement with the existing residents.
- Further review HUD’s Section 18 and RAD programs to determine feasibility for development.
Glendale Townhomes

**Redevelopment Strategy**

- Demolition and new construction
- Replace 184 units with approximately 350 apartments.
- Approximately 67% affordable with 33% market rate.

**Financial Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phases of 9% Equity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 9% Allocation</td>
<td>$1.25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases of 4% Equity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure per Unit</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Fee</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Debt Interest Rate</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Debt Term</td>
<td>30 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Price</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$7,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glendale Scenario Comparison
### Minneapolis Public Housing Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Financial Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>53% RAD, 47% LIHTC</strong></td>
<td><strong>53% TPV, 47% LIHTC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Market Rate, TPV, LIHTC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phases of 9% Equity</strong> 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Per Unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Per Unit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max 9% Allocation</strong> $1.25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD Units</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Only</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phases of 4% Equity</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Infrastructure per Unit</strong> $50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land and Building Acquisition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>3,804.35</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>3,804.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Costs</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>3,804.35</td>
<td>17,500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>17,500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Costs</td>
<td>69,825,000</td>
<td>199,500</td>
<td>8,802,500</td>
<td>25,150</td>
<td>8,802,500</td>
<td>25,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,720,650</td>
<td>13,488</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>3,057,637</td>
<td>8,736</td>
<td>148,644</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>245,505</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,097,164</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>1,100,080</td>
<td>3,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>7,215,128</td>
<td>20,615</td>
<td>2,388,713</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>2,721,938</td>
<td>7,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Soft Costs</td>
<td>2,886,447</td>
<td>28,184</td>
<td>24,462,737</td>
<td>69,894</td>
<td>15,211,877</td>
<td>43,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Fee</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>1,785,032</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>1,787,034</td>
<td>5,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>116,355,436</td>
<td>332,444</td>
<td>56,869,313</td>
<td>162,484</td>
<td>56,869,313</td>
<td>162,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,355,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>332,444</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,796,790</strong></td>
<td><strong>333,705</strong></td>
<td><strong>117,949,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>337,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Permanent Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Perm. Debt Interest Rate</strong> 5.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Equity (9%)</td>
<td>56,869,313</td>
<td>162,484</td>
<td>7,578,658</td>
<td>21,653</td>
<td>41,904,191</td>
<td>119,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Equity (4%)</td>
<td>21,873,908</td>
<td>62,497</td>
<td>19,550,468</td>
<td>55,858</td>
<td>23,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Debt</td>
<td>9,864,447</td>
<td>28,184</td>
<td>15,211,877</td>
<td>43,463</td>
<td>8,303,568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPHA Capital Fund (Funding Gap)</td>
<td>24,462,737</td>
<td>69,894</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPHA Seller Note</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,787,034</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>1,794,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>1,787,034</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>1,794,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>1,785,032</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>1,787,034</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>1,794,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,355,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>332,444</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,796,790</strong></td>
<td><strong>333,705</strong></td>
<td><strong>117,949,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>337,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Per Unit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vacancy Rate</strong> 5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Need</td>
<td>24,462,737</td>
<td>69,894</td>
<td>15,211,877</td>
<td>43,463</td>
<td>8,303,568</td>
<td>23,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Cash Developer Fee</td>
<td>3,570,064</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>3,574,069</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>3,588,293</td>
<td>10,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>-2,449,951</td>
<td>-7,000</td>
<td>-2,162,875</td>
<td>-6,180</td>
<td>-4,917,058</td>
<td>-14,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Funding Gap</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,582,849</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,623,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,974,803</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,928</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Funding Gap / Hard Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>Net Funding Gap</strong></th>
<th><strong>3.7%</strong></th>
<th><strong>2.0%</strong></th>
<th><strong>0.10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt to Equity</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (Year 1)</th>
<th>(3,637,017)</th>
<th>10,391</th>
<th>4,279,420</th>
<th>12,227</th>
<th>6,048,185</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Expenses (Year 1)</td>
<td>(2,574,966)</td>
<td>(7,357)</td>
<td>(2,574,966)</td>
<td>(7,357)</td>
<td>(2,574,966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Reserves</td>
<td>(157,500)</td>
<td>(450)</td>
<td>(157,500)</td>
<td>(450)</td>
<td>(157,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Debt Service Payment</td>
<td>(678,727)</td>
<td>(1,939)</td>
<td>(1,345,178)</td>
<td>(3,843)</td>
<td>(2,883,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less GP Management Fee</td>
<td>(10,300)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(10,300)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(10,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less LP AM Fee</td>
<td>(10,300)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(10,300)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(10,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>205,224</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>181,177</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>411,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Challenges

Funding source: 9% LIHTC

- Minnesota’s annual allocation of 9% tax credits is both limited and highly competitive.
- MPHA must apply to the Minneapolis Housing Finance Board (MHFB), as sub-allocator, in Round 1.
- In 2017, MHFB had $1.23M to allocate.
- The maximum allocation per project is $1.2M.
- Obtaining HUD approval for Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPVs).

Opportunities

Overall

- Increasing the number of apartments provides greater financial feasibility and allows MPHA to develop additional affordable apartments.
- Diversifies MPHA’s portfolio in order to create new streams of revenue allowing MPHA to preserve more affordable units, which counteracts decreasing federal funding.
- Increase resident amenities.

A

Mixed-Finance
Demolition-Disposition
New Construction
Mixed-Income

Glendale Townhomes
Scattered Sites
This section in CSG’s analysis includes MPHA’s Scattered Site public housing units, AMP 2, totaling approximately 746 units and assumes the following:

- Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) conversion
- Establishing a rehab construction line of credit

Rehab construction line of credit potential approaches:

1. **MPHA Reserves.** MPHA has approximately $23M in unrestricted reserves from public housing and central office program funds.

2. **Minnesota Local Banks and Foundations Affordable Housing Pool.** Minnesota Impact Investment for Affordable Housing fund and Greater Minnesota Housing Fund could be potential source or serve as program models.

3. **Combination of MPHA Reserves and Affordable Housing Pool**
Scattered Sites

Recommendations

Scattered Sites

- Convert units from public housing to vouchers through HUD programs: Section 18 Disposition, Voluntary Conversion and/or RAD.
- Establish a local revolving loan fund for capital improvements.
- Use MPHA reserve funds and raise local foundations and bank funds by marketing the unique characteristics of the scattered sites (stabilizing integrated workforce housing in opportunity areas).
- Streamline operating expenses, to increase the Net Operating Income (NOI), will allow MPHA to access conventional financing.
- Incorporate green construction into rehab scope of work to reduce energy usage that will result in significant long-term savings and garner support from the City toward their Climate Action Plan.
Introduction

- The 20-year capital needs identified for the 746 scattered site units is $79.4M, approximately $106K per unit. A 10-year program to address capital needs will require relocation and rehab on approximately 75 units per year.
- Rehabbing the scattered sites is more inefficient financially and geographically, since the units are spread out across the City.
- If MPHA determined they wanted to use their reserve funding, the timing of converting to RAD and designating the reserve funds will be critical to avoid HUD recapture.
- To establish an Affordable Housing Pool program, significant coordination by MPHA will be required and a community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) will need to be appointed to manage the funds.
Scattered Sites

Operations - Expenses

The Scattered Sites had the highest per unit cost at $9,092, with high personnel and maintenance costs, compared to Glendale Townhomes and the High Rise properties. Generally the Scattered Site units are larger, but some of the maintenance items are handled by the tenants, as required in the terms of their lease.

Based on CSG’s operational analysis, CSG found the following:

- Most properties are staffed at similar levels based on units and proportion of maintenance and administrative staff, with the exception of AMP 2.
- MPHA properties average 35 units per staff member, while AMP 2 has 25 units per staff member. On average, 68% of staff located at the property focus on maintenance, while AMP 2 staff has 71% maintenance.
- The optimal location of staff can help reduce travel costs, reduce wait times for residents to have maintenance requests addressed, and increase the amount of time spent on preventive maintenance. This is especially pronounced for engineers who handle more complex maintenance and whose time is in demand.

Please reference the CSG Consolidated Operational Analysis dated October 11, 2017 for additional information.
Scattered Sites

Operations - Revenue

- Tenant Rent has grown historically approximately 3% year over year.
- The Scattered Sites have the highest coefficient because of the larger bedroom sizes.
- The Scattered Sites have the highest incomes, highest rent and also highest subsidy.
- MPHA has lost $7.48 million in subsidy due to proration since 2014.
- Other key drivers for revenue are occupancy and vacancy.

Please reference the CSG Consolidated Operational Analysis dated October 11, 2017 for additional information.
Scattered Sites

Items for Consideration

- Research existing revolving loan funds, program guidelines, and other materials.
- Discuss design of program with local foundations and lenders.
- Set the eligibility requirements.
- Determine allowed/prohibited uses of funds.
- Set a minimum and maximum amount for the loans.
- Determine the length of the loan term, which may vary based on the use of the loan. For example, the term for a loan to purchase equipment may be based on the life of the product while a loan for real estate may have a 15-year term.
- Decide if the interest rate will be variable or fixed and whether the rate will vary based on the project.
- Develop loan checklist/budget materials.
- Determine the administrative duties and staffing needs associated with the program.
- Provide program framework to potential funders.
Impact Investment Collaborative for Affordable Housing

- $17.1M committed to the impact investing collaborative, and the commitment is expected to exceed $20M. It is invested in a fixed income bond fund focused on affordable housing and small business lending throughout Minnesota.
- Leading the way for others to invest are the three lead anchor investors: The McKnight Foundation, the Bush Foundation and Otto Bremer Trust.

Greater Minnesota Housing Fund - NOAH Impact Fund

- The NOAH Impact Fund investors include Bremer Bank, Sunrise Bank, Western Bank, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Hennepin County, the McKnight Foundation and Otto Bremer Trust.
- Freddie Mac is providing up to $100M in debt that can be used for first mortgages, complementing the equity financing being made available via the NOAH Impact Fund.
- Hennepin County contributed $3M.
Opportunities

Set up Affordable Housing Pool
- Market to Local Foundations and Banks.
- Establish a revolving line of credit with a low-interest rate for repairs.
- Promote upward mobility of scattered site residents (working residents and sites located in opportunity areas).
- Further establish partnerships with organizations that focus on resident self sufficiency.

Additional Funding to Address Capital Needs
- Streamlining operating expenses, increases Net Operating Income (NOI), will allow MPHA to access conventional financing.
- Reducing energy usage will result in significant long-term savings and garner support from the City toward their Climate Action Plan.

RAD Conversion
- Converting the units from the public housing platform to RAD, removes HUD restrictions and allows access to private capital.
- Long-term affordability, stable subsidy and site specific reserves.

Reserves
- MPHA has over $23M to use as seed capital.
Challenges

High Capital Needs
- 20-year capital needs of roughly $79.4M ($106K per unit).
- 10-year program to address these needs would require relocation/rehab of about 75 units/year.

Geography
- Units are spread out across the City, non-contiguous.

Reserve Obligation
- Obligating the reserve funds will be critical to avoid HUD recapture.
- Timing of converting to RAD and starting repair program to fully obligate funds.

Programmatic Implementation
- Significant coordination by MPHA will be required to establish and manage an Affordable Housing Pool.
- Set up of a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI).
High Rise Sites
This section of CSG’s portfolio analysis includes MPHA’s high rise public housing units, AMPs 3 through 7, totaling approximately 5,006 units and assumes the following:

- Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) conversion of all units.
- Leveraging acquisition/rehabilitation with bonds/4% LIHTC.

CSG developed the following scenarios for AMPs 3 through 7:

- **Baseline**: MPHA’s portfolio as-is, including 100% of 20-year PNA and 100% operating expenses (requires approximately $400M in volume cap).

- **CSG Recommended**: 75% of 20-year PNA and 85% of operating expenses (requires approximately $340M in volume cap).

- **CSG Recommended/Green Construction**: 85% of 20-year PNA and 80% of operating expenses (requires approximately $370M in volume cap).
Introduction

Background

- MPHA’s focus on core services can help reduce expenses and increase supportable debt for future rehabilitation and portfolio transition.

- Removing Protective Services and Tenant Services costs can help increase supportable debt, with AMPs 3, 6, and 7 standing to benefit the most.

- When removing these costs, it is expected, they will be funded through additional funds or partnering organizations that can support MPHA’s core mission of providing high quality housing for residents.

- Protective Services and Tenant Services are services that are valued by residents, administrators, and housing advocates. Therefore any change in funding or service will have to be done carefully and with transparency to maintain the current service level and to gain trust with residents and housing advocates.

Please reference the CSG Consolidated Operational Analysis dated October 11, 2017 for additional information.
High Rise Sites

Recommendations

- Convert units from public housing to vouchers through HUD programs: Section 18 Disposition, Voluntary Conversion and/or RAD.
- Confirm MPHA’s desired approach and program for the first group of sites.
- Request that the City of Minneapolis set aside volume bond cap for senior public housing preservation projects.
- Determine timing for projects to competitively pursue additional financing sources to stabilize housing for the vulnerable aging population.
- Streamline operating expenses, increases Net Operating Income (NOI), allowing MPHA to access conventional financing.
- Reduce energy usage that will result in significant long-term savings and garner support from the City toward their Climate Action Plan.
Financial Assumptions

Scenarios

- **Baseline**: 100% of 20 Year PNA & 100% Operating Expense.

- **CSG Recommended**: 75% of 20 Year PNA & 85% of Operating Expense also incorporates TPV for projects that qualify for HUD Obsolescence.

- **CSG Recommended & Deep Green**: 85% of 20 Year PNA & 80% of Operating Expense also incorporates TPV for projects that qualify for HUD Obsolescence.

Methodology

- **Hard Cost** includes 14% for General Conditions, Overhead and Profit.

- **Construction Contingency** is estimated at 15%.

- **Demolition Costs** if necessary, are handled outside of the development budget.

- **Relocation** is estimated at $2,000 per unit.

- **Building Acquisition** is estimated at the greater of $20K per unit or net operating income (NOI) capitalized at 7% to generate LIHTC equity.

- **Soft costs** are based on estimates from other similar transactions.
Financial Assumptions

Income and Operating Expenses

- **RAD Rents** were inflated to 2017 levels and range from $517 for a one-bedroom to $1,802 for a four-bedroom unit.
- **Total Operating Expenses** at 100% is approximately $6,632 per month, which includes $400 per unit per year for replacement reserve deposit.
- **Reserves** include 8 months of operating expenses, replacement reserves and debt service.

Financing

- **Tax Credit Pricing** estimated at $0.92
- Assumes self-development and 50% of MPHA’s developer fee is deferred to reduce funding gap.

Debt

- **Construction Period** rate 4.5% over 30-months.
- **Permanent Period** includes 5.5% rate over 30-year amortization and 15-year term. The debt coverage ratio is 1.15x Yr 1 and 1.10x in Yr 15.
Approach Considerations

Prioritizing Sites with Lowest Needs
- Allows MPHA to stabilize a greater number of high rise units in its 10-year implementation period.
- Scope of rehab work would likely be very similar to MPHA’s current modernization projects, allowing MPHA to ramp up capacity.
- Generates greater developer fee and is more equity efficient due to the efficiencies of doing more units per year.
- Requires less private activity tax-exempt bond volume cap so MPHA can gradually enter the Affordable Housing Developer pool.

Prioritizing Sites with Highest Needs
- Stabilizes sites that have the greatest needs.

Alternating Lowest and Highest Need Sites
- Allows MPHA to evaluate the financial factors for each project to program funding based on the availability of key financing sources: private activity tax-exempt bond volume cap and MPHA gap funding, as well as additional financing sources: private and public federal, state, and local).
- Allows MPHA to use site rankings in the context of other factors, including redeveloping sites where public and private investments are being made or planned for in the future.
## Portfolio Rankings

**Baseline (as-is) Lowest Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Development Costs</th>
<th>Total Gap</th>
<th>Per Unit Net Gap (after 50% Dev Fee investment)</th>
<th>LIHTC Equity as % of Hard Cost</th>
<th>Amount of Cash Flow over 15-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Pentagon</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$110,704</td>
<td>$50,870</td>
<td>$46,229</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$8,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thomas T Feeney Manor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$111,924</td>
<td>$51,957</td>
<td>$47,281</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$8,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Third Avenue Towers</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>$137,834</td>
<td>$67,042</td>
<td>$60,964</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-$11,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Riverside</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>$139,310</td>
<td>$61,084</td>
<td>$54,911</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$8,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hamilton Manor</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$141,206</td>
<td>$69,152</td>
<td>$62,908</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-$24,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parker Skyview</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$142,819</td>
<td>$79,294</td>
<td>$72,926</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-$1,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lowry Towers</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>$149,536</td>
<td>$74,146</td>
<td>$67,455</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-$16,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring Manor</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$154,280</td>
<td>$82,457</td>
<td>$75,487</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$7,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. Anthony Highrise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$156,370</td>
<td>$80,557</td>
<td>$73,509</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$4,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Atrium /Archie Givens</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>$158,529</td>
<td>$90,182</td>
<td>$83,010</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-$8,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lyndale Manor</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>$163,381</td>
<td>$93,489</td>
<td>$86,056</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-$9,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (1206 2nd St.)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$163,978</td>
<td>$88,426</td>
<td>$80,958</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$7,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue Highrise</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>$165,660</td>
<td>$83,658</td>
<td>$76,089</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-$1,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heritage Commons</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$166,314</td>
<td>$95,548</td>
<td>$87,958</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-$8,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Holland Highrise</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$167,099</td>
<td>$79,739</td>
<td>$72,081</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$7,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar High 630 Cedar Ave S</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$167,990</td>
<td>$77,871</td>
<td>$70,166</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$7,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charles Horn Towers</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>$169,684</td>
<td>$79,171</td>
<td>$71,371</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$8,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Portfolio Rankings

Baseline (as-is) Highest Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Development Costs</th>
<th>Total Gap</th>
<th>Per Unit Net Gap (after 50% Dev Fee investment)</th>
<th>LIHTC Equity as % of Hard Cost</th>
<th>Amount of Cash Flow over 15-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hiawatha Towers Apartments</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>$170,854</td>
<td>$86,758</td>
<td>$78,911</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Franklin Towers</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$171,192</td>
<td>$87,063</td>
<td>$79,198</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-$1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park Center</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$182,134</td>
<td>$105,966</td>
<td>$97,486</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$5,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar High Apartments</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>$182,311</td>
<td>$86,316</td>
<td>$77,844</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$7,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oliver Manor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$185,259</td>
<td>$96,041</td>
<td>$87,437</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-$8,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>James R. Heltzer Manor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$188,793</td>
<td>$90,670</td>
<td>$81,846</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$8,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Signe Burckhardt</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$190,001</td>
<td>$98,605</td>
<td>$89,372</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-$2,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elliot Twins Apartments</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$191,253</td>
<td>$112,158</td>
<td>$103,189</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lynway Manor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$194,676</td>
<td>$114,873</td>
<td>$105,764</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-$10,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37th Street Manor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$200,465</td>
<td>$114,082</td>
<td>$104,628</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$6,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Art Love Manor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$202,225</td>
<td>$105,848</td>
<td>$96,335</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-$8,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Snelling Manor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$203,938</td>
<td>$115,088</td>
<td>$105,452</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$7,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sibley Triangle Apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$214,710</td>
<td>$121,622</td>
<td>$111,420</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$4,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dickman Park Apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$228,388</td>
<td>$130,882</td>
<td>$119,947</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$4,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (1900 3rd St.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$234,301</td>
<td>$137,355</td>
<td>$126,097</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rainbow Terrace</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$235,871</td>
<td>$125,912</td>
<td>$114,597</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-$14,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (809 Spring St.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$250,894</td>
<td>$148,622</td>
<td>$136,475</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$3,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Portfolio Rankings

**CSG Rec (Op Ex/Cap reduction) Lowest Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Development Costs</th>
<th>Total Gap (after 50% Dev Fee investment)</th>
<th>Per Unit Net Gap as % of Hard Cost</th>
<th>LIHTC Equity</th>
<th>Amount of Cash Flow over 15-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thomas T Feeney Manor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$91,927</td>
<td>$36,419</td>
<td>$32,786</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$11,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Pentagon</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$102,032</td>
<td>$18,280</td>
<td>$14,673</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$23,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Third Avenue Towers</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>$110,017</td>
<td>$50,143</td>
<td>$45,191</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$7,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hamilton Manor</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$112,576</td>
<td>$51,755</td>
<td>$47,007</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-4,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parker Skyview</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$115,110</td>
<td>$51,587</td>
<td>$46,740</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$6,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lowry Towers</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>$118,803</td>
<td>$55,489</td>
<td>$50,407</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$2,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Riverside</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>$123,396</td>
<td>$25,774</td>
<td>$21,022</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$23,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Atrium /Archie Givens</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>$125,809</td>
<td>$64,164</td>
<td>$58,716</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$11,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lyndale Manor</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>$129,387</td>
<td>$68,250</td>
<td>$62,606</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$9,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue Highrise</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>$131,835</td>
<td>$53,113</td>
<td>$47,732</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$17,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heritage Commons</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$132,049</td>
<td>$68,776</td>
<td>$62,993</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$11,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hiawatha Towers Apartments</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>$135,911</td>
<td>$55,619</td>
<td>$49,660</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$17,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Franklin Towers</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$136,613</td>
<td>$56,076</td>
<td>$50,084</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$17,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring Manor</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$139,236</td>
<td>$40,726</td>
<td>$35,361</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$5,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar High 630 Cedar Ave S</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$141,008</td>
<td>$38,454</td>
<td>$32,586</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$5,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park Center</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$144,398</td>
<td>$64,818</td>
<td>$58,392</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$5,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. Anthony Highrise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$185,230</td>
<td>$1,583</td>
<td>-4,047</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$11,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Portfolio Rankings

**CSG Rec (Op Ex/Cap reduction) Highest Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Development Costs</th>
<th>Total Gap</th>
<th>Per Unit Net Gap (after 50% Dev Fee investment)</th>
<th>LIHTC Equity as % of Hard Cost</th>
<th>Amount of Cash Flow over 15-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charles Horn Towers</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>$145,896</td>
<td>$39,226</td>
<td>$23,931</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$23,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (1206 2nd St.)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$147,085</td>
<td>$45,337</td>
<td>$5,731</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$5,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oliver Manor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$147,150</td>
<td>$69,687</td>
<td>$11,173</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$11,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Holland Highrise</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$148,944</td>
<td>$38,495</td>
<td>$5,747</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$5,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Signe Burckhardt</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$149,964</td>
<td>$66,198</td>
<td>$15,602</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$15,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elliot Twins Apartments</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$150,550</td>
<td>$72,748</td>
<td>$18,179</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$18,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar High Apartments</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>$152,118</td>
<td>$44,949</td>
<td>$5,494</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$5,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lynway Manor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$153,571</td>
<td>$85,292</td>
<td>$9,316</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$9,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Art Love Manor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$159,336</td>
<td>$76,637</td>
<td>$11,173</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$11,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>James R. Heltzer Manor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$160,609</td>
<td>$48,063</td>
<td>$24,030</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$24,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37th Street Manor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$168,503</td>
<td>$67,503</td>
<td>$21,982</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$21,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Snelling Manor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$172,772</td>
<td>$67,270</td>
<td>$23,729</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$23,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sibley Triangle Apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$185,240</td>
<td>$70,182</td>
<td>$3,055</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$3,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dickman Park Apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$195,710</td>
<td>$77,291</td>
<td>$3,055</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$3,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rainbow Terrace</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$211,106</td>
<td>$55,010</td>
<td>$44,103</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$44,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (1900 3rd St.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$243,608</td>
<td>$42,969</td>
<td>$25,850</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$25,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (809 Spring St.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$255,841</td>
<td>$51,234</td>
<td>$25,850</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$25,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Portfolio Rankings

**Green/CSG Rec (Op Ex/Cap red) Lowest Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Development Costs</th>
<th>Total Gap</th>
<th>Net Gap (after 50% of Dev Fee investment)</th>
<th>LIHTC Equity as % of Hard Cost</th>
<th>Amount of Cash Flow over 15-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thomas T Feeney Manor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$99,851</td>
<td>$15,426</td>
<td>$11,371</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$14,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Pentagon</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$112,379</td>
<td>$8,392</td>
<td>$4,345</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$26,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Third Avenue Towers</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>$120,936</td>
<td>$21,866</td>
<td>$16,660</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$9,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hamilton Manor</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$123,650</td>
<td>$22,837</td>
<td>$17,490</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parker Skyview</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$129,097</td>
<td>$23,607</td>
<td>$18,135</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$6,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lowry Towers</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>$130,751</td>
<td>$25,345</td>
<td>$19,618</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$6,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Riverside</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>$136,630</td>
<td>$15,725</td>
<td>$10,373</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$1,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Atrium /Archie Givens</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>$138,809</td>
<td>$30,074</td>
<td>$23,932</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$14,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lyndale Manor</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>$142,911</td>
<td>$31,406</td>
<td>$25,040</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$12,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heritage Commons</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$145,729</td>
<td>$33,015</td>
<td>$26,502</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$14,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue Highrise</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>$147,885</td>
<td>$28,898</td>
<td>$22,417</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$19,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hiawatha Towers Apartments</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>$152,548</td>
<td>$30,338</td>
<td>$23,607</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$19,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Franklin Towers</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$153,092</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>$23,640</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$19,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spring Manor</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$154,404</td>
<td>$19,472</td>
<td>$13,425</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$5,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. Anthony Highrise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$156,620</td>
<td>$20,685</td>
<td>$14,553</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$2,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar High 630 Cedar Ave S</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$157,190</td>
<td>$25,762</td>
<td>$19,137</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$5,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park Center</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$161,917</td>
<td>$36,211</td>
<td>$28,956</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$5,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Portfolio Rankings

Green/CSG Rec (Op Ex/Cap red) Highest Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Development Costs</th>
<th>Total Gap</th>
<th>Per Unit Net Gap (after 50% of Dev Fee investment)</th>
<th>LIHTC Equity as % of Hard Cost</th>
<th>Amount of Cash Flow over 15-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charles Horn Towers</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>$162,303</td>
<td>$24,906</td>
<td>$18,178</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$26,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oliver Manor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$162,848</td>
<td>$36,857</td>
<td>$29,427</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$14,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (1206 2nd St.)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$163,093</td>
<td>$22,044</td>
<td>$15,554</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$5,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Holland Highrise</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$165,331</td>
<td>$21,469</td>
<td>$14,836</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$5,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elliot Twins Apartments</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$166,969</td>
<td>$40,440</td>
<td>$32,777</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$21,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Signe Burckhardt</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$167,372</td>
<td>$37,502</td>
<td>$29,910</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$18,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar High Apartments</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>$169,683</td>
<td>$30,428</td>
<td>$23,139</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$5,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lynway Manor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$170,123</td>
<td>$42,311</td>
<td>$34,486</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$12,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Art Love Manor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$176,576</td>
<td>$41,762</td>
<td>$33,596</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$14,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>James R. Heltzer Manor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$178,719</td>
<td>$30,921</td>
<td>$23,320</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$26,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37th Street Manor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$187,825</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
<td>$30,315</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$24,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Snelling Manor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$192,332</td>
<td>$37,462</td>
<td>$29,120</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$26,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rainbow Terrace</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$204,475</td>
<td>$51,143</td>
<td>$41,373</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$7,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sibley Triangle Apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$205,876</td>
<td>$39,259</td>
<td>$30,450</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$2,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dickman Park Apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$217,629</td>
<td>$44,040</td>
<td>$34,601</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$2,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (1900 3rd St.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$222,673</td>
<td>$44,466</td>
<td>$34,750</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$-14,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friendly Manor (809 Spring St.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$236,850</td>
<td>$50,877</td>
<td>$40,402</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$-14,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSG’s Analysis for MPHA’s 5,006 High Rise, included in AMPs 3-7:
- Baseline (no changes) represents an estimated funding gap of $430M.
- Potential Cost Savings (15% reduction in OpEx and 25% reduction Cap needs) represents an estimated funding gap of $256M, the reduction in gap is $174M.
Uses and Sources Comparison

**Baseline**

- **Uses**
  - Acquisition $100
  - Hard Costs Plus Contingency $534
  - Financing $45
  - Other Soft Costs $45
  - Reserves $21

- **Sources**
  - LIHTC Equity $251
  - Supportable Debt $13
  - Deferred Fee $38
  - Seller Note $100
  - Funding Gap $430

**CSG Recommended**

- **Uses**
  - Acquisition $130
  - Hard Costs Plus Contingency $401
  - Financing $38
  - Other Soft Costs $35
  - Reserves $21

- **Sources**
  - LIHTC Equity $205
  - Supportable Debt $73
  - Deferred Fee $29
  - Seller Note $130
  - Funding Gap $256
CSG Baseline Scenario

- **Sources**
- **Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>High Rise</th>
<th>1,344</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 4</td>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 5</td>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 6</td>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 7</td>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$106</td>
<td>$106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Hard Costs Plus Contingency**
- **Permanent Financing**
- **Funding Gap**
- **Other Uses**
- **Other Sources**
CSG Recommended Scenario

- **AMP 3**
  - High Rise
  - Source: $87 Million
  - Use: $105 Million

- **AMP 4**
  - High Rise
  - Source: $43 Million
  - Use: $20 Million

- **AMP 5**
  - High Rise
  - Source: $48 Million
  - Use: $7 Million

- **AMP 6**
  - High Rise
  - Source: $47 Million
  - Use: $18 Million

- **AMP 7**
  - High Rise
  - Source: $35 Million
  - Use: $22 Million

**Total Sources**: $270 Million
**Total Uses**: $314 Million

**Funding Gap**: $44 Million
Access to Additional Funding to Address Capital Needs

- Streamlining operating expenses, increases Net Operating Income (NOI), allowing MPHA to access conventional financing.
- Reducing energy usage will result in significant long-term savings and garner support from the City toward their Climate Action Plan.

RAD Conversion

- Converting the units from the public housing platform to RAD, removes HUD restrictions and allows access to private capital.
- Long-term affordability, stable subsidy and site specific reserves.

Project Prioritization

- CSG has worked with MPHA to develop criteria for prioritizing the High Rise sites.
- Key Performance Indicators, developed with Ameresco, will further assist MPHA in making strategic decisions about its developments.

Economic Stimulus

- MPHA’s construction activity will create jobs and stimulate economic impact in the surrounding area, providing both a direct and indirect impact to the local economy.
Challenges

Changing MPHA’s Role

- Revise charter to allow MPHA to own, develop and manage non-public housing apartments.
- Preserve affordable apartments by accessing essential financing tools, which require MPHA to own, develop and manage various types of apartments.
- Garner buy-in from local community and residents as MPHA defines its new role.

Funding source: State Volume Cap/Tax Levy Bonds

- In 2017, MHFA’s Housing Pool included $182.6M and the City Entitlement Allocation was $49.6M.
- Minnesota’s annual allocation of bond cap is both limited and highly competitive.
- The City would need to pass a tax levy for MPHA to access City general obligation bonds outside of the State Volume Cap.

Limited Gap Funding Sources

- Utilizing core financing tools, MPHA’s rehab projects reflect a $240M gap.
- Projects will need to be strategically phased, based on access to key funding sources and MPHA staff capacity.
Background
The following sections provide background and reference information for the Portfolio Strategy.

The Background sections include:
- MPHA’s Portfolio
- Capital Needs
- Economic Impact of Redevelopment Activities
- Reducing Expenses and Increasing Revenue
- Impact of Reducing Utility Expenses
- Adjusted Income and Expenses
80%, the majority of MPHA’s portfolio, is composed of elderly and mixed-population high rise properties.

12% of MPHA’s portfolio, includes scattered sites apartments for families.

8%, the remainder of the portfolio, includes family apartments at Glendale Townhomes and other affordable sites.
MPHA's public housing portfolio is comprised of 6,248 apartments, including:

**Family.** 1,242 total units, including:
- 746 scattered sites
- 184 townhomes
- 312 tax credit apartments

**High Rise.** 5,006 total units, including:
- 2,109 senior units
- 2,987 units for mixed-populations
MPHA Portfolio

MPHA’s 6,248 units are located in 13 wards across the City.

- Wards 3, 5 and 6 include 79% of the high rise properties.
- Wards 4, 5 and 8 have the highest concentration of scattered sites.
- Ward 5 has the highest number of scattered sites.
- Ward 10 scattered sites have the highest values (per MPHA).
- Wards 2, 3 and 7 have fewer units.
- 298 units are located outside of Minneapolis.
Heritage Park

**Background:** The 440 apartments (200 public housing) that make up Heritage Park/Bassett Creek were built as replacement units as part of the Hollman Consent Decree. The City and MPHA selected McCormack Baron Associates (now known as McCormack Baron Salazar or MBS) as Development Partner. The apartments were built in four phases and were placed in service from 2003-2005. MPHA has the option to purchase Bassett Creek (Phase IB) this year (in 2017) and the other phases are in subsequent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERITAGE/BASSETT PH/LIHTC</th>
<th>LIHTC-only</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scope:** The Minneapolis Public Housing Authority (MPHA) requested that CSG Advisors review the Heritage Park/Bassett Creek structure/financials and develop financial models that show leverage options. CSG evaluated various alternatives to determine options available to MPHA as the phases enter the end of the 15-year compliance period.
Heritage Park

Opportunities:
- High demand (99% occupancy)/relatively high rents.
- Extensive amenities.
- Potential to earn developer, asset and property management fees (diversify revenue).
- MPHA potential to own and manage RAD, LIHTC and market rate apartments (diversify portfolio).
- Location – access to amenities: job centers, transit, schools, recreation. Near the central business district and the proposed light rail blue line extension.
- Mixed-income rental, also part of a larger planned development that also includes for-sale homes.
- The exterior of the buildings are in good condition.
- Local community support - the success, stability and sustainability of this neighborhood is critical to the City and stakeholders.

Challenges:
- High operating expenses (resident services programs - Urban Strategies, staffing, security, expensive community spaces).
- Significant debt has accumulated on the four phases with no cash flow.
- Requiring that MBS reduce their expenses based on MPHA annual operating budget review.
- Revising MPHA’s bylaws to allow the agency to own and manage units that are not subsidized.
- Public housing units do not break even.
- The physical conditions analysis found high capital needs.
The one-bedrooms are all LIHTC-only and market, none are public housing.

50% are two-bedrooms, equally PH/LIHTC and market, as well as some LIHTC-only.

25% are three-bedrooms, predominately public housing, some market and LIHTC-only.

2% and 5% are four and five bedroom, all of which are PH/LIHTC.
Heritage Park

Financial Models

- As-is scenario - current revenue and expenses
- RAD/enhanced - 15% reduction in expenses
- The hard costs are taken from a Physical Conditions Assessment completed by McCormack Baron Salazar in 2016.

Assumptions in Operating Budget

- Full RAD Rents
- $500 Replacement Reserve
- 15% reduction in MBS current operating expense per unit
- 6% vacancy rate

Next Steps

CSG recommends that after MPHA completes its analysis of existing capital needs and legal counsel has reviewed the transactional documents, MPHA should consider:

- Exercising its option to purchase the four phases, including the site and the 440 mixed-income apartments.
- Refinancing the existing debt.
- Converting the 200 (potentially more using transfer of assistance) existing public housing units to RAD.

Assumptions in Development Budget:

- Recapitalizing with 4% LIHTC
- Modest acquisition; $10K per unit – Potential impact to purchase price
- $27K in hard costs based on Physical Conditions Assessment
- Equity Price at $0.95
- Debt sized at 6% rate, 40 year term
# Heritage Park Sources and Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Perm Loan</th>
<th>Seller Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$6.9M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Park I</strong> (57 RAD/LIHTC, 29 LIHTC-only, 27 Market)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Def Dev Fee</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Perm Loan</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>Seller Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$8.8M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Park III</strong> (60 RAD/LIHTC, 32 LIHTC-only, 28 Market)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>Land/Building Acq</td>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>Dev Fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Perm Loan</th>
<th>Seller Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$6.1M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Park II</strong> (38 RAD/LIHTC, 20 LIHTC-only, 37 Market)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Perm Loan</th>
<th>Seller Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$6.7M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bassett Creek</strong> (45 RAD, 19 LIHTC, 48 Market)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **$27K in hard based on Conditions Assessment**

*Numbers are in millions*
Heritage Park Options

**Scenario 1**
Purchase
Convert to RAD
- Retain all subsidy
- Gain value of rehab units
- Gain additional units

**Scenario 2**
Ownership As-Is
Convert to RAD
- Loss of Capital Fund
- Potential change in terms
- Retain ACC subsidy
- Gain Capital fund

**Scenario 3**
Ownership As-Is
Remain PH
- Retain capital fund
- Potential change in terms
- Retain ACC Subsidy
- Units continue to operate at deficit

**MPHA > MBS**
**MPHA < MBS**
**MPHA = MBS**
Capital Needs
Capital Needs Summary

MPHA measures and tracks capital needs for units it owns in AMPs 1 through 7 (5,936 units).

MPHA administers, but does not own, the public housing units in AMPs 8 and 9 (312 units). Capital needs for these units should be funded from replacement reserves established at these properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPHA’s Capital Needs *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing (2017)</strong> $125M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrued (2018-2027)</strong> $220M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrued (2028-2037)</strong> $178M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Needs** – repairs/replacements beyond ordinary maintenance required to provide decent and economically sustainable housing.

**Accrued Needs** - expected ongoing repairs/replacements beyond ordinary maintenance, assuming that all existing needs are met.

* Please note that these totals include only MPHA’s residential assets (MPHA’s office and maintenance buildings and the McCorvey Center were taken out from this total.)
Capital Needs Summary

CSG is evaluating various structuring and leveraging options to assist MPHA in strategically programming its $10.2M in annual capital funds and develop a portfolio strategy. CSG’s analysis uses the following metrics.

**Capital needs by AMP** indicates total existing and accrued capital needs by AMP.

**Facility Cost Index (FCI)** provides a comparative indicator of the relative condition of each MPHA facility (development). FCI is expressed as a ratio of the cost of remedying maintenance deficiencies (deferred maintenance) to the current replacement value (CRV). FCI provides facility managers a method of measurement to determine the relative condition index of a single facility or group of facilities. FCI is calculated as the percentage of Total Current Maintenance Deficiencies/Total Current Replacement Value.

**Capital needs ranked by unit** indicates MPHA’s properties with the highest and lowest capital needs by unit.

MPHA is planning $4M in capital improvement projects for the remainder of 2017 and $10.5M in 2018. These projects will partially offset the total estimate of capital need. The work includes replacement of major systems and comprehensive rehab of units, as well as replace of roofs at scattered sites.
MPHA Capital needs: $126M existing; $220M accrued 2018-2027; $182M accrued 2028-2037.

Notes: The totals shown above do not factor in MPHA’s 2017/2018 planned capital fund investments. Heritage Commons (2005) and Feeney Manor (2011) were removed as outliers from the average age for AMP 3. MPHA’s offices, the McCorvey Senior Center, maintenance building are not included, these needs total $12.3M from 2017-2037.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Percentage FCI</th>
<th>Lowest Percentage FCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Anthony Highrise 49 units</td>
<td>Heritage Commons 102 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Townhomes 184 units</td>
<td>Fifth Avenue Highrise 254 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar High Apts 348 units</td>
<td>T Feeney Manor 48 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snelling Manor 28 units</td>
<td>Parker Skyview 333 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Twins Apts 174 units</td>
<td>Lyndale Manor 239 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibley Triangle Apts 35 units</td>
<td>Lynway Manor 462 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Terrace 84 units</td>
<td>Lowry Towers 193 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FCI = Renewal and Repair Costs/Replacement Costs
**Good** 0-5%; **Fair** 6-10%; **Poor** 11-30%; **Critical** >30%

Please note that this information does not factor in MPHA’s capital investment projects currently underway.

*Data Source: Ameresco Asset Planner MPHA PNA database*
Glendale Townhomes has the greatest capital needs (2017-2037) at $152,203 per unit.
Thomas T Feeney Manor has the lowest capital needs (2017-2037) at $47,891 per unit.

Data Source: Ameresco Asset Planner MPHA PNA database
Multiplier Effect of Developing Affordable Housing

MPHA → General Contractor → Local Investment Goods & Services → Local Businesses
MPHA → General Contractor → Suppliers → Local Businesses
MPHA → Sub-Contractors → Local Businesses
Highlights of the Local Economy Impact

**Phase I**
*Local industries involved in affordable housing development.*

Jobs, wages and local taxes (including permit, utility connection, and other fees) generated by the actual affordable housing construction and related activities.

**Phase II**
*Ripple effect.*

Wages and profits for local area residents earned during the construction period are spent on other locally produced goods and services.

**Phase III**
*Ongoing, annual effect.*

Local jobs, income, and taxes generated as a result of the creation of new communities and a greater number of apartment homes being occupied.
Highlights of the Local Economy Impact

Phase I
Local industries involved in affordable housing development
- 4,000 construction jobs
- $208M in wages

Phase II
Ripple effect
- Spin-off jobs
- Wages

Phase III
Ongoing, annual effect
- Permanent jobs
- Wages
- Additional taxes and fees
## Highlights of the Local Economy Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sites</th>
<th>Construction 40% Labor</th>
<th>Construction 60% Materials</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glendale Townhomes</strong></td>
<td>$28M</td>
<td>$42M</td>
<td>$70M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Units New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scattered Sites</strong></td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$47M</td>
<td>$79M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746 Units Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Rise Buildings</strong></td>
<td>$163M</td>
<td>$245M</td>
<td>$408M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,600 Units Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$223M</td>
<td>$334M</td>
<td>$557M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glendale Townhomes reflects new construction hard cost estimates based on similar projects in the area. Scattered Sites and Highrises reflect hard costs based on Ameresco’s 2017-2038 Physical Needs Assessment.

\[
\frac{\$223M}{\$60,000} = 3,716 \text{ jobs}
\]

Approximately 3,716 construction jobs could potentially be created as part of the reinvestment in Minneapolis’ affordable housing portfolio.
Highlights of MPHA’s Local Economic Impact

**DIRECT**
*(Jobs & Income)*

Initial/ Immediate Economic Activity.

- Contractor purchases window materials.
- Contractor hires labor to install windows.

**INDIRECT**
*(Production, Employment, Income Changes)*

Community Businesses and Industries that Supply the Project Activities.

- Increased demand for all related window supplies and labor to produce and sell supplies.

**INDUCED**
*(Increased Spending)*

Direct and Indirect Economic Activity Results in Increased Spending.

- All people impacted by the purchase have disposable income to spend on household goods and discretionary items.
Larger Impact – Post Construction (Ongoing and Long-Term)

- For every dollar of direct federal, state, local spending on housing capital or maintenance, an additional $1.12 of indirect and induced expenditures is generated by suppliers, vendors, and wage-earners.

- Every dollar of affordable housing operating expenditures generates an additional $0.93 of economic activity in the local market.

- Ongoing public housing operations support additional jobs.

Source: Center for Housing Policy, 2011
Reducing Expenses and Increasing Revenue
Overall, MPHA has the potential to save funds for their core mission of housing and raise additional debt for future improvements, by finding ways to cut costs for security and tenant services. While these programs greatly improve the quality of lives for residents, they do not have to be funded or administered by MPHA personnel to be run effectively.

While reducing 15% of expenses can provide the largest savings and largest amount of debt, it is also the most difficult to achieve. Removing security and tenant services would represent 7.8% of MPHA costs at the property, which would require an additional 7.22% ($2.86M) decrease in expenses.
Reducing expenses will allow MPHA to increase the amount of supportable debt through a variety of means. By removing the cost for tenant and protective services, MPHA can raise up to $28 million in supportable debt. Reducing overall expenses by 15% will provide MPHA the maximum amount of additional supportable debt with an additional $65.5 million of debt from the current status quo.

Shedding additional costs will allow MPHA to focus on its core housing mission, and raise additional debt to allow MPHA to address Urgent ($7M) and High ($29M) capital needs.
Other Expenses for LIHTC Benchmark is Real Estate Taxes per unit cost.

MPHA’s AMPs 1 and 2 represented the largest per unit expenses in Personnel and Utilities.

MPHA’s AMPs 3 and 5, which ran a deficit in 2016, showed high per unit costs in Other Expense.
### 2016 Operating Expense Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Apartments (Non-Senior)</th>
<th>Apartments (Senior)</th>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>AMP 4</th>
<th>AMP 5</th>
<th>AMP 6</th>
<th>AMP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$1,444</td>
<td>$1,146</td>
<td>$1,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Cost</td>
<td>$1,008</td>
<td>$1,047</td>
<td>$1,048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$2,564</td>
<td>$1,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$2,870</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>$257</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$1,141</td>
<td>$702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>$1,146</td>
<td>$1,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax/PILOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: MPHA 2016 data and MN Multi-Housing Association 2016 data

---

- MMHA Apartments benchmark include buildings with the following criteria:
  - Elevator in building
  - Are more than 45 years old
  - Have more than 100 units
  - Heat, water, and sewer paid for by owner
2016 OPERATING EXPENSE COMPARISON

- MPHA’s Glendale Townhomes/High rise sites: Salaries (nearly double) MN Multi-housing townhomes and apartments.
- Glendale Townhomes Utilities (nearly triple) MN Multi-housing townhomes
- MN Multi-Housing Maintenance Townhomes/Apartments includes all capital expenditures, while MPHA does not.
- MN Multi-Housing Townhomes/Apartment do not budget for tenant services or protective services/security.
- MN Multi-Housing Townhomes/Apartment pay taxes, while MPHA pays payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT).

Data Sources: MPHA 2016 data and MN Multi-Housing Association 2016 data
2016 MPHA Revenue and Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Revenue per Unit</th>
<th>Expense per Unit</th>
<th>NOI</th>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>NOI after Debt Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Townhomes</td>
<td>$8,718</td>
<td>$8,624</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered Sites</td>
<td>$9,980</td>
<td>$9,092</td>
<td>$889</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 3</td>
<td>$6,448</td>
<td>$6,786</td>
<td>-$339</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td>-$753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 4</td>
<td>$6,169</td>
<td>$5,647</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>$616</td>
<td>-$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 5</td>
<td>$6,055</td>
<td>$6,374</td>
<td>-$320</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>-$752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 6</td>
<td>$6,039</td>
<td>$5,632</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>$144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 7</td>
<td>$6,039</td>
<td>$5,472</td>
<td>$566</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$420k ($70 per unit) of 2016 expenses were paid for with settlement payments and are not included.

$49k ($8 per unit) in insurance proceeds from Other Revenue from were excluded.

**Highest Net Operating Income (NOI) per unit**

- **AMP 2 – Scattered Sites** had the highest revenues and expenses per unit.
- **AMP 7 – High Rise** properties had the lowest cost per unit due to low maintenance and protective service costs.
- **AMP 6 – High Rise** maintenance expenses were lower than other High Rise properties.
- **AMP 4 – High Rise** expenses include lower than average protective services and maintenance costs.

**Lowest Net Operating Income (NOI) per unit**

- **AMP 3 – High Rise** expenses were driven up by tenant services costs and protective services.
- **AMP 5 – High Rise** expenses were driven by high protective services and maintenance costs.
- **AMP 1 – Glendale Townhomes** had positive NOI, but had high per unit expenses, driven by high personnel, utility, and maintenance costs.
Scattered Sites have the highest per unit cost, with high personnel and maintenance costs when compared to Glendale Townhomes and other high rise properties.

Data Source: MPHA 2016
The Scattered Sites have the highest revenue per unit at $10,044, followed by Glendale Townhomes at $8,718.

AMP 3 includes $289 per unit in Other Revenue from HPSSC.

For the high rise AMPs, which is mostly one-bedroom and senior-occupied, the tenant revenue ranges from $2,881 to $3,233 per unit and total revenue ranges from $5,853 to $6,448.

High rise AMPS include 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and make up 80% of MPHA's portfolio (5,006 units).
### Tenant Rent – Based on Actuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Rent</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Income</td>
<td>$10,382</td>
<td>$10,788</td>
<td>$11,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Tenant Income based on Actuals</th>
<th>% of AMI ($90,400)</th>
<th>Average Rent based on Actuals</th>
<th>FMR Based on Unit Size</th>
<th>% of FMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Townhomes</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>16.04%</td>
<td>$362</td>
<td>$1,296</td>
<td>27.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered Sites</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>18,870</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>30.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>10,247</td>
<td>11.34%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>10,425</td>
<td>11.53%</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>31.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>9,449</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>27.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>9,472</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>28.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>9,564</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>$11,147</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
<td>$279</td>
<td>$946</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The average income shown is calculated as net income (income less allowable exclusions).
- The fair market rent is averaged based on the bedroom distribution.
- From 2014 to 2016, MPHA’s tenant rent has grown 3% each year, while tenant incomes have increased 5% between 2015 and 2016.
- Average annual income based on actuals is approximately $11,000.
- Scattered Sites have incomes that are 70% higher than MPHA’s average and is the closest to FMR.
- AMP 5 has the lowest average income by 14% as compared to MPHA’s average and is farthest from the FMR.
Congressional appropriations have decreased subsidy to MPHA by 10% since 2014.

Subsidy received by MPHA has increased by less than 1% in 2015 and less than 2% in 2016, although the subsidy received in 2016 was 90% of eligible subsidy.
Glendale Townhomes and the Scattered Sites received higher revenue per unit, specifically from tenant rents.

AMP 1 and 2 have the highest average income for residents, contributing to their high revenue from tenant income.

Data Source: MPHA 2016
Glendale Townhomes and the Scattered Sites have the highest per unit personnel and utility costs.

Data Source: MPHA 2016
Scattered Sites and Glendale Townhomes had the highest per unit maintenance costs, as the cost of having individual townhomes and Scattered Sites does not provide the same economy of scale as MPHA high rises.

Protective services was highest in AMP 5 due to the crime in the surrounding area.

Tenant services was highest in AMP 3 because of the costs from the local community center.

Data Source: MPHA 2016
Impact of Reducing Utility Expenses
- Utility costs have decreased over the past three years, with a 14% decrease in the total utility cost.
- Increasing average temperatures over the last three years, along with capital improvements has seen the MPHA utility costs decrease.

Data Source: Weather.com
MPHA actuals
## Utilities per Unit – 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>Electric</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Townhomes</td>
<td>$931</td>
<td>$552</td>
<td>$742</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered Sites</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>2,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 3</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 4</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 6</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 7</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPHA Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307</strong></td>
<td><strong>$319</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,166</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Townhomes and Scattered Sites had the highest per unit cost in 2016, as high-rise building (AMPs 3-7) benefited from the economy of scale.
- Utilities per unit at AMP 3 were 18% higher than the other high rise apartments, mostly driven by electric costs.

*Data Source: MPHA 2016*
MPHA-wide, improving utility performance can help increase the amount of debt that can be raised, MPHA must change from the current public housing model to retain these savings.

- A 2.5% decrease in MPHA-wide utility costs of $173,000 can potentially lead to an additional $1.7M in supportable debt.

Data Source: MPHA 2016
Adjusted Income and Expenses Impact
MPHA’s focus on core services can help reduce expenses and increase supportable debt for future rehabilitation and portfolio transition.

Removing Protective Services and Tenant Services costs can help increase supportable debt, with AMPs 3, 6, and 7 standing to benefit the most.

When removing these costs, it is expected, they will be funded through additional funds or partnering organizations that can support MPHA’s core mission of providing high quality housing for residents.

Protective Services and Tenant Services are services that are valued by residents, administrators, and housing advocates. Therefore any change in funding or service will have to be done carefully and with transparency to maintain the current service level and to gain trust with residents and housing advocates.
### 2016 MPHA NOI and Expense Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>AMP 1</th>
<th>AMP 2</th>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>AMP 4</th>
<th>AMP 5</th>
<th>AMP 6</th>
<th>AMP 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$1,606,640</td>
<td>$7,428,860</td>
<td>$8,759,126</td>
<td>$5,855,530</td>
<td>$5,478,907</td>
<td>$5,461,059</td>
<td>$5,723,403</td>
<td>$40,313,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$433,220</td>
<td>$1,879,947</td>
<td>$2,319,797</td>
<td>$1,573,308</td>
<td>$1,546,808</td>
<td>$1,454,748</td>
<td>$1,552,734</td>
<td>$10,760,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>164,624</td>
<td>768,841</td>
<td>863,074</td>
<td>658,490</td>
<td>619,932</td>
<td>600,884</td>
<td>573,299</td>
<td>4,249,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Cost</td>
<td>221,583</td>
<td>786,022</td>
<td>1,570,126</td>
<td>1,059,250</td>
<td>1,004,805</td>
<td>960,160</td>
<td>1,019,727</td>
<td>6,621,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenant Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$692,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,678</strong></td>
<td><strong>$107,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>$147,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,252,901</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>409,214</td>
<td>1,888,017</td>
<td>1,407,812</td>
<td>766,142</td>
<td>800,743</td>
<td>853,038</td>
<td>808,902</td>
<td>6,933,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>189,285</td>
<td>974,021</td>
<td>1,164,900</td>
<td>589,859</td>
<td>633,522</td>
<td>465,801</td>
<td>531,955</td>
<td>4,549,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,509</strong></td>
<td><strong>$469</strong></td>
<td><strong>$536,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>$98,221</strong></td>
<td><strong>$644,045</strong></td>
<td><strong>$294,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,127</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,823,442</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>48,662</td>
<td>271,833</td>
<td>248,602</td>
<td>166,558</td>
<td>167,337</td>
<td>166,632</td>
<td>163,890</td>
<td>1,233,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>24,006</td>
<td>213,132</td>
<td>316,838</td>
<td>276,131</td>
<td>122,625</td>
<td>138,210</td>
<td>121,013</td>
<td>1,211,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Amortization</td>
<td>5,745</td>
<td>25,286</td>
<td>241,201</td>
<td>251,990</td>
<td>165,930</td>
<td>102,362</td>
<td>171,033</td>
<td>963,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,592,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,807,768</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,362,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,582,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,813,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,142,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,298,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,599,948</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPC (Principal)</strong></td>
<td>7,560</td>
<td>33,138</td>
<td>315,374</td>
<td>329,485</td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>133,810</td>
<td>223,647</td>
<td>1,259,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualty Loss</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>75,733</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportable Debt</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,426,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,675,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,915,688</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,054,498</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All AMPs with negative NOI will need to be covered from reserves.
- Supportable debt is calculated based on current year NOI at 1.20 Debt Service Coverage Ratio, 6% interest and 35-year amortization.
- Tenant Services Salaries and Protective Services Salaries were $0 in 2016.
## Adjusted Income Impact

### Option 1: Remove Tenant Services ($6,678 per Unit)

Removing Tenant Services costs from the properties will reduce MPHA costs by $1.1 million per year, allowing MPHA to raise additional debt and focus more funds on the operation and upkeep of its property. AMP 3 provided the highest potential savings ($692k), however, AMP 7 will provide the highest increase in allowable debt service with the removal of tenant services cost. Tenant Participation Activities (TPA) funds, which account for $131 in HUD subsidy, was removed from the revenue in this analysis, as well as all tenant services expenses. While the TPA funds cannot be removed from MPHA activities, they have removed for the sake of this exercise. Allowable debt in AMP 2 decreased because the excluded TPA tenant services cost. Tenant Participation Activities (TPA) funds, which account for $131 in HUD subsidy, was removed from the revenue in this analysis, as well as all tenant services expenses. While the TPA funds cannot be removed from MPHA activities, they have removed for the sake of this exercise. Allowable debt in AMP 2 decreased because the excluded TPA revenue ($16k) was more than their excluded tenant service cost ($200). Also removed from this analysis is revenue from HPSSC and Elderly/Disabled Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMP 1</th>
<th>AMP 2</th>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>AMP 4</th>
<th>AMP 5</th>
<th>AMP 6</th>
<th>AMP 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$1,602,558</td>
<td>$7,412,216</td>
<td>$8,531,644</td>
<td>$5,777,400</td>
<td>$5,405,883</td>
<td>$5,387,041</td>
<td>$5,646,396</td>
<td>$39,763,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>1,537,848</td>
<td>6,807,568</td>
<td>8,669,102</td>
<td>5,439,950</td>
<td>5,705,746</td>
<td>5,036,153</td>
<td>5,150,680</td>
<td>38,347,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Costs</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>108,870</td>
<td>320,290</td>
<td>329,704</td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>133,810</td>
<td>223,647</td>
<td>1,344,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>$53,209</td>
<td>$495,778</td>
<td>-$457,748</td>
<td>$7,747</td>
<td>-$516,831</td>
<td>$217,078</td>
<td>$272,070</td>
<td>$71,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Debt Service</td>
<td>$771,442</td>
<td>$7,187,906</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$112,317</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,147,253</td>
<td>$3,944,537</td>
<td>$15,163,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Debt Service</td>
<td>$734,383</td>
<td>-$238,409</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$112,317</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$471,817</td>
<td>$1,028,849</td>
<td>$2,108,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 2: Remove Protective Services ($6,591 per Unit)

Removal of protective services costs to the property will reduce the overall cost to MPHA by $1.8 million per year. AMP 5 provided the highest potential cost savings, however, AMP 6 provided the highest amount of increase in supportable debt, with $4.2 million increase in potential future debt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMP 1</th>
<th>AMP 2</th>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>AMP 4</th>
<th>AMP 5</th>
<th>AMP 6</th>
<th>AMP 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>1,606,640</td>
<td>7,476,530</td>
<td>8,759,126</td>
<td>5,855,530</td>
<td>5,478,907</td>
<td>5,462,659</td>
<td>5,723,403</td>
<td>40,362,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>1,551,075</td>
<td>6,807,299</td>
<td>8,825,334</td>
<td>5,484,408</td>
<td>5,169,471</td>
<td>4,848,397</td>
<td>5,090,523</td>
<td>37,776,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Costs</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>108,870</td>
<td>320,290</td>
<td>329,704</td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>133,810</td>
<td>223,647</td>
<td>1,344,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>$44,065</td>
<td>$560,361</td>
<td>-$386,498</td>
<td>$41,419</td>
<td>$92,468</td>
<td>$480,453</td>
<td>$409,233</td>
<td>$1,241,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Debt Service</td>
<td>$638,860</td>
<td>$8,124,247</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,506</td>
<td>$1,340,618</td>
<td>$6,965,722</td>
<td>$5,933,164</td>
<td>$23,603,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Debt Service</td>
<td>$601,801</td>
<td>$6,806</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,506</td>
<td>$1,340,618</td>
<td>$4,267,087</td>
<td>$3,017,476</td>
<td>$9,834,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Adjusted Income Impact (continued)

### Option 3: Remove Tenant Services and Protective Services ($6,379 per Unit)

Removal of both tenant services (except TPA funds) and protective services with save MPHA $3.2 million every year, with the largest potential savings in AMP 3, with $1.2 million reduction in annual cost. AMP 6 stands to benefit the most from the reduction in tenant services and protective services costs, with an increase in $7.4 million in allowable debt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w/o TS &amp; PS</th>
<th>AMP 1</th>
<th>AMP 2</th>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>AMP 4</th>
<th>AMP 5</th>
<th>AMP 6</th>
<th>AMP 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>1,602,558</td>
<td>7,412,216</td>
<td>8,531,644</td>
<td>5,777,400</td>
<td>5,405,883</td>
<td>5,387,041</td>
<td>5,646,396</td>
<td>39,763,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>1,496,340</td>
<td>6,807,099</td>
<td>8,132,349</td>
<td>5,341,729</td>
<td>5,061,701</td>
<td>4,741,835</td>
<td>4,942,553</td>
<td>36,523,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Costs</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>108,870</td>
<td>320,290</td>
<td>329,704</td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>133,810</td>
<td>223,647</td>
<td>1,344,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>$94,718</td>
<td>$496,247</td>
<td>$79,005</td>
<td>$105,968</td>
<td>$127,214</td>
<td>$511,396</td>
<td>$480,197</td>
<td>$1,894,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Debt Service</td>
<td>$1,373,243</td>
<td>$7,194,713</td>
<td>$1,145,439</td>
<td>$1,536,344</td>
<td>$1,844,373</td>
<td>$7,414,340</td>
<td>$6,962,013</td>
<td>$27,470,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Debt Service</td>
<td>$1,336,184</td>
<td>-$231,603</td>
<td>$1,145,439</td>
<td>$1,536,344</td>
<td>$1,844,373</td>
<td>$4,738,903</td>
<td>$4,046,325</td>
<td>$14,415,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 4: Reduce overall expenses 15% ($5,897 per Unit)

HUD guidelines allow an expected reduction in expenses of 15%. If MPHA was able to reduce their overall expenses by 15% (not including casualty loss and EPC), they will be able to increase the allowable debt, with AMP 2 seeing the largest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15% Reduction</th>
<th>AMP 1</th>
<th>AMP 2</th>
<th>AMP 3</th>
<th>AMP 4</th>
<th>AMP 5</th>
<th>AMP 6</th>
<th>AMP 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>1,606,640</td>
<td>7,476,530</td>
<td>8,759,126</td>
<td>5,855,530</td>
<td>5,478,907</td>
<td>5,462,659</td>
<td>5,723,403</td>
<td>40,362,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>1,353,696</td>
<td>5,786,603</td>
<td>7,957,774</td>
<td>4,745,234</td>
<td>4,941,488</td>
<td>4,371,307</td>
<td>4,503,853</td>
<td>33,659,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Costs</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>108,870</td>
<td>320,290</td>
<td>329,704</td>
<td>216,969</td>
<td>133,810</td>
<td>223,647</td>
<td>1,344,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>$241,444</td>
<td>$1,581,056</td>
<td>$481,062</td>
<td>$780,593</td>
<td>$320,450</td>
<td>$957,542</td>
<td>$995,904</td>
<td>$5,358,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Debt Service</td>
<td>$3,463,451</td>
<td>$14,805,105</td>
<td>$6,974,548</td>
<td>$11,317,226</td>
<td>$4,645,963</td>
<td>$11,184,050</td>
<td>$11,523,171</td>
<td>$63,913,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Recommendation Key Performance Indicators

Throughout 2017, MPHA worked with Ameresco to establish key performance indicators (KPIs) to evaluate: the operational health and performance of each site, financing opportunities and market needs and trends, as well as the condition and location of each site. These KPIs will assist MPHA in developing a portfolio implementation strategy.

### Operational Health/Property Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover rate (days vacant)</td>
<td>Time to turn units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work orders issued</td>
<td>PHAS/REAC score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work orders completed</td>
<td>Monthly income-expense ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>Cost per unit per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rate</td>
<td>Energy performance (gas, water, electric consumption)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financing Opportunities

- Leveraging with LIHTC, RAD, others/gap financing needed
- Capital Fund investments (in the last 5 years include all sources)
- Competitiveness to qualify for sources
- Appraised value of land/buildings

### Market Needs/Trends

- Current resident demographics
- Current wait list demographics
- Future demographics
## Recommended Key Performance Indicators

### Physical Health/Property Potential
- Capital Needs/FCI (current needs, FCI percentage)
- Age of Units
- Code/Health Deficiencies
- Ability to Increase Density (land to building ratio)
- Ability to Add On-Site Services
- Security
- Ability to Adapt/Age In Place/ADA Units

### Location/Neighborhood/Socioeconomic
- Proximity to assets (include job centers, child care, schools, recreation/parks, grocery stores, pharmacy, library, cultural)
- Access to education (consider including well performing. Also consider Including early education, K-12, GED, college-prep, adult classes (college, vocational, art/music)
- Proximity to social services
- Access to transit
- Safety/crime
- Proximity to negative uses (noise, pollution, environmental issues)
- Access to health services (include proactive health services-such as programs related to nutrition, exercise, wellness)

### Other Areas of Opportunity
- Opportunity areas (as defined by HUD)
- Partnership opportunities
- Investment already occurring in the area (that is relevant, will benefit MPHA residents)
Implementation Strategy

**Strategic Plan**
- Develop comprehensive portfolio strategy
- Meet with local, regional, state and federal organizations/agencies

**Glendale Townhomes**
- Further consider programming options
- Procure a Development Partner that designs a program that allows residents in good standing the right to return and secures the necessary sources to make the project financially feasible.

**Scattered Sites**
- Further explore options to convert units from public housing to vouchers.
- Develop a local revolving loan fund
- Raise local foundations and bank funds, leverage with MPHA reserve funds

**High Rise Developments**
- Convert units to vouchers
- Request that the City of Minneapolis set aside volume bond cap for senior public housing preservation projects

**Overall**
- Address operations savings strategies proposed by CSG
- Research and identify potential energy performance opportunities